Judicial Selection

Name

Institution Affiliation

Judicial Selection

There are benefits to having a judiciary that is separate from other branches of the government. Judicial independence provides judges with protection if they make controversial decisions that result in public outrage. Judicial independence also allows a judge to make unpopular pronouncements and still be safe from politicians or government officials that may retaliate or reduce their wages. Moreover, judicial independence is essential to nurturing public confidence in the impartiality and neutrality of the judiciary. Despite their independence, judges are responsible for their actions and decisions. Proceedings are open to public scrutiny so that citizens can review and probe the operation of the courts. On the other hand, there are also advantages to having a judiciary that is answerable to its decisions. Judicial accountability implies that rulings, hearings, and trials can be inspected by the public meaning there is transparency that enables the media and the citizens to examine the judicial system. If there are any established claims of misbehavior, a judge can be removed from office or subjected to remedial measures. Judicial appointments based on merit do not exclude politics from the process but only eliminates politics from public awareness. Although judicial elections are not faultless, they are more efficient than judicial appointments as a way of endorsing public accountability and judicial independence.

The Importance of Judicial Independence (Federalist #78)

The Convention ensured the detachment of the courts from Congress for the purpose of crafting a judiciary that would establish a balance against it. The reason why Hamilton resists entrusting judicial power to a branch of the legislature is that this would lead to the brink of violating the disjunction of authority (Anonymous, 2014). Moreover, because of the inclination of legislative bodies towards party separation, it should be feared that the fatal consideration of

division could be detrimental to justice. Consequently, Hamilton admires the Constitution for founding courts that are independent of Congress. Furthermore, he is satisfied to see that financial independence is incorporated into organizational independence.

The Good Behaviour Clause is another factor promoting judiciary independence. It is concerning his backing of an effective republic that Hamilton declares the judicial review an element of the Constitution. Enforced by state courts before the meeting of the Federal Convention and assumed by most of the Convention members, Hamilton explains that judicial review is a canon that has approached its end in the Federalist paper.

Additionally, Hamilton views judicial review as a channel for safeguarding the constitution and free government. Specifically, when Hamilton regards the judiciary as an obstacle to the infringements and subjugations of the representative body, he maintains that judicial review implies a restraint on the legislature's violations on individual privileges (Anonymous, 2014). While Hamilton believes that power concentration in the legislature is repression, he does not feel that a strong judiciary is dangerous for a free government. Although he acknowledges that there may be individual oppression from the courts, he insists that the people's liberty will certainly not be threatened from that section. Incidentally, judicial review not only facilitates the protection of vested rights from the legislature but also from the executive.

Election as a Way to Achieve both Accountability and Independence from Politics

Although the judicial election is not perfect, it is better compared to judicial appointment. Judicial elections have significant advantages over judicial appointments because they provide an essential means of self-government to voters. Moreover, this aspect of accountability to the public will probably become more vital in the future due to the pressure that is facing the legal

system from the antagonistic components of the plaintiffs' bar. Judicial elections allow the public to have control over the judiciary and halt the constant decay of the justice system.

Judges are preferring to participate in judicial activism, making decisions that observe policy inclinations instead of law. Because these activist resolutions have removed properly political verdicts from the properly political branches, judicial selection is charged with politics at the state and federal levels.

Proposals that states should eliminate judicial elections due to allegations of threats to judicial independence and lobbying and change rather than judicial selection through unaccountable committees does not tackle the main challenge. Certainly, judicial selection has larger issues such as a significant lack of public accountability. Considerably, judicial selection does not exclude politics from the process but merely hides it from public scrutiny.

Conflicting opinions regarding the function of judges indicates that politics will remain an element of judicial selection unless judges revert to employing the written law. Therefore, the country can either permit public involvement in judicial appointments, educate the public on the role of the courts and allow for accountability in the judiciary or discard public education and hide the politics from public inquiry.

