INDEX

academic conferences, 216
Africa Judges & Jurists Forum, 215
Argentina, 211, 235–6
Aristotle, 39
Arrington, Celeste, 125
Association of Asian Constitutional Courts, 215
audience sensitivity, 188
audience-based approach, 143–5
authoritarian regimes, 21
  agency in, 198–9, 200
  agents in, 198–9, 200
  arbitrariness in, 21
  bureaucracy in, 198–9, 200
  constitutional court in, 53–5, 65
  constitutional dynamic and, 47
  democracy and, 27
  dual state and, 42–3
  election in, 32, 47, 92
  electoral pressure in, 140–1, 145–6
  guardianship and, 39
  interest-based politics in, 91
  judges in, 164, 203
  judicial public communication in, 221
  legal mobilization in, 112
  political branches in, 90
  political legitimacy and, 37
  public opinion in, 140–1, 145–6
autocratic legalism, 3, 43
autocratization, 2–3
avoidance, 153

backchanneling, 219–23
Barber, Nick, 21
Bar-Siman-Tov, Ittai, 107, 108
Baum, Lawrence, 143
Beetham, David, 135
Belgium, 107
Bellamy, Richard, 70
Biagi, Francesco, 66
Blauberger, Michael, 181
Brazil, 209, 212
Brennan, Jason, 39
Brumberg, Daniel, 36
Busch, Marc, 181
business community, 201–2
  judicial independence and, 201–2
Bussey, Erica, 121

Canada, 216
case administration, 184–6
Chan, Cora, 41
Chang, Wen-Chen, 175
Cheema, Moeen, 124
Cheeseman, Nic, 31
Chilton, Adam, 8
Chopra, Surabhi, 247
Cichowski, Rachel, 109
citations, 178–9
civil servants, 198
Colombia, 107, 108
comparative citation, 179–80
comparative jurisprudence, 179
Conference of European Constitutional Courts, 215
constituency
  authoritarian constituency, 148–50, 151–3
  democratic constituency, 148–50, 151–3, 193
constitution, 6–8, *See also* constitution of hybrid regime
constitutional court, 9, 15

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011

apex courts, 16
as political institutions, 16
centralized constitutional court, 15
constitutional accountability and, 98–9
constitutional adjudicative powers of, 15
constitutional interpretation of, 101–2
decentralized constitutional court, 15
democracy and, 82–6, 92
democratic roles of, 68–70, 72–3, 92–3
effectiveness of, 7
impartiality of, 17
institutional competency of, 129–31
institutional legitimacy of, 128
judicial discretion of, 101–2, 232
proportionality and, 104–5
judicial interpretation of, 101–2
legitimacy of, 7
perceived legitimacy of, 137, 142, 143–5
roles of, 16–17
rule of law and, 99
standard account of, 15
constitutional courts in
Colombia, 108
Egypt, 57, 74
Europe, 66
Germany, 181, 210
Hungary, 67, 136, 152
Kenya, 136
Poland, 136
Russia, 74, 211
South Africa, 107, 136, 185, 216
South Korea, 175, 208
Taiwan, 175
Turkey, 64, 74
Uganda, 98, 113–14, 121, 136
Ukraine, 74
constitutional dynamic
authoritarian regimes and, 47
democracy and, 47
in hybrid regimes, 46, 47–50, 60, 146–7
constitutionalism
abusive constitutionalism, 3
as source of legitimacy, 70
comparative constitutionalism, 9
court-centric constitutionalism, 3–4
legal constitutionalism, 8
normative constitutionalism, 5
political constitutionalism, 8
popular constitutionalism, 85
court
audience of, 142–5
communication strategies of, 209–10, 211
confidence in, 138–9, 233–4
decision-making patterns of, 154
institutional reform as resistance to, 168
narrative of, 182
negative publicity of, 167
noncompliance to, 167–8
public relations of, 205, 208–10, 211–12, 234
resistance to, 166
violence to, 168
courtocracy, 66–8

