

Where To Download Citizens Courts And Confirmations Positivity Theory And The Judgments Of The American People Free Download Pdf

Citizens, Courts, and Confirmations **Citizens, Courts, and Confirmations** *Overcoming Historical Injustices* **Auditors' Information Search and Evaluation in Hypothesis-testing Inconsistency and Indecision in the United States Supreme Court** *Judging Inequality* New Directions in Congressional Politics **The American Supreme Court** **Judicial Politics in the United States** **Curbing the Court** *The Oxford Handbook of Empirical Legal Research* **New Directions in Judicial Politics** **The Limits of Legitimacy** **Law's Infamy** **Scales of Memory** **Rationality and Reasoning** **Overcoming Historical Injustices** **South Africa Edition** Historical Dictionary of the U.S. Supreme Court **The Politics of Federal Prosecution** **Corruption and Governmental Legitimacy** **Black and Blue** Motivating Cooperation and Compliance with Authority *Routledge Handbook of Judicial Behavior* **The Supreme Court** Comparative Constitutional History **Red, White, and Kind of Blue?** *The Media, the Court, and the Misrepresentation* **Personal Control in Action** **Encyclopedia of Medical Decision Making** **Social and Political Foundations of Constitutions** **The Oxford Handbook of U.S. Judicial Behavior** **Covering the United States Supreme Court in the Digital Age** The Consumer

Citizen **Partisan Supremacy The Chief Justice** *Judicial Power and Strategic Communication in Mexico* **What's Law Got to Do With It? Prosecutors, Voters and The Criminalization of Corruption in Latin America** Reforming the Presidential Nomination Process **The Conscientious Justice**

United States Supreme Court justices make decisions that have a profound impact on American society. Empirical legal scholars have portrayed justices as either single-minded or strategic seekers of policy, and there is little room in these theories for things like law, reputation, or personality. This book offers a fresh perspective that will jar Supreme Court scholarship out of complacency. It argues that justices' personalities influence their behavior, which in turn influences legal development and the United States Constitution. This impressive group of authors exhaustively examine every part of the Court's decision-making process, and focus on the trait of conscientiousness and how it influences justices over nine different empirical contexts, from agenda setting to writing the Court's opinions. *The Conscientious Justice* is an important and comprehensive account of judging that restructures existing approaches to analyzing the High Court. *Corruption and Governmental Legitimacy* analyzes "legal corruption," the noncriminal acts of corruption that flourish in democratic nations. This book defines legal corruption and illustrates its corrosive effects. It also examines the possibilities and challenges of corrective legislation and anticorruption campaigns. This volume analyses the social and political forces that influence constitutions and the process of constitution making. It combines theoretical perspectives on the social and political foundations of constitutions with a range of detailed case studies from nineteen countries. In the first part leading scholars analyse and develop a range of theoretical perspectives, including constitutions as coordination devices, mission statements, contracts, products of domestic power play, transnational

documents, and as reflection of the will of the people. In the second part these theories are examined through in-depth case studies of the social and political foundations of constitutions in countries such as Egypt, Nigeria, Japan, Romania, Bulgaria, New Zealand, Israel, Argentina and others. The result is a multidimensional study of constitutions as social phenomena and their interaction with other social phenomena. This book addresses an apparent paradox in the psychology of thinking. On the one hand, human beings are a highly successful species. On the other, intelligent adults are known to exhibit numerous errors and biases in laboratory studies of reasoning and decision making. There has been much debate among both philosophers and psychologists about the implications of such studies for human rationality. The authors argue that this debate is marked by a confusion between two distinct notions: (a) personal rationality (rationality¹ Evans and Over argue that people have a high degree of rationality¹ but only a limited capacity for rationality². The book re-interprets the psychological literature on reasoning and decision making, showing that many normative errors, by abstract standards, reflect the operation of processes that would normally help to achieve ordinary goals. Topics discussed include relevance effects in reasoning and decision making, the influence of prior beliefs on thinking, and the argument that apparently non-logical reasoning can reflect efficient decision making. The authors also discuss the problem of deductive competence - whether people have it, and what mechanism can account for it. As the book progresses, increasing emphasis is given to the authors' dual process theory of thinking, in which a distinction between tacit and explicit cognitive systems is developed. It is argued that much of human capacity for rationality¹ is invested in tacit cognitive processes, which reflect both innate mechanisms and biologically constrained learning. However, the authors go on to argue that human beings also possess an explicit thinking system, which underlies their unique -

