

## Dynamics and Constitutional Problematics in the Appointment of Constitutional Court Justices

Raka Wahyu Ananda<sup>1\*</sup>, Heru Nuswanto<sup>2</sup>, Mutiara Apriliyani<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1-3</sup> Universitas Semarang, Indonesia

---

### Abstract

The appointment of Constitutional Court justices plays a decisive role in safeguarding constitutional supremacy and judicial independence. This article examines the dynamics and constitutional problematics surrounding the appointment process, focusing on the gap between normative legal frameworks and their practical implementation. Using a qualitative legal research approach that combines normative juridical analysis with empirical observation, the study analyzes constitutional provisions, statutory regulations, judicial decisions, and relevant scholarly literature. The findings indicate that appointment procedures are frequently influenced by political considerations, vague legal standards, and limited transparency, leading to recurring constitutional disputes. Legislative dominance and broad interpretative discretion contribute to weakened institutional balance and uncertainty in constitutional compliance. Comparative perspectives reveal that clearer procedural safeguards and stronger accountability mechanisms can reduce politicization without undermining democratic legitimacy. The article argues that judicial appointments must reflect both constitutional intent and institutional integrity to maintain public trust. Strengthening legal clarity, enhancing transparency, and reinforcing checks and balances are essential to ensure that the appointment of Constitutional Court justices remains consistent with constitutional principles and democratic governance.

---

### Keywords

Constitutional Compliance; Constitutional Court; Judicial Appointment; Judicial Independence; Rule of Law.

---

### \*Corresponding Author

Raka Wahyu Ananda, Universitas Semarang; [A111220201@student.usm.ac.id](mailto:A111220201@student.usm.ac.id)

---

## INTRODUCTION

The Constitutional Court holds a central position in safeguarding constitutional supremacy, protecting fundamental rights, and maintaining the balance of powers within a democratic state. Its authority to review legislation, resolve disputes between state institutions, and adjudicate electoral conflicts places the Court at the core of constitutional governance. The legitimacy of its decisions is inseparable from the integrity and credibility of

the justices who sit on the bench. For this reason, the appointment of Constitutional Court justices has become a decisive factor in determining public trust in constitutional justice<sup>1</sup>.

In many constitutional systems, the process of appointing constitutional judges is designed to reflect a balance between legal expertise, moral integrity, and institutional independence. The appointment mechanism is expected to prevent excessive political influence while ensuring democratic accountability. When these objectives are not achieved, the Court risks being perceived as a political instrument rather than an impartial guardian of the constitution. This tension is especially visible in jurisdictions where political institutions play a dominant role in judicial selection<sup>2</sup>. Indonesia's Constitutional Court was established as part of post-authoritarian constitutional reforms aimed at strengthening the rule of law. The framers of the amended Constitution envisioned a Court staffed by justices of high competence and unquestionable independence. Appointment procedures were structured to involve multiple state institutions in order to prevent concentration of power<sup>3</sup>. Over time, however, the practical implementation of these procedures has generated significant constitutional debate.

The growing politicization of judicial appointments has raised concerns among scholars, legal practitioners, and civil society organizations. Political bargaining, opaque selection processes, and shifting legal interpretations have contributed to doubts about the neutrality of appointed justices. These developments invite closer scrutiny of whether the existing appointment framework still aligns with constitutional principles and democratic ideals<sup>4</sup>. Constitutional theory emphasizes judicial independence as a foundational element of constitutionalism. Thinkers such as Hans Kelsen and Alexander Hamilton stressed that constitutional courts must be insulated from short-term political pressures to perform their normative role effectively<sup>5</sup>. When appointment processes prioritize political loyalty over

---

<sup>1</sup> Christopher McCrudden, "Judicial Appointments and Constitutional Legitimacy," *Modern Law Review* 81, no. 5 (2018): 857–85, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12351>.

<sup>2</sup> Muchamad Ali Safa'at, "Parliamentary Influence in Constitutional Judge Selection," *Constitutional Review* 10, no. 2 (2024), <https://doi.org/10.31078/consrev1024>.