Daly, Tom, 86, 238
Davis, Richard, 207
democracy, 18–19, 82, 88–9
as source of legitimacy, 71
authoritarian regimes and, 27
by judiciary, 66–8
citizens and, 30
constitutional dynamic and, 47
constitutional interpretation and, 100–1
election and, 19, 47
electoral pressure in, 140, 145
guardianship and, 39
hybrid regimes and, 34, 41, 61–2
institutional requirement of, 20–2
judicial review and, 86–9
liberal constitutional democracy, 19
liberty and, 19–20
normative account of, 18
political equality and, 19, 88
public opinion in, 140, 145
rule of law and, 20–2
transition to, 13

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011

democratic accountability, 99
democratic backsliding, 2–3
democratic hedging, 69
democratization, 2, 13–14
  constitutional court and, 65–6, 67–70
  new democracy, 65–6, 69
  transitional regimes, 65–6
democratization jurisprudence, 64, *See also* democratization; Optimistic Model of constitutional court
Diamond, Larry, 34
divided politics, 59–61
dock control, 184–5
Dressel, Bjorn, 142
dual agency, 154, *See also* constitutional dynamics; constitutional dynamics in hybrid regimes
Dugard, John, 231
Dworkin, Ronald, 162

East Africa, 220
Egypt, 57, 74, 224
election
  free and fair, 19, 29–31, *See also* democracy and election
  noncompetitive, 30
  political equality and, 30
  semi-competitive, 10, 31–2
election in
  Hong Kong SAR, 11, 31–3, 36, 97, 150
  Malaysia, 32
  Pakistan, 11–12, 31, 32, 36
  Philippines, 31
  The Gambia, 32
  Turkey, 31
  Uganda, 12, 32, 36, 98
Ellett, Rachel, 57, 191, 239
Elster, Jon, 62
Ely, John Hart, 68, 94–6, 101, 115–16
Epperly, Brad, 58
Epstein, Lee, 154
European Network of Councils for the Judiciary, 226, 228, 240
European Union, 179, 224–5

Fiji, 229
Finnis, John, 84
foreign visits, 216
formal legal position, 159–60, 163–4
Fraenkel, Ernst, 42
France, 224
front-channel negotiations, 221
Fuller, Lon, 20

Galanter, Mark, 125–6
Gandhi, Jennifer, 92
Gardbaum, Stephen, 94
Germany, 42, 107, 162, 181, 210, 232
Ghias, Shoaib, 197
Gibson, James, 137
Ginsburg, Tom, 18, 19
Goldsworthy, Jeff, 160
González-Ocantos, Ezequiel, 202
Grendstad, Gunnar, 210
guardianship, 38–9
  elite entrenchment and, 39–40
  in hybrid regime, 40–1

Halliday, Terence, 193
hearing, 185
Hirschl, Ran, 3, 9
HKSAR. *See* Hong Kong SAR
Hong Kong Bar Association, 194
Hong Kong SAR
  access to justice in, 114
  anti-extradition bill protest in, 11, 199
  Basic Law of, 10, 35
  Chief Justice of, 56, 216, 248–50
  civil rights in, 14
  civil servants in, 199
  civil society in, 11
  court in, 13–14, 64, 120–1, 152
  Court of Final Appeal of, 102–3, 248, 251
  election in, 11, 31–3, 36, 97, 150
  foreign judges in, 229, 251–2
  freedom of speech in, 102–3
  independent judicial power of, 249
  judges in, 56, 76, 147, 225, 232–3, 236–7, 240–1, 250–1
  judicial image in, 212