if limited - capacity to be rational. "In February 2016, while testifying in a House Appropriations Subcommittee hearing, U.S. Attorney General Loretta Lynch, a Barack Obama appointee, promised that her department would act with independence in investigating Hillary Clinton's usage of a personal email server during her tenure as Secretary of State. During that hearing, Congressman John Carter (R-TX) asked Lynch: If the FBI makes the case that Hillary Clinton mishandled classified information and put America's security at risk, will you prosecute the case? . . . [P]lease look the American people in the eye and tell us what your position is as you are the chief prosecutor of the United States. In response to this questioning, Lynch asserted that: [The matter] is being handled by . . . independent attorneys in the Department of Justice. They follow the evidence, they look at the law and they'll make a recommendation to me when the time is appropriate. . . This will be conducted as every other case. We will review all the facts and all the evidence and come to an independent conclusion as how to best handle it. And I am also aware of no efforts to undermine our review or investigation into this matter at all (Goldman 2016). Despite strong claims of prosecutorial independence, many Republicans complained that a Department of Justice run by Obama appointees could not impartially pass legal judgment on the Hillary Clinton emails matter. A June 27, 2016 meeting between Lynch and former U.S. President Bill Clinton would not help matters. The two privately talked for approximately 20 minutes on a plane sitting on the Phoenix Sky Harbor airport tarmac in a meeting described as unplanned and "primarily social." Despite the meeting's claimed innocuous content, it "caused a cascading political storm" for Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign and "provided fodder for Republicans who have accused the Justice Department of bias in its inquiry into Secretary Clinton's use of a private email server at the State Department" (Chozick 2016). Even Democrats expressed concerns about the meeting Senator Chris Coons (D-

DE) remarked that "I do think that this meeting sends the wrong signal . . . I think she should have steered clear, even of a brief, casual social meeting with the former president"-- An analysis of how problematic laws ought to be framed and considered From the murder of George Floyd to the systematic dismantling of voting rights, our laws and their implementation are actively shaping the course of our nation. But however abhorrent a legal decision might be—whether *Dred Scott v. Sanford* or *Plessy v. Ferguson*—the stories we tell of the law’s failures refer to their injustice and rarely label them in the language of infamy. Yet in many instances, infamy is part of the story law tells about citizens’ conduct. Such stories of individual infamy work on both the social and legal level to stigmatize and ostracize people, to mark them as unredeemably other. Law’s Infamy seeks to alter that course by making legal actions and decisions the subject of an inquiry about infamy. Taken together, the essays demonstrate how legal institutions themselves engage in infamous actions and urge that scholars and activists label them as such, highlighting the damage done when law itself acts infamously and focus of infamous decisions that are worthy of repudiation. Law's Infamy asks when and why the word infamy should be used to characterize legal decisions or actions. This is a much-needed addition to the broader conversation and questions surrounding law’s complicity in evil. The US Supreme Court seeks to withhold information about its deliberations, while the press's job is to report and disseminate this information. These two objectives conflict and create tension between the justices and the reporters who cover them; add to that the increasing demands for transparency in the digital age and the result is an interesting dynamic between an institution that seeks to preserve its opaqueness and a press corps that demands greater transparency. This volume examines the relationship between justices and the press through chapters that discuss facets such as coverage of the institution, the media's approach to the docket,