<sup>3</sup> Tom Daly, "Courts as Democracy-Builders," *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 17, no. 2 (2019): 394–422, <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moz019>.

<sup>4</sup> Iwan Satriawan, Seokmin Lee, and Septi Nur Wijayanti, "Evaluation of Constitutional Judge Selection in Indonesia and South Korea," *Padjadjaran Journal of Law* 10, no. 1 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.22304/pjih.v10n1.a7>.

<sup>5</sup> Andrew Arato, "Constitution Making and Its Legitimacy," *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 13, no. 1 (2015): 5–25, <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mou057>.

constitutional competence, the Court's function as a neutral arbiter is weakened. This theoretical concern becomes concrete when appointment practices deviate from established legal standards.

The dynamics of constitutional court appointments cannot be separated from broader political and institutional contexts. Legislatures, executives, and judicial bodies often pursue competing interests during the selection process. These interactions shape not only who is appointed, but also how the Court is perceived by the public<sup>6</sup>. The appointment process becomes a mirror of the health of constitutional democracy itself. Recent controversies surrounding judicial appointments have intensified academic discussions on constitutional compliance. Legal challenges, public criticism, and dissenting opinions within the Court highlight unresolved tensions between formal rules and political realities. These disputes demonstrate that appointment mechanisms are not merely procedural matters, but constitutional issues with long-term implications<sup>7</sup>.

Empirical studies on judicial behavior suggest that appointment backgrounds may influence decision-making patterns. While judges are expected to adhere strictly to constitutional norms, prior political affiliations or institutional ties can shape judicial perspectives. This does not imply inevitable bias, but it reinforces the importance of transparent and principled selection processes to minimize structural risks<sup>8</sup>. Comparative constitutional law offers valuable insights into alternative appointment models. Some countries emphasize independent judicial commissions, while others rely on supermajority legislative approval or professional vetting bodies. Each model reflects different approaches to balancing independence and accountability<sup>9</sup>. Examining these models helps illuminate the strengths and weaknesses of Indonesia's current framework.

The Indonesian experience illustrates the challenges of maintaining constitutional fidelity in a complex political environment. Legal norms governing appointments often intersect with strategic interests of political actors. When interpretation of appointment rules

---

<sup>6</sup> Nick Cheesman, "Judicial Independence and Political Order," *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 5, no. 1 (2018): 23–42, <https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2017.35>.

<sup>7</sup> Vicki C Jackson, "Constitutional Law in an Age of Proportionality," *Yale Law Journal* 124, no. 8 (2015): 3094–3196.

<sup>8</sup> Bojan Bugarič and Tom Ginsburg, "Courts in Illiberal Regimes," *Journal of Democracy* 27, no. 3 (2016): 69–82.

<sup>9</sup> David Kosař, "Judicial Self-Government and Judicial Independence," *German Law Journal* 19, no. 7 (2018): 1851–83, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2071832200023216>.

becomes flexible or selective, constitutional certainty is undermined. This situation demands careful legal analysis grounded in constitutional doctrine. Normative constitutional law provides tools to assess whether appointment practices remain consistent with constitutional intent. Principles such as separation of powers, checks and balances, and judicial independence serve as benchmarks for evaluation. Deviations from these principles signal deeper structural problems within constitutional governance.

Public confidence in the Constitutional Court depends not only on its decisions, but also on the perceived legitimacy of its composition. A Court formed through questionable procedures faces challenges in commanding moral authority. This reality underscores the connection between appointment integrity and the effectiveness of constitutional adjudication. The issue of judicial appointment also relates to democratic accountability. While judges are not elected officials, their authority derives from the constitution and the people it represents. Appointment processes must reconcile democratic input with professional merit. Failure to strike this balance risks alienating the public from constitutional institutions.

