CRAFTING COURTS IN NEW DEMOCRACIES

The role of Latin American courts in facilitating democracy and economic liberalization is considerable. But while national "high courts" have been closely studied, the form, function, and empowerment of local courts are still not well understood.

In *Crafting Courts in New Democracies* Matthew C. Ingram fills this gap by examining the varying strength of local judicial institutions in Brazil and Mexico since the 1980s. Combining statistical analysis and in-depth qualitative research, Ingram offers a rich account of the politics that shape subnational court reform in the region's two largest democracies. In contrast to previous studies, theoretical emphasis is given to the influence of political ideas over the traditional focus on objective, material incentives. Exhaustively researched and rigorously presented, *Crafting Courts in New Democracies* will appeal to scholars and policymakers interested in the judiciary, institutional change, Latin America, the causal role of ideas, justice reform, and the rule of law.

Matthew C. Ingram (JD, PhD, University of New Mexico) is an assistant professor of political science at the University at Albany, State University of New York. His research has been funded by the National Science Foundation, the Social Science Research Council, and the Fulbright Program. Before entering academia, Professor Ingram worked in law enforcement in California.

Crafting Courts in New Democracies

THE POLITICS OF SUBNATIONAL JUDICIAL REFORM IN BRAZIL AND MEXICO

MATTHEW C. INGRAM

University at Albany, State University of New York



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107117327

© Matthew C. Ingram 2016

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2016

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data Ingram, Matthew C, author. Crafting courts in new democracies : the politics of subnational judicial reform in Brazil and Mexico / Matthew C. Ingram. pages cm ISBN 978-1-107-11732-7 (hardback) 1. State courts – Mexico. 2. State courts – Brazil. I. Title. KG497.I54 2015 347.72'02–dc23 2015015119

ISBN 978-1-107-11732-7 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

> To my mother Katharine Goodridge Ingram for encouraging intellectual curiosity, playfulness, and creativity

Contents

Figu	res	page xiii
Tabl	les	XV
Prefa	ice	xvii
Ackn	nowledgments	xix
1	Judicial Reform in New Democracies	1
	Argument	3
	Broader Overview	5
	Empirical Problems	5
	Theoretical Puzzles	11
	Conceptual Clarification: Court Strength in the Mexican and	
	Brazilian States	13
	Understanding Reform Options within Landscape of Institutio	ns
	and Ideas	15
	Institutional Landscape	15
	Agendas of Judicial Reform: Policy Options in Circulation,	
	1985–2005	24
	Ideational Landscape	31
	Country Selection, Boundary Conditions, and Interactions	41
	Country Selection	41
	Boundary Conditions	43
	Interactions	49
	Plan of the Book	51

viii

Contents

Part I: Theory and Methods

2	Ideas, Interests, and Judicial Institutions	57
	Why Build Strong Courts?	57
	A Non-Methodological Challenge in the Study of Ideas	59
	Methodological Challenges in the Study of Ideas	60
	Conceptualizing Ideas: Programmatic Commitments	61
	Measurement of Ideas	65
	Empirical Implications of Ideational Arguments	66
	Testing the Argument	67
	An Ideational Argument: The Causal Role of Programmatic	
	Commitments	68
	Empirical Implications	74
	What Are the Origins of Ideas?	76
	Alternative Explanations: Rational-Strategic Accounts	78
	Overview of Causal Logics behind Rational-Strategic	
	Argument	79
	Positive Consequences of Electoral Competition	81
	Reelection Logic	81
	Signaling (or Strategic Bargaining) Logic	83
	Insurance Logics	84
	Governance Logic	93
	Negative Consequences of Electoral Competition	93
	Government-Opposition Dynamics	94
	Territorial Interests	95
	Conclusion: Reprising Strengths of Ideational Argument	97
3	Methods	100
	Introduction	100
	Subnational Research: Leveraging Strengths, Overcoming	
	Weaknesses	102
	Multi-Method Research: Integrating Quantitative and	
	Qualitative Methods	111
	Large-N Method: Time-Series Cross-Section (TSCS) Analysis	112
	Case Selection: Nested Analysis	115
	Small-N Method: Theory-Guided Process Tracing	132
	Conclusion	136
Pai	rt II: Empirical Analysis	
	Introduction	139