and the effects of news coverage on public opinion. Additionally, two journalists who cover the court offer insights into the profession of reporting today, while two biographers of Supreme Court justices share the perspectives of those justices regarding the press. This book investigates the judgements South Africans make about the fairness of their country's past, focusing on historical land dispossessions. "Americans spend far more time thinking about what to buy, and what not to buy, than they do about politics. Political leaders often make political claims while using consumer terminology. And political decisions resemble consumer decisions in surprising ways. Together, these forces help give rise to the consumer-citizen: A person who depends on tools and techniques familiar from consumer life to make sense of politics. Understanding citizens as consumer-citizens has implications for a broad array of topics related to public opinion and political behaviour. More than a dozen new experiments make clear that appealing to the consumer-citizen as consumer-citizen can increase trust in government, improve attitudes toward taxes, and enhance political knowledge. Indeed, such appeals can even cause people to sign up for government-sponsored health insurance. However, the consumer-citizen may also prefer candidates whose policies would explicitly undercut their own self-interest. Two concepts from consumer psychology, consumer fairness and operational transparency, are especially useful for understanding the consumer citizen. Although the rise of the consumer-citizen may trouble democratic theorists, the lessons of the consumer-citizen can be applied to a new approach to civic education, with the aim of enriching democracy and public life"-- "I have no agenda," US Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts proclaimed at his Senate confirmation hearing: "My job is to call balls and strikes and not to pitch or bat." This declaration was in keeping with the avowed independence of the judiciary. It also, when viewed through the lens of Roberts's election law decisions, appears to be false. With a scrupulous

reading of judicial decisions and a careful assessment of partisan causes and consequences, Terri Jennings Peretti tells the story of the GOP's largely successful campaign to enlist judicial aid for its self-interested election reform agenda. *Partisan Supremacy* explores four contemporary election law issues—voter identification, gerrymandering, campaign finance, and the preclearance regime of the Voting Rights Act—to uncover whether Republican politicians and Republican judges have collaborated to tilt America's election rules in the GOP's favor. Considering cases from *Shelby County v. Holder*, which enfeebled the Voting Rights Act, to *Crawford v. Marion County Election Board*, which upheld restrictive voter identification laws, to *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon*, which loosened campaign finance restrictions, Peretti lays bare the reality of “friendly” judicial review and partisan supremacy when it comes to election law. She nonetheless finds a mixed verdict in the redistricting area that reveals the limits of partisan control over judicial decisions. Peretti's book helpfully places the current GOP's voter suppression campaign in historical context by acknowledging similar efforts by the post-Civil War Democratic Party. While the modern Democratic Party seeks electoral advantage by expanding voting by America's minorities and youth, arguably hewing closer to democratic principles, neither party is immune to the powerful incentive to bend election rules in its favor. In view of the evidence that *Partisan Supremacy* brings to light, we are left with a critical and pressing question: Can democracy survive in the face of partisan collaboration across the branches of government on critical election issues? Situated between two different constitutional traditions, those of the United Kingdom and the United States, Canada has maintained a distinctive third way: federal, parliamentary, and flexible. Yet in recent years it seems that Canadian constitutional culture has been moving increasingly in an American direction. Through the prorogation crises of 2008 and 2009, its senate reform proposals, and the

appointment process for Supreme Court judges, Stephen Harper's Conservative government has repeatedly shown a tendency to push Canada further into the US constitutional orbit. *Red, White, and Kind of Blue?* is a comparative legal analysis of this creeping Americanization, as well as a probing examination of the costs and benefits that come with it. Comparing British, Canadian, and American constitutional traditions, David Schneiderman offers a critical perspective on the Americanization of Canadian constitutional practice and a timely warning about its unexamined consequences. In recent years the American public has witnessed several hard-fought battles over nominees to the U.S. Supreme Court. In these heated confirmation fights, candidates' legal and political philosophies have been subject to intense scrutiny and debate. *Citizens, Courts, and Confirmations* examines one such fight--over the nomination of Samuel Alito--to discover how and why people formed opinions about the nominee, and to determine how the confirmation process shaped perceptions of the Supreme Court's legitimacy. Drawing on a nationally representative survey, James Gibson and Gregory Caldeira use the Alito confirmation fight as a window into public attitudes about the nation's highest court. They find that Americans know far more about the Supreme Court than many realize, that the Court enjoys a great deal of legitimacy among the American people, that attitudes toward the Court as an institution generally do not suffer from partisan or ideological polarization, and that public knowledge enhances the legitimacy accorded the Court. Yet the authors demonstrate that partisan and ideological infighting that treats the Court as just another political institution undermines the considerable public support the institution currently enjoys, and that politicized confirmation battles pose a grave threat to the basic legitimacy of the Supreme Court. A crisis of legitimacy exists between African Americans and American legal institutions. This book shows how and why African Americans differ in a desire to ascribe legitimacy to legal institutions, as well as a willingness

