

JUDICIALIZATION OF POLITICS

JUDICIALIZATION OF POLITICS

*The Interplay of Institutional Structure,
Legal Doctrine, and Politics on the
High Court of Australia*

Reginald S. Sheehan

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Rebecca D. Gill

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS

Kirk A. Randazzo

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2012
Carolina Academic Press
All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Sheehan, Reginald S., 1959-

Judicialization of politics : the interplay of institutional structure, legal doctrine, and politics on the High Court of Australia / Reginald S. Sheehan, Rebecca D. Gill, and Kirk A. Randazzo.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-61163-207-1 (alk. paper)

1. Australia. High Court. 2. Courts of last resort--Australia. 3. Judicial review--Australia. 4. Political questions and judicial power--Australia. I. Gill, Rebecca D. II. Randazzo, Kirk A. III. Title.

KU3466.S54 2012
347.94'026--dc23

2012025991

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Contents	v
List of Tables and Figures	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
Chapter One · Introduction	3
Overview of the Chapters	7
High Court Data Base and the Authors	8
Chapter Two · The Evolution of the High Court	11
The Evolution of the Court	12
The Modern Court	17
Constitutional Interpretation on the High Court	22
Chapter Three · History, Legal Doctrine, and Justice Backgrounds	31
The History of the High Court	31
Establishing an Identity (1903–1919)	31
Growing Pains (1919–1950)	35
Time to Regroup (1950–1964)	40
The Modern High Court	42
The Barwick Court (1964–1981)	42
The Gibbs Court (1981–1987)	47
The Mason Court (1987–1995)	50
The Brennan Court (1995–1998)	55
The Gleeson Court (1998–2008)	59
Conclusion	59
Chapter Four · Impact of Institutional Change on Agenda	63
Theory of Agenda Change	64
Agenda of the High Court Over Time	67
Empirical Evidence of a Potential Judicialization of Politics	76
Conclusions	79

Chapter Five · Litigants, Barristers, and Party Capability	81
Litigant Participation in the High Court of Australia	82
Who Wins in High Court Litigation	91
Evolution of Party Capability Theory	92
Party Capability in the High Court	95
Empirical Results	96
Substantive Implications of Empirical Results	105
Conclusions	108
Chapter Six · Policy-Making Trends on the High Court	111
Policy Making over Time	111
Case Outcomes	114
Opinion Length	117
Joint and Dissenting Opinions	120
Policy Outcomes	124
Conclusion	129
Chapter Seven · Decision-Making Trends on the High Court	131
Theories of Decision Making	131
Individual Level Decision Making	138
The Barwick Court	138
The Gibbs Court	142
The Mason Court	144
The Brennan Court	147
The Gleeson Court	149
Explaining Individual Justice Votes	151
Conclusion	162
Chapter Eight · Conclusion	163
The Business of the High Court of Australia	164
Judicialization of Politics in the High Court of Australia	166
Developing Comparative Judicial Theory	169
References	171
Index	191

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 3.1	Justice Attributes on the Barwick Court	43
Table 3.2	Justice Attributes on the Gibbs Court	48
Table 3.3	Justice Attributes on the Mason Court	51
Table 3.4	Justice Attributes on the Brennan Court	56
Table 3.5	Justice Attributes on the Gleeson Court	60
Table 4.1	Proportion of Cases before the High Court by Decade	68
Figure 4.1	Number of Cases Decided per Year	68
Figure 4.2	Proportion of Cases Before the High Court by Year	69
Figure 4.3	Proportion of Criminal versus Government Regulation Cases by Year	70
Table 4.2	Proportion of Criminal Cases by Decade	71
Figure 4.4	Criminal Cases by Category	71
Figure 4.5	Governmental Regulation Cases by Category	72
Table 4.3	Proportion of Governmental Regulation Cases by Decade	73
Table 4.4	Proportion of Private Economic Cases by Decade	74
Figure 4.6	Proportion of Private Economic Cases by Category	74
Figure 4.7	Constitutional Review in the High Court	75
Figure 4.8	Proportion of National and State Action Review	76
Figure 4.9	Proportion of Cases Affirmed or Reversed	77
Table 4.5	Regression Models on Agenda Setting	78
Table 5.1	Who Participates in the Australian High Court?	83
Table 5.2	Participation Rates as Appellant and Respondent	84
Table 5.3	Appellant Participation over Time	86
Table 5.4	Respondent Participation over Time	87
Table 5.5	Matching Appellants and Respondents in Criminal Cases	88
Table 5.6	Matching Appellants and Respondents in Civil Cases	88
Table 5.7	Source of Appeals to the High Court: Change in the State of Origin	89
Table 5.8	Source of Appeals to the High Court: Change in the State of Appeal	90