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011

judicial independence in, 57, 201, 249–50
judicial interpretation in, 102–3
judicial legitimacy in, 253–4
judicial mobilization in, 112
judicial protest in, 194
judiciary of, 13, 150, 212, 247
lawyers' protest in, 194
legal mobilization in, 112, 113
legislature of, 150
LGBTQ rights in, 119–21, 237
National Security Law of, 11, 33, 152, 246–7
non-adjudicative strategies in, 248–55
nonpermanent judges in, 229
outward influence of courts in, 124
political opposition in, 11, 60
preroogative power in, 45
protection of rights in, 43
resignation of judges in, 229, 231, 232–3, 251–2
rule of law in, 35, 201
universal suffrage in, 10
Hume, Robert, 177–8
Hungary, 2, 34, 50, 67, 74, 136, 147, 152
Huntington, Samuel, 29
Huq, Aziz, 18, 19, 244
hybrid regimes, 2, 26–8
access to justice in, 113–14
agency in, 56, 198–9, 200
bureaucracy in, 198–9, 200
check and balance in, 43
Constitution in, 6–8, 27, 35, 43
constitutional courts in, 5–6, 7, 17, 46, 62, 132
as referee, 95–7, 100
constitutional dynamics and, 41, 49, 146–7, 153–5
constitutional interpretation and, 100–1
democratic constituency and, 151–2
democratic representation and, 89–90
democratic roles of, 8–9, 74–6, 92–3, 132
extralegal effects and, 122–3
institutional legitimacy of, 127–8
interest-based politics and, 91–2
judicial autonomy of, 6, 63
judicial discretion and, 100
judicial legitimacy of, 141, 146–7
Optimistic Model of, 63–4
Pessimistic Model of, 52–5
political participation and, 110–12
Realistic Model of, 76–8
rule of law and, 93, 99
constitutional dynamics in, 46, 49, 60, 146–7
constitutional ideologies and, 37, 40–1
constitutional legal accountability in, 96
democracy and, 34, 40–1, 61–3
democratic constitutional norms in, 8
democratic institutions in, 36
dual state and, 44, 45
elections in, 27, 31–3, 47–8, 58–9, 97
elites in, 60, 100, 148
guardianship in, 40–1
ideological homogeneity, 60
incumbent bias in, 117–19
incumbent government in, 31, 32, 49–50, 96, 148
judges in, 75–6, 158, 239
judicial autonomy and, 6, 56–7, 60–1, 76
judicial independence and, 6, 36, 62–3
judicial political dynamics in, 55–6
judicial review and, 87
judicial strategies in, 165–6, 170–4
judicial–executive relationship in, 13, 54–6, 124, 200, 239
legal mobilization in, 47–9
liberal democracy and, 35
normative state and, 43–5
opposition in, 47–9, 60
political accountability in, 91
political branches in, 90–1, 108
political legitimacy and, 37
political participation in, 89, 91, 109–10
political pluralism and, 60, 62

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011

hybrid regimes (cont.)
political representation in, 90
prerogative state and, 44–5
proliferation of, 1–3
public opinion in, 141, 198
rule of law and, 35–6
rule of law in, 201
semi-competitive election and, 27, 28–9, 31–3
state agents and, 45–6, 198–9, 200
trifurcated legal order of, 43–4, 45

Ibero-American Conference of Constitutional Justice, 215
incrementalism, 186–7
India, 183, 184
institutional competency, 127–8
of court, 128
of legislature, 128
relative, 131
Inter-American Court of Human Rights, 215
interest of litigants, 161
International Association of Women Judges, 215
International Commission of Jurists, 215
international organizations, 200
judicial independence and, 201
intra-branch relations, 217
Ip, Eric C. 13, 198, 247
Israel, 107, 125
Issacharoff, Samuel, 68–73, 76

Japan, 29, 125
Jenne, Erin, 96, 164
Johnston, Jane, 211, 235
Jones, Carol, 199
judges, 161–2, 164, 202
bilateral engagements of, 216
foreign, 203–4
institution-building by, 233
overseas, 203–4
political acumen of, 161–2
public communication and, 208
social network of, 204–5
violence to, 168

judgment
release of, 186
timing of, 183–4
judicial agency, 162
judicial bargaining, 220
judicial behavior, 53, 143, 196, 203
judicial communication, 123, 125–6, 181–2, 207, 210
selectiveness of, 210
judicial decision, 174–5
deviance to, 167–8
noncompliance to, 167–8
judicial diplomacy, 212–13, 235
hostile relations and, 218–19
public relation and, 213
judicial incrementalism, 187
judicial independence, 4, 53–5, 238, *See also* judicial independence in hybrid regime
business community and, 201–2
de facto, 36
de jure, 36
international organizations and, 201
semi-competitive elections and, 58–9
judicial language, 180
judicial legitimacy, 134, 137, 210
judicial mobilization, 227
judicial mobilization in
Hong Kong SAR, 112
Pakistan, 150, 227, 228, 239
Poland, 227–8, 239–40
Uganda, 113
judicial networks, 215
judicial oath, 230
judicial politics, 162, 169
judicial power, 136
judicial protest, 192, 225–6, 237
judicial protest in
Egypt, 224
European Union, 224–5
France, 224
Hong Kong SAR, 194
Pakistan, 150, 195, 224, 227, 239
Poland, 224, 227–8, 239–40
Romania, 224
Uganda, 194, 224
judicial public relations, 205–6, 208–10, 211–12, 235