to accept the policy decisions those institutions put forward. In recent years the American public has witnessed several hard-fought battles over nominees to the U.S. Supreme Court. In these heated confirmation fights, candidates' legal and political philosophies have been subject to intense scrutiny and debate. *Citizens, Courts, and Confirmations* examines one such fight--over the nomination of Samuel Alito--to discover how and why people formed opinions about the nominee, and to determine how the confirmation process shaped perceptions of the Supreme Court's legitimacy. Drawing on a nationally representative survey, James Gibson and Gregory Caldeira use the Alito confirmation fight as a window into public attitudes about the nation's highest court. They find that Americans know far more about the Supreme Court than many realize, that the Court enjoys a great deal of legitimacy among the American people, that attitudes toward the Court as an institution generally do not suffer from partisan or ideological polarization, and that public knowledge enhances the legitimacy accorded the Court. Yet the authors demonstrate that partisan and ideological infighting that treats the Court as just another political institution undermines the considerable public support the institution currently enjoys, and that politicized confirmation battles pose a grave threat to the basic legitimacy of the Supreme Court. Constitutions are a product of history, but what is the role of history in interpreting and applying constitutional provisions? This volume addresses that question from a comparative perspective, examining different uses of history by courts in constitutional adjudication. Although they are not directly accountable to voters, constitutional court judges communicate with the general public through the media. In *Judicial Power and Strategic Communication in Mexico*, Jeffrey K. Staton argues that constitutional courts develop public relations strategies in order to increase the transparency of judicial behavior and promote judicial legitimacy. Yet, in some political contexts there can be a tension between transparency and

legitimacy, and for this reason, courts cannot necessarily advance both conditions simultaneously. The argument is tested via an analysis of the Mexican Supreme Court during Mexico's recent transition to democracy, and also through a cross-national analysis of public perceptions of judicial legitimacy. The results demonstrate that judges can be active participants in the construction of their own power. More broadly, the study develops a positive political theory of institutions, which highlights the connections between democratization and the rule of law. *Judicial Politics in the United States* examines the role of courts as policymaking institutions and their interactions with the other branches of government and other political actors in the U.S. political system. Not only does this book cover the nuts and bolts of the functions, structures and processes of our courts and legal system, it goes beyond other judicial process books by exploring how the courts interact with executives, legislatures, and state and federal bureaucracies. It also includes a chapter devoted to the courts' interactions with interest groups, the media, and general public opinion and a chapter that looks at how American courts and judges interact with other judiciaries around the world. *Judicial Politics in the United States* balances coverage of judicial processes with discussions of the courts' interactions with our larger political universe, making it an essential text for students of judicial politics. Studies the largest foreign bribery case in history to identify the drivers, impact and dilemmas of resolute anti-corruption efforts. The United States Supreme Court exists to resolve constitutional disputes among lower courts and the other branches of government, allowing elected officials, citizens, and businesses to act without legal uncertainty. American law and society function more effectively when the Court resolves these ambiguous questions of Constitutional law. Since lower courts must defer to its reasoning, the Court should also promulgate clear and consistent legal doctrine, giving a reason for its judgment that a majority of justices support. Yet a

