TABLES

3.1 Population of international courts, 1945–2015 68
3.2 Measuring the formal independence of international courts 74
3.3 Prevalence of rules that hamper independence over time 76
4.1 Number of EACJ's cases by respondent, First Instance only (2006–2020) 93
4.2 Summary of EACJ's case outcomes (2006–2020) 95
4.3 Summary of EACJ's remedies (2006–2020) 103
4.4 Summary of EACJ's consequential orders 105
4.5 Legal counsel representing applicants at the EACJ 110
4.6 Cross-tabulations of EACJ's deference by support network 111
4.7 Rules constituting the formal independence of the EACJ 114
4.8 EACJ deference and EAC fragmentation on select issues 121
4.9 Descriptive statistics on EACJ's citation practices 129
4.10 Cross-tabulation of EACJ's citation practices by deference (merits only) 130
4.11 Public legitimation narratives in EACJ's Facebook posts 136
5.1 Summary of CCJ's case outcomes (2009–2020) 151
5.2 Summary of CCJ's remedies (2009–2020) 159
5.3 Cross-tabulations of CCJ's deference by support network 167
5.4 Rules constituting the formal independence of the CCJ 172
5.5 CCJ's deference and CARICOM fragmentation related to *Myrie* and *Tomlinson* 178
5.6 State implementation of CARICOM's free movement requirements 184
5.7 Descriptive statistics on CCJ's citation practices 188
5.8 Cross-tabulations of CCJ's citation practices by deference 189
5.9. Public legitimation narratives in CCJ's Facebook posts 196
6.1 Number of ACtHPR cases by respondent (2009–2020) 211
6.2 Alleged and confirmed African Charter violations (2009–2020) 212
6.3 Summary of ACtHPR's case outcomes (2009–2020) 215
6.4 Summary of ACtHPR's remedies (2009–2020) 225
6.5 Legal representation of applicants before ACtHPR, by type 231
6.6 Cross-tabulations of ACtHPR's deference by support network 235
6.7 Rules constituting the formal independence of the ACtHPR 237
6.8 Descriptive statistics on ACtHPR's citation practices 245

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 20:23:25, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636

6.9 Cross-tabulation of ACtHPR's citation practices by deference (merits only) 248
6.10 Public legitimation narratives in ACtHPR's Facebook posts 254
7.1 Comparison of deference by the EACJ, CCJ, ACtHPR 262
7.2 Descriptive statistics on citation practices by court 265
7.3 Prominence of public legitimation narratives on courts' Facebook pages 267
7.4 Summary of findings on support networks by court 270
A1.1 Interviews 302
A3.1 Sources for coding of formal independence by international court 303
A4.1 Cross-tabulations of EACJ citation practices by deference (all cases) 311
A4.2 Annual percent of EACJ's Facebook posts with at least one public legitimation narrative (people-centered or political purpose) 311
A5.1 Cross-tabulations of CCJ's deference by support network (private or supranational actor) 312
A5.2 Cross-tabulation of CCJ citation practices by deference, including remedies (merits only) 312
A6.1 Cross-tabulation of ACtHPR's unanimous decisions by deference 313
A6.2 Annual percent of ACtHPR's Facebook posts with at least one public legitimation narrative (people-centered or political purpose) 314

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 20:23:25, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009607636