Judicial Spending and Court Strength

140

	Contents	ix
4	Large-N Analysis in Mexico (1993–2009)	147
	Introduction	147
	Judicial Spending in the Mexican States	147
	Measuring Programmatic Commitments and Electoral	
	Competition in Mexico	149
	Data and Methods	152
	Data	152
	Methods	153
	Results	154
	Discussion	159
	Conclusion	162
5	Large-N Analysis in Brazil (1985–2006)	164
	Introduction	164
	Judicial Spending in the Brazilian States	165
	Measuring Programmatic Commitments and Electoral	
	Competition in Brazil	167
	Data and Methods	170
	Data	170
	Methods	172
	Results	172
	Controlling for Political Stability or Institutionalization	174
	Examining Individual Party Effects	181
	Left Successors and Right Successors	183
	Discussion	185
	Conclusion	190
6	Small-N Analysis in Mexico: Aguascalientes, Michoacán,	
	and Hidalgo	192
	Introduction	193
	Measuring Judicial Strength in Three Mexican States	196
	Judicial Spending	199
	Institutional Design	201
	Career Structure	203
	Causal Analysis	205
	Courts in Rightward, PRI-to-PAN Transitions	207
	Courts in Leftward, PRI-to-PRD Transitions	212
	Courts in PRI-Dominated, Authoritarian Enclaves	218
	Conclusion	220

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-11732-7 - Crafting Courts in New Democracies: The Politics of Subnational
Judicial Reform in Brazil and Mexico
Matthew C. Ingram
Frontmatter
More information

х	Contents	
7	Small-N Analysis in Brazil: Acre, Rio Grande do Sul,	
	and Maranhão	224
	Introduction	224
	Measuring Judicial Strength in Three Brazilian States	229
	Judicial Spending	230
	Judicial Personnel	235
	Infrastructure	235
	Causal Analysis	235
	Courts in New, Leftist Strongholds	236
	1995–1996: Corrosive Gains from Within, Progressive	
	Strength from Without	236
	2000–2003: Progressive Pressures from Within Meet	
	External Support	241
	2006–2007: Deepening Administrative Reforms	252
	Courts under Competitive Alternation	253
	1989–1992: Positive Change from Within Supported by	
	the Left	253
	1999–2002: The Left Clashes with the Court	257
	Courts in Traditional, Authoritarian Enclaves	260
	CNJ Boomerang	267
	Causal Logics Revisited	269
	Conclusion	276

Part III: Conclusion

8	Crafting Courts in New Democracies: Beyond Brazil and	
	Mexico	281
	Ideational Origins of Strong State Courts in Mexico and Brazil	281
	Implications for Theory Development	284
	Revisiting Potential Boundary Conditions: Case Study of	
	Bolivia	286
	Clarifying Causal Logics	291
	Baseline Strength of Institutions	293
	Legacies of Authoritarianism	294
	National Institutions, Interdependence, and Policy	
	Movement across Levels of Government	297
	Ideas and Epistemic Communities	298
	Judge-Led Reforms and Conduct "Beyond the Bench"	299
	Policy Implications	300
	Coda and Directions for Future Research	301

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-11732-7 - Crafting Courts in New Democracies: The Politics of Subnational
Judicial Reform in Brazil and Mexico
Matthew C. Ingram
Frontmatter
More information

Contents	xi
Appendices	
APPENDIX A: List of Acronyms and Glossary of Legal Terms	307
APPENDIX B: List of Interviews	315
APPENDIX C: Auxiliary Tables and Figures for Case Selection	320
APPENDIX D: Auxiliary GEE Analysis in Brazil Showing Individual Rightist Parties	329
References	331
Index	363

Figures

1.1	Average Judicial Spending Per Capita in Mexican States,	
	1993–2009 (constant 2000 pesos)	page 6
1.2	Average Judicial Spending Per Capita in Brazilian States,	
	1985–2006 (constant 2000 reais)	7
3.1	Potential Typical and Atypical Cases	118
3.2	Average Typicality Scores in Mexico	123
3.3	Average Typicality Scores in Brazil	124
3.4	2×3 Table Showing Case Selection	131
II.1	Variation in Judicial Spending Per Capita across Brazilian and	
	Mexican States in 2003 (in constant 2000 U.S. Dollars)	145
4.1	Average Judicial Spending Per Capita across the Thirty-One	
	Mexican States	148
4.2	Effect of Three Ideology Measures on Spending in Mexico	156
4.3	Marginal Effect of Ideology in Full Model (Model 2)	156
4.4	Predicted Values and Marginal Effects in Two Time Periods,	
	Models 3–4	157
5.l	Average judicial Spending Per Capita across the Twenty-Six	
	Brazilian states	166
5.2	Predicted Values of Spending (Low Volatility, 1985–1994)	178
5.3	Marginal Effects of Ideology (Low Volatility, 1985–1994)	178
5.4	Predicted Values of Spending (Low Volatility, 1995–2006)	179
	Marginal Effects of Ideology (Low Volatility, 1995–2006)	179
5.6	Effect of Programmatic Commitments on Judicial Spending	
	(Model 18)	185
6.1	Judicial Spending in Three Mexican States	200
7.1	Judicial Spending in Three Brazilian States	231
8.1	Effect of Ideological Location of Prior Regime on Judicial	
	Spending in Mexico	295