Court that prioritizes resolving many disputes will at times produce contradictory sets of opinions or fail to provide a rationale and legal precedent for its decision at all. In either case, it produces an unreasoned judgment. Conversely, a Court that prioritizes logically consistent doctrine will fail to resolve many underlying disputes in law and society. Inconsistency and Indecision in the United States Supreme Court demonstrates that over time, institutional changes, lobbied for by the justices, substantially reduced unreasoned judgments in the Court's output, coinciding with a reduction in the Court's caseload. Hence, the Supreme Court historically emphasized the first goal of dispute resolution, but evolved into a Court that prioritizes the second goal of logically consistent doctrine. As a result, the Court today fails to resolve more underlying questions in law and society in order to minimize criticism of its output from other elites. In so doing, the modern Court often fails to live up to its Constitutional obligation. In *The Supreme Court*, Lawrence Baum provides a brief yet comprehensive introduction to the U.S. Supreme Court, one that is balanced and illuminating. In successive chapters, the book examines each major aspect of the Court: the selection, backgrounds, and departures of justices; the creation of the Court's agenda; the decision-making process and the factors that shape the Court's decisions; the substance of the Court's policies; and the Court's impact on government and American society. Describing the Court's personalities and procedures, and delving deeply to explain the actions of the Court and the behavior of justices, Baum shows students the Court's complexity and reach. Tables and figures, plus a lively photo program, make this one of the most engaging books available. It is simply the standard. *The Historical Dictionary of the U.S. Supreme Court* covers its history through a chronology, an introductory essay, appendixes, and an extensive bibliography. The dictionary section has over 700 cross-referenced entries on every justice, major case, issue, and process that comprises the

Court's work. The Court's decisions are interpreted and disseminated via the media. During this process, the media paints an image of the Court and its business. Like any artist, the media has license regarding what to cover and the amount of attention devoted to any aspect of the Court and its business. Some cases receive tremendous attention, while others languish on the back pages or are ignored. These selection effects create a skewed picture of the Court and its work, and might affect public attitudes toward the Court. Indeed, studies of media coverage of other governmental institutions reveal that when, and how, their policy decisions are covered has implications for the public's understanding of, compliance with, support for, and cynicism about the policy. This book uncovers and describes this coverage and compares it to the confirmation hearings, the Court's actual work, even its members. Rorie Spill Solberg and Eric N. Waltenburg analyze media coverage of nominations and confirmation hearings, the justices' "extra-curricular" activities and their retirements/deaths, and the Court's opinions, and compare this coverage to analyses of confirmation transcripts and the Court's full docket. Solberg and Waltenburg contend that media now cover the Court and its personnel more similarly to its coverage of other political institutions. Journalists still regurgitate a mythology supported by the justices, a "cult of the robe," wherein unbiased and apolitical judges mechanically base their decisions upon the law and the Constitution. Furthermore, they argue the media also focus on the "cult of personality," wherein the media emphasize certain attributes of the justices and their work to match the public's preferences for subject matter and content. The media's portrayal, then, may undercut the Court's legitimacy and its reservoir of good will. Social scientists have convincingly documented soaring levels of political, legal, economic, and social inequality in the United States. Missing from this picture of rampant inequality, however, is any attention to the significant role of state law and courts in establishing policies

that either ameliorate or exacerbate inequality. In *Judging Inequality*, political scientists James L. Gibson and Michael J. Nelson demonstrate the influential role of the fifty state supreme courts in shaping the widespread inequalities that define America today, focusing on court-made public policy on issues ranging from educational equity and adequacy to LGBT rights to access to justice to worker's rights. Drawing on an analysis of an original database of nearly 6,000 decisions made by over 900 judges on 50 state supreme courts over a quarter century, *Judging Inequality* documents two ways that state high courts have crafted policies relevant to inequality: through substantive policy decisions that fail to advance equality and by rulings favoring more privileged litigants (typically known as "upperdogs"). The authors discover that whether court-sanctioned policies lead to greater or lesser inequality depends on the ideologies of the justices serving on these high benches, the policy preferences of their constituents (the people of their state), and the institutional structures that determine who becomes a judge as well as who decides whether those individuals remain in office. Gibson and Nelson decisively reject the conventional theory that state supreme courts tend to protect underdog litigants from the wrath of majorities. Instead, the authors demonstrate that the ideological compositions of state supreme courts most often mirror the dominant political coalition in their state at a given point in time. As a result, state supreme courts are unlikely to stand as an independent force against the rise of inequality in the United States, instead making decisions compatible with the preferences of political elites already in power. At least at the state high court level, the myth of judicial independence truly is a myth. *Judging Inequality* offers a comprehensive examination of the powerful role that state supreme courts play in shaping public policies pertinent to inequality. This volume is a landmark contribution to scholarly work on the intersection of American jurisprudence and inequality, one that essentially rewrites the "conventional