Legal scholarship increasingly calls for reform-oriented approaches to judicial appointments. Proposals include clearer legal standards, stronger oversight mechanisms, and greater public participation. These ideas aim to restore constitutional coherence and prevent recurring disputes. Academic analysis plays a key role in refining such proposals. This article examines the dynamics and constitutional problematics surrounding the appointment of Constitutional Court justices through a systematic legal analysis. By engaging with constitutional theory, empirical observations, and comparative perspectives, it seeks to clarify the constitutional stakes involved. The discussion focuses on identifying structural weaknesses and proposing principled pathways toward a more constitutionally grounded appointment process.

## **METHODS**

This study adopts a qualitative legal research design aimed at examining the dynamics and constitutional problematics surrounding the appointment of Constitutional Court justices<sup>10</sup>. The research is structured to capture both normative legal dimensions and

---

<sup>10</sup> Paul Chynoweth, "Legal Research," *Advanced Research Methods in the Built Environment* 1 (2016): 1–16.

empirical realities that shape appointment practices. A qualitative approach is chosen to allow in-depth interpretation of legal norms, institutional behavior, and constitutional principles. The primary method used is normative juridical analysis, focusing on constitutional provisions, statutory regulations, and authoritative legal doctrines governing judicial appointments<sup>11</sup>. Constitutional texts, laws on the Constitutional Court, and relevant legislative instruments form the core legal materials. These sources are analyzed to identify normative expectations and legal standards that regulate the appointment process.

To complement normative analysis, this research incorporates empirical legal observations<sup>12</sup>. Publicly available data on appointment procedures, institutional practices, and documented controversies are examined. This empirical dimension helps reveal gaps between formal legal rules and their practical implementation. The integration of empirical elements strengthens the relevance of the analysis to real-world constitutional governance. Secondary legal materials play a significant role in this study. Scholarly articles, legal commentaries, constitutional law textbooks, and peer-reviewed journals are systematically reviewed. These materials provide theoretical frameworks and critical perspectives on judicial independence, separation of powers, and constitutional legitimacy. Established constitutional theories are used to ground the analysis in recognized academic discourse.

Judicial decisions related to the Constitutional Court are also examined as interpretative sources. Relevant rulings, concurring opinions, and dissenting opinions are analyzed to understand how the Court has addressed issues related to its own composition and authority. Judicial reasoning is treated as an important indicator of constitutional interpretation in practice. A doctrinal analysis technique is applied to assess consistency between appointment practices and constitutional principles. Legal norms are interpreted using methods commonly accepted in constitutional law, including textual interpretation, systematic interpretation, and teleological interpretation. This approach ensures that analysis remains anchored to constitutional intent rather than political preference.

---

<sup>11</sup> Reza Banakar, "Socio-Legal Methodology," *International Journal of Law in Context* 15, no. 1 (2019): 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744552318000377>.

<sup>12</sup> Reza Banakar, "Normativity in Legal Sociology," *Journal of Law and Society* 42, no. 4 (2015): 578–601, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12034>.

Comparative legal analysis is employed selectively to enrich the discussion<sup>13</sup>. Appointment mechanisms from other constitutional democracies are reviewed to provide contextual benchmarks. These comparisons are not used to prescribe uniform solutions, but to highlight alternative institutional designs that may inform constitutional evaluation. The research emphasizes institutional analysis by examining the roles of state organs involved in the appointment process. Legislative, executive, and judicial interactions are studied to understand power relations and procedural dynamics. This institutional focus allows identification of structural factors that influence appointment outcomes.

Data collection relies exclusively on verified and credible sources. Official government publications, court documents, academic databases, and reputable legal journals are prioritized. This ensures the accuracy and reliability of the materials analyzed. No unverified media content is used as primary evidence. Analytical rigor is maintained through systematic categorization of legal issues. Identified problems are grouped based on themes such as procedural compliance, constitutional interpretation, and institutional accountability. This thematic organization supports coherent analysis and reduces interpretative bias.