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011

judicial reasoning, 176–8
  procedural review in, 177–8
  specificity in, 182
  substantive review in, 177
judicial remedies, 175–6, 186
judicial resignation, 228, 230–1, 237
  signaling effects of, 231
judicial review
  counter-majoritarian difficulty in, 71–2
  counter-majoritarian difficulty of, 82, 86–7
  democracy and, 82–6
  democratic objections to, 82, 86–90
  judicial intervention and, 66–8
  legislature and, 85, 106–7, 109
  process theory of, 94–6
    counter-majoritarian difficulty and, 94
  semi-procedural review in, 107, 109
judicialization, 64
judicialization of politics, 4, 123
judiciary
  democracy by, 66–8
  executive and, 83
juristocracy, 3

Kalb, Johanna, 179
Kavanagh, Aileen, 95
Kenya, 136
Khaitan, Tarun, 153
King, Jeff, 116–19, 130
Klass, Brian, 31
Komesar, Neil, 131
Krygier, Martin, 20

Larsson, Olof, 178
Latin America, 215
lawyers, 194
  judicial politics and, 194, 195
Lazarus, Liora, 109
legal academy, 216
legal discontent, 138
legal façade, 3
legal language, 181
legal mobilization, 109, *See also* judicial mobilization
legal mobilization in Pakistan, 112
legal profession, 195–6, 217
legislature, 83, 128
  judicial review and, 85, 106–7
LGBTQ rights, 119–21
Lust-Okar, Ellen, 92

Malaysia, 32
Martinsen, Dorte, 181
Mashaw, Jerry, 88
Mazmanyan, Armen, 64
media, 197–8, 206–7
Mexico, 210, 255
Michigan, 209
Mietzner, Marcus, 66
Moustafa, Tamir, 28, 53, 57
Mudde, Cas, 96, 164
Museveni, Yoweri, 12–13, 32, 98, 125, 147, 187–9, 194, 224
Musharraf, Pervez, 11–12, 14, 32, 34, 150, 194, 199, 227, 229

natural language, 180–1
Nazi Germany, 42, 162, 232
Nebraska, 208
New Jersey, 208
Nicaragua, 230
non-adjudicative strategies, 233–4, 236, 237
non-engagement strategy, 205–7
normative legitimacy, 135
Norway, 209–10, 212, 229

Pakistan
  access to justice in, 113
  as authoritarian regime, 28
  bureaucracy in, 60, 199–200
  Chaudhry court in, 56, 64, 97, 113, 150, 199, 228
  Constitution of, 35, 113
  court in, 56, 64, 97, 113, 150, 183, 188, 200, 228
  election in, 11–12, 31, 32, 36
  judges in, 50, 56, 76, 184, 225, 229
  judicial mobilization in, 150, 227, 228, 239
  judicial protest in, 150, 195, 224, 227, 239