wisdom” on the role of courts in America’s democracy. As the U.S. Congress has steadily evolved since the Founding of our nation, so too has our understanding of the institution. The second edition of *New Directions in Congressional Politics* offers an accessible overview of the current developments in our understanding of America’s legislative branch. Jamie L. Carson and Michael S. Lynch help students bridge the gap between roles, rules, and outcomes by focusing on a variety of thematic issues: the importance of electoral considerations, legislators’ strategic behavior to accomplish objectives, the unique challenges of Congress as a bicameral institution in a polarized environment, and the often-overlooked policy outputs of the institution. This book brings together leading scholars of Congress to provide a general overview of the entire field. Each chapter covers the cutting-edge developments on its respective topic. As the political institution responsible for enacting laws, the American public regularly looks to the U.S. Congress to address the important issues of the day. The contributors in this volume help explain why staying atop the research trends helps us better understand these issues in the ever-changing field of American politics. New to the Second Edition New and updated chapters highlighting party recruitment, redistricting, women in Congress, the nationalization of Congressional elections, and the reassertion of Congressional oversight. A first look at Congressional-executive relations in the Trump era. Updated data through the 2018 Midterm elections. The *Encyclopedia of Medical Decision Making* presents state-of-the-art research and ready-to-use facts sorting out findings on medical decision making and their applications. The 2008 U.S. presidential campaign has provided a lifetime's worth of surprises. Once again, however, the nomination process highlighted the importance of organization, political prowess, timing, and money. And once again, it raised many hackles. The Democratic contest in particular generated many complaints—for example, it started too early, it was too long, and Super Tuesday

was overloaded. This timely book synthesizes new analysis by premier political scientists into a cohesive look at the presidential nomination process—the ways in which it is broken and how it might be fixed. The contributors to *Reforming the Presidential Nomination Process* address different facets of the selection process, starting with a brief history of how we got to this point. They analyze the importance—and perceived unfairness—of the earliest primaries and discuss what led to record turnouts in 2008. What roles do media coverage and public endorsements play? William Mayer explains the "superdelegate" phenomenon and the controversy surrounding it; James Gibson and Melanie Springer evaluate public perceptions of the current process as well as possible reforms. Larry Sabato (*A More Perfect Constitution*) calls for a new nomination system, installed via constitutional amendment, while Tom Mann of Brookings opines on calls for reform that arose in 2008 and Daniel Lowenstein examines the process by which reforms may be adopted—or blocked. *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. Judicial Behavior* offers readers a comprehensive introduction and analysis of research regarding decision making by judges serving on federal and state courts in the U.S. Featuring contributions from leading scholars in the field, the Handbook describes and explains how the courts' political and social context, formal institutional structures, and informal norms affect judicial decision making. The Handbook also explores the impact of judges' personal attributes and preferences, as well as prevailing legal doctrine, influence, and shape case outcomes in state and federal courts. The volume also proposes avenues for future research in the various topics addressed throughout the book. Consultant Editor for *The Oxford Handbooks of American Politics*: George C. Edwards III. This monograph explores how the constitutional courts in the United States, Germany, and South Africa have invoked slavery, Nazism, and apartheid - three historical evils - as an aid in constitutional interpretation. It examines how the memory of evil pasts moulds