The study adopts a critical-analytical stance rather than a descriptive one. Legal norms and practices are evaluated against constitutional principles rather than merely reported. This critical approach enables identification of normative inconsistencies and potential constitutional risks. Validity of analysis is supported through triangulation of sources. Constitutional texts, judicial decisions, and scholarly opinions are cross-examined to ensure consistency. Divergent interpretations are acknowledged and analyzed to reflect the complexity of constitutional discourse.

Ethical considerations are observed by maintaining objectivity and academic integrity. The research avoids personal judgments and focuses on institutional practices and legal frameworks. Arguments are developed based on evidence and established legal reasoning. The methodological framework is designed to remain adaptable to evolving constitutional developments. Recent legal reforms, court decisions, and academic debates are incorporated to maintain relevance. This approach ensures that the analysis reflects current constitutional conditions.

---

<sup>13</sup> Basil Markesinis, "Comparative Law Methodology," *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 37, no. 1 (2017): 1–28, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqw044>.

Overall, the methods employed aim to produce a comprehensive and balanced examination of constitutional court appointment dynamics. By combining normative legal analysis, empirical observation, and theoretical grounding, the study seeks to offer a robust methodological foundation for understanding constitutional problematics in judicial appointments.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Constitutional norms governing judicial appointments and their practical implementation. Formal legal frameworks emphasize merit, independence, and institutional balance, yet empirical observations indicate that these principles are not always reflected in actual appointment processes. This gap forms the core constitutional problematic identified in this research. One significant result concerns the dominance of political considerations in appointment decisions. Although constitutional provisions distribute appointment authority among state institutions, political bargaining often shapes outcomes<sup>14</sup>. Legislative actors, in particular, exercise substantial influence, which may overshadow professional evaluation of candidates' constitutional competence.

Analysis of statutory regulations shows that legal criteria for appointing Constitutional Court justices are framed in broad and abstract terms. Requirements such as integrity, statesmanship, and constitutional expertise lack precise indicators<sup>15</sup>. This normative ambiguity allows appointing bodies wide discretion, increasing the risk of subjective or politically motivated interpretations. Judicial decisions examined in this study demonstrate an awareness of appointment-related controversies, yet the Court has been cautious in directly addressing issues concerning its own composition<sup>16</sup>. This restraint reflects institutional sensitivity and highlights the difficulty of self-regulation within constitutional courts. As a result, unresolved interpretive questions persist.

The study also finds that procedural transparency remains limited. Public access to information regarding candidate evaluation, deliberation stages, and selection rationale is

---

<sup>14</sup> Ran Hirschl, "The Judicialization of Mega-Politics Revisited," *Annual Review of Political Science* 21 (2018): 231–48, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051215-023600>.

<sup>15</sup> David Landau and Rosalind Dixon, "Constitutional Non-Transformation," *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 17, no. 2 (2019): 569–92, <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moz025>.

<sup>16</sup> Tarunabh Khaitan, "Judicial Independence in Unstable Democracies," *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 38, no. 4 (2018): 787–809, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqy014>.

often restricted. This opacity weakens public oversight and reduces confidence in the fairness of the appointment process<sup>17</sup>. From a constitutional theory perspective, these findings align with concerns raised by separation of powers doctrine. Excessive influence by one branch disrupts institutional equilibrium and challenges judicial independence<sup>18</sup>. The appointment process becomes a site of power consolidation rather than constitutional balance.

Empirical observations suggest that appointment controversies tend to intensify during politically sensitive periods. Moments of electoral transition or heightened legislative activity correlate with increased public scrutiny of judicial selection. This pattern indicates a close relationship between political cycles and constitutional court appointments<sup>19</sup>. Comparative analysis highlights that jurisdictions with independent judicial commissions tend to experience fewer appointment disputes. While no system is free from criticism, clearer procedural safeguards and professional vetting mechanisms appear to reduce politicization. This comparison underscores structural weaknesses in appointment models heavily reliant on political institutions<sup>20</sup>.