Table 5.9	Appellant Success Rates by Litigant Type (All Cases)	97
Table 5.10	Litigant Net Advantage (All Cases)	98
Table 5.11	Litigant Success Rates and Net Advantage over Time	99
Table 5.12	Litigant Success Rates in the High Court of Australia	101
Table 5.12	Litigant Success Rates in the High Court of Australia, continued	102
Figure 5.1	Likelihood of Appellant Win for Litigant Categories	106
Figure 5.2	Cumulative Success of Appellant Barristers in Prior Cases	107
Figure 5.3	Likelihood of Appellant Win for Individuals and Barrister Success	108
Figure 6.1	Percentage of Appeals Allowed over Time by Unanimity	115
Table 6.1	Appeals Allowed by Chief Justice	115
Figure 6.2	Percentage of Appeals Allowed by Issue Area	116
Figure 6.3	Average Judgment Length by Unanimity	118
Table 6.2	Average Judgment Length by Chief Justice	119
Figure 6.4	Average Opinion Length over Time by Unanimity	119
Figure 6.5	Average Judgment Length by Issue Area	120
Table 6.3	Opinion to Vote Ratio by Chief Justice	121
Figure 6.6	Opinion to Vote Ratio over Time	121
Figure 6.7	Opinion to Vote Ratio by Issue Area	122
Figure 6.8	Dissenting Judgments per Case over Time	123
Figure 6.9	Dissenting Judgments per Case by Issue Area	124
Table 6.5	“Liberal” Outcomes by Chief Justice	126
Figure 6.10	Percentage “Liberal” Outcomes over Time	126
Figure 6.11	Percentage “Liberal” Outcomes over Time by Unanimity	127
Figure 6.12	Percentage “Liberal” Outcomes by Issue Area	128
Table 6.4	Dissenting Opinions per Case by Chief Justice	129
Table 7.1	Individual Decision Making on the Barwick Court	139
Table 7.2	Individual Decision Making on the Gibbs Court	143
Table 7.3	Individual Decision Making on the Mason Court	145
Table 7.4	Individual Decision Making on the Brennan Court	148
Table 7.5	Individual Decision Making on the Gleeson Court	150
Table 7.6	Random Intercept Hierarchical Logit Model of Voting Behavior	157
Table 7.7	Random Intercept Hierarchical Logit Model of Activism	159
Table 7.8	Random Intercept Hierarchical Logit Model of Activism, Pre- and Post- <i>Mabo</i>	161

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the National Science Foundation for providing support for the creation of the High Court Data Base, in particular, the funding for collection of the Australia data at Michigan State University. Additionally, the authors thank the co-PIs of the High Court Data Base project, Stacia Haynie, Donald Songer and C. Neal Tate. In 2009, we lost a wonderful scholar and friend in C. Neal Tate. He impacted all three of our careers in various ways and put us, and many others, on the path to comparative judicial politics. We hope we have done him proud with this research because we know his intellectual spirit was with us on this journey.

Reginald Sheehan has taught study abroad at the University of New South Wales and Australia National University for 15 years and has benefitted from many lectures and conversations with colleagues and friends in Australia. He would like to thank the following: David Biles, Nicholas Dowd, Peter Grabosky, Nathan Harris, Don MaCaskill, David McDonald, Tony PalFREEMAN, Helen Pringle, Rodney Smith, Elaine Thompson and Michael Wearing. He would also like to thank John Hudzik for giving him the opportunity to be a part of the Australia program and introducing him to many of these people. A special thank you to Brian Galligan and Fiona Wheeler, who generously served as Australian advisors to the NSF High Court Data Base project. He is grateful to Kara Colt for her research assistance and William Myers for his insights and challenging discussions about the High Court. He would also like to thank his co-authors and former PhD students, Rebecca Gill and Kirk Rاندازو, who have made him proud with their accomplishments and continue to impact the field of judicial politics with their research. Finally and most importantly, he is always grateful to the support and encouragement he receives from his wife Tracie and his two children, Kelsey and Brennan.

Rebecca Gill would like to thank Mary Sue Wood for her keen eye and tireless patience. Also critical to the success of this project has been the College of Law at the Australian National University, where she was a visiting scholar in

2003. Special thanks go to Fiona Wheeler and Michael Coper for helping to make Rebecca's time in Australia a success. Thanks for opportunity to travel to Australia go to John Hudzik, Reginald Sheehan, and the rest of the study abroad team at Michigan State University. For entertaining her questions and providing her with invaluable information, she thanks the Hon. Michael Kirby QC, CMG, Sir Anthony Frank Mason, AC, KBE, QC, George Williams AO, Tony Blackshield, Andrew Lynch, and Waanda McCarthy. And, most importantly, she acknowledges the singularly important role of C. Neal Tate in guiding her through graduate school and beyond.

Kirk Randazzo is extremely thankful to his colleagues in the Department of Political Science at the University of South Carolina, especially Donald Songer and Lee Walker who share his interests in comparative judicial politics. Additionally, he thanks Charles Finocchiaro, David Darmofal, Holger Kern, and Amanda Licht for their support and for the many conversations on research and empirical analyses. A very special thank you goes to Reginald Sheehan, an advisor, friend, and mentor, and without whom none of this would be possible. Finally, and most importantly, thank you to his wife Carol and his two children Samuel and Anna for their constant love and encouragement.