constitutional meaning in the contested present. What motivates political actors with diverging interests to respect the Supreme Court's authority? A popular answer is that the public serves as the guardian of judicial independence by punishing elected officials who undermine the justices. Curbing the Court challenges this claim, presenting a new theory of how we perceive the Supreme Court. Bartels and Johnston argue that, contrary to conventional wisdom, citizens are not principled defenders of the judiciary. Instead, they seek to limit the Court's power when it suits their political aims, and this inclination is heightened during times of sharp partisan polarization. Backed by a wealth of observational and experimental data, Bartels and Johnston push the conceptual, theoretical, and empirical boundaries of the study of public opinion of the courts. By connecting citizens to the strategic behavior of elites, this book offers fresh insights into the vulnerability of judicial institutions in an increasingly contentious era of American politics. Interest in social science and empirical analyses of law, courts and specifically the politics of judges has never been higher or more salient. Consequently, there is a strong need for theoretical work on the research that focuses on courts, judges and the judicial process. The Routledge Handbook of Judicial Behavior provides the most up to date examination of scholarship across the entire spectrum of judicial politics and behavior, written by a combination of currently prominent scholars and the emergent next generation of researchers. Unlike almost all other volumes, this Handbook examines judicial behavior from both an American and Comparative perspective. Part 1 provides a broad overview of the dominant Theoretical and Methodological perspectives used to examine and understand judicial behavior, Part 2 offers an in-depth analysis of the various current scholarly areas examining the U.S. Supreme Court, Part 3 moves from the Supreme Court to examining other U.S. federal and state courts, and Part 4 presents a comprehensive overview of Comparative Judicial

Politics and Transnational Courts. Each author in this volume provides perspectives on the most current methodological and substantive approaches in their respective areas, along with suggestions for future research. The chapters contained within will generate additional scholarly and public interest by focusing on topics most salient to the academic, legal and policy communities. When the U.S. Supreme Court announces a decision, reporters simplify and dramatize the complex legal issues by highlighting dissenting opinions and thus emphasizing conflict among the justices themselves. This often sensationalistic coverage fosters public controversy over specific rulings despite polls which show that Americans strongly believe in the Court's legitimacy as an institution. In *The Limits of Legitimacy*, Michael A. Zilis illuminates this link between case law and public opinion. Drawing on a diverse array of sources and methods, he employs case studies of eminent domain decisions, analysis of media reporting, an experiment to test how volunteers respond to media messages, and finally the natural experiment of the controversy over the Affordable Care Act, popularly known as Obamacare. Zilis finds that the media tends not to quote from majority opinions. However, the greater the division over a particular ruling among the justices themselves, the greater the likelihood that the media will criticize that ruling, characterize it as "activist," and employ inflammatory rhetoric. Hethen demonstrates that the media's portrayal of a decision, as much as the substance of the decision itself, influences citizens' reactions to and acceptance of it. This meticulously constructed study and its persuasively argued conclusion advance the understanding of the media, judicial politics, political institutions, and political behavior. This volume offers perspectives from political scientists, legal scholars, and practicing judges as they seek to answer the question of how much law actually has to do with judicial behavior and decision-making, and what it means for society at large. The Chief Justice brings together leading scholars of the

courts who employ social science theory and research to explain the role of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. They consider the chief justice's appointment, office, powers, and influence both within the Court and in the American system of government more generally. The chief justice presides over oral arguments and the justices' private conferences. The chief justice speaks first in those conferences, presents cases and other matters to the other justices, and assigns the Court's opinions in all cases in which the chief justice votes with the majority. In addition, the chief justice presides over the Judicial Conference of the United States, a policy-making body composed of lower-court federal judges. As Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes wrote, the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court is "the most important judicial officer in the world." This new study presents exciting international research developments on personal control and self-regulation. Each chapter examines the subject at a different level of analysis to foster a complete understanding. Brief synopses of each chapter are provided as introductions to the three major sections of the book. These sections cover the person as an agent of control, affective and cognitive mechanisms of executive agency, and reactions to threatened control. For more than fifty years, Robert G. McCloskey's classic work on the Supreme Court's role in constructing the US Constitution has introduced generations of students to the workings of our nation's highest court. As in prior editions, McCloskey's original text remains unchanged. In his historical interpretation, he argues that the strength of the Court has always been its sensitivity to the changing political scene, as well as its reluctance to stray too far from the main currents of public sentiment. In this new edition, Sanford Levinson extends McCloskey's magisterial treatment to address developments since the 2010 election, including the Supreme Court's decisions regarding the Defense of Marriage Act, the Affordable Care Act, and gay marriage. The best and most concise account of the Supreme Court and its place in