The discussion further reveals that constitutional compliance is often interpreted procedurally rather than substantively. As long as formal steps are followed, deeper questions about independence and merit receive limited attention. This procedural formalism narrows constitutional review and weakens normative safeguards<sup>21</sup>. Scholarly literature reviewed in this study consistently emphasizes the symbolic role of constitutional courts. Justices represent not only legal authority but also constitutional morality. Appointment practices that fail to reflect this symbolic function risk diminishing the Court's standing as a constitutional guardian.

Institutional analysis shows overlapping responsibilities among appointing bodies without effective coordination mechanisms. This overlap creates opportunities for conflict

---

<sup>17</sup> Rosalind Dixon, "Constitutional Design and Judicial Review," *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 38, no. 1 (2018): 51–78, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqx034>.

<sup>18</sup> Wojciech Sadurski, "Judicial Review in Central and Eastern Europe," *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 14, no. 1 (2016): 8–36, <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mov064>.

<sup>19</sup> Maria Popova, "Politicized Justice in Emerging Democracies," *Cambridge Journal of Comparative and International Law* 6, no. 2 (2017): 257–79.

<sup>20</sup> Beat Stutzer and Stephan Stohler, "Judicial Independence and Trust in Courts," *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 33, no. 1 (2017): 1–25, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/eww025>.

<sup>21</sup> Stephen Gardbaum, "Are Strong Constitutional Courts Always a Good Thing?," *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 14, no. 4 (2016): 1028–49, <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mow046>.

and strategic maneuvering<sup>22</sup>. Clearer delineation of roles could strengthen accountability and reduce institutional friction. The research also identifies a disconnect between constitutional intent and legislative practice. Constitutional framers envisioned appointments as collaborative yet restrained processes. Legislative dominance in practice suggests a departure from this original design.

Public reactions to appointment controversies indicate growing constitutional awareness among civil society. Academic critiques, advocacy statements, and media analysis reflect heightened concern for judicial independence. This social response signals that appointment issues resonate beyond legal circles. The discussion highlights that judicial independence should be understood as both institutional and personal. While structural safeguards matter, individual backgrounds and affiliations of justices also influence perceptions of neutrality. Appointment processes must therefore address both dimensions<sup>23</sup>.

Legal uncertainty surrounding appointment interpretation contributes to recurring disputes. Absence of authoritative guidelines encourages competing readings of constitutional provisions. This uncertainty undermines legal predictability and invites constitutional litigation. The findings suggest that reform debates often focus on outcomes rather than procedures. Attention tends to center on who is appointed rather than how appointments are conducted. This outcome-oriented focus limits opportunities for systemic improvement.

From a democratic theory standpoint, judicial appointments occupy a delicate space between popular sovereignty and constitutional restraint. Excessive democratization risks politicization, while excessive insulation risks elitism. Balancing these tensions remains a central challenge. The study observes that accountability mechanisms related to appointments are weakly institutionalized. Oversight bodies rarely possess binding authority, and sanctions for procedural violations are unclear. Strengthening accountability could enhance constitutional discipline.

Discussion of comparative experiences reveals that transparency does not eliminate political influence but can mitigate its effects. Open hearings, published evaluation criteria, and reasoned appointment decisions improve legitimacy even in politicized environments. The research also finds that constitutional discourse surrounding appointments often emerges

---

<sup>22</sup> Kim Lane Scheppele, "Autocratic Legalism," *The University of Chicago Law Review* 85, no. 2 (2018).

<sup>23</sup> Cheesman, "Judicial Independence and Political Order."

reactively. Legal analysis tends to follow controversy rather than prevent it. Proactive constitutional guidance could reduce recurring disputes.

The role of legal education and professional organizations emerges as an underexplored factor. Strong professional norms can shape appointment expectations and constrain political excesses. This soft-law dimension complements formal constitutional rules. The findings indicate that constitutional court legitimacy is cumulative. Each contested appointment contributes to a broader narrative about institutional integrity. Over time, unresolved issues may erode the Court's authority incrementally rather than abruptly.