Evidence whether elections can truly achieve independence. Huber and Gordon demonstrated that Pennsylvania judges reacted to the possible electoral results of sentencing by being increasingly retaliatory as re-elections loom (2004). They construed that nonpartisan retention elections are unable to eradicate politics from the sentencing procedure. Those that are conscious of judicial selection are firmly committed to the formal guidelines for judicial elections believing that these systems can substantially impact practice. This is true because voters react in various ways to retention elections, partisan elections, and nonpartisan elections.

Because of this, sitting judges are the most susceptible to loss in partisan elections and securest in retention elections. This implies that elections present the biggest hindrances to judicial independence.

Hall revealed that meditated decisions made by states regarding retention and selection processes outline the essential principles of the operation of elections and produce substitute strategic eventualities that constitute the way voters receive and utilize information (Streb, 2009). Also, these deliberate choices configure the degree to which occupants are protected from political influence. Many people are disappointed with the way the judicial elections operate. This is mostly because of the sensed threats to judicial independence, even though there are other possible factors. Decisions about recommended corrections in election rules rely greatly on the tenets of those who make those decisions. What is most imperative is an individual's perception of the proper balance between judicial accountability and judicial independence. Nevertheless, regardless of one's principles, the evaluation of proposed changes must respect the opinion of the voter. This is because voters are the ones to decide the results and effect of judicial elections. Changes centered on erroneous perceptions of voting in judicial competition cannot accomplish their anticipated outcomes.

Judicial Independence versus Judicial Accountability. Judicial independence is a respected part of American legal system, and there are reasons to support its importance over judicial accountability. Hamilton asserted that the absolute independence of the judiciary was vital in the Constitution (Anonymous, 2014). Three reasons elucidate on the significance of judicial independence. To begin with, the principle of the separation of powers obliges the independence of the judiciary from the elected arms of government. Secondly, adhering to the rule of law demands judicial independence. Lastly, judges should be objective and fair in settling

cases if they are to step in the service of justice. There will be no fairness or objectivity if other branches manipulate the judicial system. Therefore, judicial independence on the elected arms inhibits judges from delivering justice, while devotion to judicial independence assists in achieving the judicial function.

For the judiciary to be independent, there should be equality, neutrality, and sound judgment encouraged by an obligation to justice and its manifestation in law. For the judicial system to achieve independence, judges must be allowed to resolve questions of law and fact without being threatened with reprisal whether economically, occupationally, or physically. The judiciary cannot be independent if it does not entrench these features in American jurisprudence. Moreover, judicial resolutions should not be nullified or declined effect covertly or indiscriminately. All these essential elements of judicial independence are required for the efficient functioning of the courts.

However, Huber and Gordon suggest that judges are most probable to support the government in times of economic prosperity, and resist it during economic decline (2004). This shows that they are not as independent because they are protecting their self-interests. They suppose that improved economic situations better their chances for re-election. Hall indicates that judicial independence depends on the deliberate choices that are made by states in the judicial selection process. All in all, no judicial system is unblemished, but judicial elections offer a way of ensuring accountability in judges when they stretch the boundaries of administrative decision-making. The options that are available is to either involve lawyers in the judicial selection process or allow the voters to select them. Still, the alternative of having voters choose the judges is better than other means.

References

A. (2014). Separation of powers does not require isolated silos. *Judicature*, *97*(5), 217-218. Retrieved from http://db03.linccweb.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.db03.linccweb.org/docview/1522791654?accountid=39901

Huber, G. A., & Gordon, S. C. (2004). Accountability and coercion: Is justice blind when it runs for office? *American Journal of Political Science*, *48*(2), 247. doi:10.2307/1519881

Streb, M. J. (2009). The need for more individual-level judicial election data*. *Justice System Journal*, *30*(3), 307-411. Retrieved from http://db03.linccweb.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.db03.linccweb.org/docview/194778648?accountid=39901