American politics, McCloskey's wonderfully readable book is an essential guide to the past, present, and future prospects of this institution. Overcoming Historical Land Injustices in South Africa is the last entry in Gibson's "overcoming trilogy" on South Africa's transformation from apartheid to democracy. Focusing on the issue of historical land dispossessions - the taking of African land under colonialism and apartheid - this book investigates the judgments South Africans make about the fairness of their country's past. Should, for instance, land seized under apartheid be returned today to its rightful owner? Gibson's research zeroes in on group identities and attachments as the thread that connects people to the past. Even when individuals have experienced no direct harm in the past, they care about the fairness of the treatment of their group to the extent that they identify with that group. Gibson's analysis shows that land issues in contemporary South Africa are salient, volatile, and enshrouded in symbols and, most important, that interracial differences in understandings of the past and preferences for the future are profound. This volume explores the various ways in which trust is thought about and studied in contemporary society. In doing so, it aims to advance both theoretical and methodological perspectives on trust. Trust is an important topic in this series because it raises issues of both motivation and emotion. Specifically, notions of trust and fairness motivate individuals to behave in a manner they deem appropriate when responding to governmental authority. On the emotions-related side, individuals have emotional responses to institutions with authority over their lives, such as the city government or the Supreme Court, depending on whether they perceive the institutions as legitimate. The public's trust and confidence in governmental institutions are frequently claimed as essential to the functioning of democracy), spawning considerable research and commentary. For those in the law and social sciences, the tendency is to focus on the criminal justice system in general and

the courts in particular. However, other public institutions also need trust and confidence in order not only to promote democracy but also to assure effective governance, facilitate societal interactions, and optimize organizational productivity. Not surprisingly, therefore, important research and commentary is found in literatures that focus on issues ranging from social sciences to natural resources, from legislatures to executive branch agencies, from brick and mortar businesses to online commerce, from health and medicine to schools, from international development to terrorism, etc. This volume integrates these various approaches to trust from these disciplines, with the goal of fostering a truly interdisciplinary dialogue. By virtue of this interdisciplinary focus, the volume should have broad appeal for researchers and instructors in a variety of disciplines: psychology, sociology, political science, criminal justice, social justice practitioners, economics and other areas. With its often vague legal concepts and institutions that operate according to unfamiliar procedures, judicial decision-making is, in many respects, a highly enigmatic process. *New Directions in Judicial Politics* seeks to demystify the courts, offering readers the insights of empirical research to address questions that are of genuine interest to students. In addition to presenting a set of conclusions about the way in which courts operate, this book also models the craft of political research, illustrating how one can account for a variety of factors that might affect the courts and how they operate. The renowned scholars and teachers in this volume invite critical thinking, not only about the substance of law and courts in America, but also about the ways in which we study judicial politics. The empirical study of law, legal systems and legal institutions is widely viewed as one of the most exciting and important intellectual developments in the modern history of legal research. Motivated by a conviction that legal phenomena can and should be understood not only in normative terms but also as social

practices of political, economic and ethical significance, empirical legal researchers have used quantitative and qualitative methods to illuminate many aspects of law's meaning, operation and impact. In the 43 chapters of *The Oxford Handbook of Empirical Legal Research* leading scholars provide accessible and original discussions of the history, aims and methods of empirical research about law, as well as its achievements and potential. The Handbook has three parts. The first deals with the development and institutional context of empirical legal research. The second - and largest - part consists of critical accounts of empirical research on many aspects of the legal world - on criminal law, civil law, public law, regulatory law and international law; on lawyers, judicial institutions, legal procedures and evidence; and on legal pluralism and the public understanding of law. The third part introduces readers to the methods of empirical research, and its place in the law school curriculum.