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011

Pakistan (cont.)
lawyers' protest in, 150, 195, 224, 227
legal mobilization in, 112
media coverage of judiciary in, 197
military court in, 44
military dictatorships in, 11
military in, 44
Musharraf, Pervez, 11–12, 14, 32, 34, 150, 194, 199, 227, 229
narrative of courts in, 183
outward influence of courts in, 124
political opposition in, 60
protection of rights in, 43
real democracy in, 34
Supreme Court of, 13, 14, 64, 97, 113, 150, 186, 228
the Lawyers' Movement of, 150, 195, 224, 228
parliamentary immunity, 20
Pelc, Krzysztof, 181
People's Republic of China, 2, 13, 28, 38, 147
perceived legitimacy, 135–6, 137–8, 142
Petter Graver, Hans, 162
Philippines, 31
Pildes, Richard, 68
Pils, Eva, 247
Plato, 38
Poland, 2, 50, 136, 207, 224, 227–8, 239–40
political fragmentation, 59–61, *See also* political dynamics and hybrid regime
judicial autonomy and, 60–1
political market, 68
political representation
majority bias in, 116–17
minority discrimination in, 115
substantive representation in, 114
political skepticism, 72
political transaction costs, 56
politics of reciprocity, 204
post-Soviet states, 64
press releases, 207
presumption of constitutionality, 106
priming, 180
professionalism, 139
protest, 223–4
public information model, 205

Qazi, Asher, 199

relational approach, 142
relational networks, 142
relation-building, 204–5, 212
reservoir of good will, 138–9
retired judge, 232
Romania, 224
rule of law, 20–2, 99
competitive elections and, 21
Russia, 2, 34, 74, 113, 211

Sadurski, Wojciech, 85, 123
Saudi Arabia, 28
Schedler, Andreas, 30, 31, 33, 47, 48
Scheppele, Kim Lane, 43, 66–8, 70–3, 74–5
Scribner, Druscilla, 211, 235
secondary materials, 180
Shah, Aqil, 11
Shapiro, Ian, 63
Shapiro, Martin, 134, 153
Simonsen, Natasha, 109
Singapore, 2, 34, 35, 38, 43, 102–3, 215
Slovenia, 208
social legitimacy, 202
social media, 207
Sólyom, László, 66
sophisticated intermediaries, 126, 197
South Africa, 107–8, 136, 162, 185, 229, 231
South Korea, 175, 208
state
dual state, 42–3
institutional guarantees of, 29
normative state, 42–3
prerogative state, 42
Staton, Jeffrey, 168, 210–11
Stone Sweet, Alec, 123
Supreme Court of
Brazil, 209
Canada, 216
India, 183
Mexico, 210

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011

Nicaragua, 230
Norway, 209–10, 229
Pakistan, 13, 14, 64, 97, 113, 150, 186, 228
Singapore, 215
Uganda, 98, 103–4, 121
United Kingdom, 207, 216
United States, 185
Sustainable Democratic Adjudication, 157, 159, 160

Taiwan, 61, 175
Taras, David, 206
Thailand, 147
The Gambia, 32, 149
tolerance interval, 154
trials, 185–6
Trochev, Alexei, 191, 211, 220, 239
Turkey, 28, 31, 64, 74, 113
Tushnet, Mark, 84, 85

Uganda
access to justice in, 113–14
backchanneling in, 220
Chief Justice of, 151
Constitution of, 35, 98
Constitutional Court of, 98, 113–14, 121, 136
court in, 98, 113–14, 147, 151, 179, 187–9, 208
election in, 12, 32, 36, 98
freedom of press in, 103–4
High Courts of, 13
judges in, 14, 50, 76, 225, 239
judicial independence in, 57
judicial mobilization in, 113
judicial protest in, 194, 224
lawyers' protest in, 194, 224
legal mobilization in, 113
military court in, 44
military dictatorship in, 12
military in, 44
Museveni, Yoweri, 12–13, 32, 98, 125, 147, 187–9, 194, 224
no-party democracy of, 12, 34
outward influence of courts in, 125
protection of rights in, 43
Supreme Court of, 98, 103–4, 121
women's rights in, 121–2
UK. *See* United Kingdom
Ukraine, 74, 113
Union of Arab Constitutional Courts & Councils, 215
United Kingdom, 72, 107, 207, 216
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 217
United States of America, 2, 20, 72, 184, 185, 209, 225
US. *See* United States of America
USA. *See* United States of America
use of precedents, 179–80

Vanberg, Georg, 140, 168
Venezuela, 2
Versteeg, Mila, 8
Veto players, 59

Wacks, Raymond, 162
Waldron, Jeremy, 70
watchdog, 130, 201
women's rights, 121–2
World Bank, 64
World Trade Organization, 181
WTO. *See* World Trade Organization

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 08:37:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009734981.011