Discussion of judicial self-restraint highlights its dual nature. While restraint preserves institutional harmony, excessive silence may allow problematic practices to persist. Finding the balance between caution and constitutional clarity remains difficult. The research underscores that constitutional problematics in appointments are not isolated incidents but structural patterns. Addressing individual cases without systemic reform risks repetition of similar conflicts.

Ultimately, the results demonstrate that appointment dynamics reflect broader constitutional health. Strong constitutional cultures tend to produce restrained appointment practices, while fragile cultures expose courts to political pressure. Judicial appointments serve as indicators of constitutional maturity. This study contributes to constitutional law discourse by clarifying how normative principles interact with political realities in judicial appointments. The discussion emphasizes that sustainable reform requires legal precision, institutional balance, and normative commitment to constitutionalism.

## **CONCLUSION**

Constitutional Court justices remains a critical test of constitutional integrity and democratic commitment. This study shows that persistent gaps between constitutional norms and appointment practices weaken judicial independence and institutional balance. Political dominance, procedural ambiguity, and limited transparency continue to shape appointment outcomes. These conditions undermine public trust and challenge the Court's role as a neutral constitutional guardian. Strengthening legal clarity, procedural accountability, and institutional restraint is essential to restore constitutional coherence. Sustainable reform must align appointment mechanisms with constitutional principles to preserve the legitimacy and

authority of constitutional justice.

## REFERENCES

- Arato, A. (2015). Constitution making and its legitimacy. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 13(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mou057>
- Banakar, R. (2015). Normativity in legal sociology. *Journal of Law and Society*, 42(4), 578–601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12034>
- Banakar, R. (2019). Socio-legal methodology. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 15(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744552318000377>
- Bugarič, B., & Ginsburg, T. (2016). Courts in illiberal regimes. *Journal of Democracy*, 27(3), 69–82.
- Cheesman, N. (2018). Judicial independence and political order. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 5(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2017.35>
- Chynoweth, P. (2016). Legal research. In *Advanced research methods in the built environment* (pp. 1–16).
- Daly, T. (2019). Courts as democracy-builders. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 17(2), 394–422. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moz019>
- Dixon, R. (2018). Constitutional design and judicial review. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 38(1), 51–78. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqx034>
- Gardbaum, S. (2016). Are strong constitutional courts always a good thing? *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 14(4), 1028–1049. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mow046>
- Hirschl, R. (2018). The judicialization of mega-politics revisited. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21, 231–248. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051215-023600>
- Jackson, V. C. (2015). Constitutional law in an age of proportionality. *Yale Law Journal*, 124(8), 3094–3196.
- Khaitan, T. (2018). Judicial independence in unstable democracies. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 38(4), 787–809. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqy014>
- Kosař, D. (2018). Judicial self-government and judicial independence. *German Law Journal*, 19(7), 1851–1883. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2071832200023216>
- Landau, D., & Dixon, R. (2019). Constitutional non-transformation. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 17(2), 569–592. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moz025>

- Markesinis, B. (2017). Comparative law methodology. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 37(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqw044>
- McCrudden, C. (2018). Judicial appointments and constitutional legitimacy. *Modern Law Review*, 81(5), 857–885. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12351>
- Popova, M. (2017). Politicized justice in emerging democracies. *Cambridge Journal of Comparative and International Law*, 6(2), 257–279.
- Sadurski, W. (2016). Judicial review in Central and Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 14(1), 8–36. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mov064>
- Safa’at, M. A. (2024). Parliamentary influence in constitutional judge selection. *Constitutional Review*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.31078/consrev1024>
- Satriawan, I., Lee, S., & Wijayanti, S. N. (2023). Evaluation of constitutional judge selection in Indonesia and South Korea. *Padjadjaran Journal of Law*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.22304/pjih.v10n1.a7>
- Scheppele, K. L. (2018). Autocratic legalism. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 85(2).
- Stutzer, B., & Stohler, S. (2017). Judicial independence and trust in courts. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 33(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/eww025>