Cambridge University Press	
978-1-107-11732-7 - Crafting Courts in New Democracies: The Politics of Subnation	ıal
Judicial Reform in Brazil and Mexico	
Matthew C. Ingram	
Frontmatter	
More information	

xiv Figures 8.2 Effect of Ideological Location of Prior Regime on Judicial Spending in Brazil 296 C.1 Average Margin of Victory across Mexican States, 1993–2007 320 C.2 Average Effective Number of Candidates (ENC) across Mexican States, 1993-2007 321 C.3 Average Ideology Score across Mexican States, 1993–2007 (Salamanca Data 1–10, where 1 = left, 10 = right) 321 C.4 Average Margin of Victory across Brazilian States, 1985–2006 322 C.5 Average Effective Number of Candidates (ENC) across Brazilian States, 1985–2006 323 C.6 Average Ideology Score across Brazilian States, 1985-2006 (Power and Zucco Data 1–10, where 1 = left, 10 = right) 324 C.7 Average Typicality Scores across Mexican States 327 C.8 Average Typicality Scores across Brazilian States 327 C.9 Typicality Scores over Time in Three Brazilian States 328 C.10 Typicality Scores over Time in Three Mexican States 328

Tables

2.1	Continuum along Which Ideas Can Be Conceptualized	page 64
2.2	Causal Logics Underpinning Accounts Based on Electoral	
	Competition	80
3.1	Thirty Most Typical Observations in Mexico	121
3.2	Thirty Most Typical Observations in Brazil	122
4.1	Descriptive Statistics for Large-N Analysis in Mexico	151
4.2	GEE Analysis of Judicial Spending in Mexico	155
5.1	Descriptive Statistics for Large-N Analysis in Brazil	171
5.2	GEE Analysis of Judicial Spending in Brazil	173
5.3	GEE Analysis of Spending, Samples Truncated by Volatility	
	and Time	176
5.4	GEE Analysis of Effect of Party Dummies on Spending	182
5.5	GEE Analysis of Effect of Left and Right Successors on	
	Spending	184
6.1	Summary of Judicial Strength in Three Mexican States	199
6.2	Summary of Causal Analysis in Mexico	206
7.1	Summary of Judicial Strength in Three Brazilian States	232
7.2	Summary of Causal Analysis in Brazil	237
C.1	Thirty Most Atypical or Worst-Predicted Observations in Brazil	l 325
C.2	Thirty Most Atypical or Worst-Predicted Observations in Mexic	o 326
D.1	Auxiliary GEE Analysis in Brazil Showing Individual Rightist	
	Parties	329

Preface

This book examines the sources of institutional change in the judiciary. That is, what explains court reform (or counterreform)? Why do some courts improve over time while others do not? Why do courts in one place perform well while courts elsewhere remain dysfunctional? In this regard, the book falls squarely within a broader field of research aimed at understanding the sources of strong democratic institutions. The book's theoretical emphasis is on the causal role of ideas. How and why do particular ideas exert influence on the shape of institutions? How do we know that ideas matter, rather than other external, material constraints or incentives? Lastly, the book is also about Latin American politics, particularly subnational politics in the region's two largest democracies, Brazil and Mexico. The focus on local courts is a significant departure from the vast majority of literature in the field of comparative public law and judicial politics that examines high courts and other national, apex iustice institutions. While a small number of scholars have studied local courts within individual countries, this is the first book to examine local courts across more than one country. What does subnational variation in judicial strength and capacity look like within these two countries? How can we better understand the sources of this variation? The argument of the book draws on the aforementioned substantive, theoretical, and regional concerns to posit that - across different local political conditions within these two countries ideas emerge as meaningful determinants of court strength.

The research design combines a subnational level of analysis across two countries with both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Brazil and Mexico are Latin America's two largest democracies, markets, and federal systems, consisting of twenty-seven and thirty-two subnational units, respectively, and accounting for more than half of the region's population and economic output. Given the book's concern with the ideational origins of institutional change, a

xviii

Preface

subnational, multi-method design across these two countries maximizes analytic leverage in several ways. First, subnational, comparative research designs within a single country enhance analytic leverage by controlling for alternative explanations at the national level (e.g., national culture, macroeconomic conditions, and political institutions). Second, most subnational research focuses on a single country, but subnational designs across more than one country are particularly useful analytically. In this regard, these two countries experienced forms of authoritarianism and transitions to democracy, yet political conditions across Brazil and Mexico varied in different ways, including the nature of authoritarian pasts (military vs. single dominant party), the centralization of party systems (fragmented vs. centralized), the programmaticness of politicians and political parties (non-programmatic vs. programmatic), and the ideology of the dominant actors at the national level before and after the transition to democracy (right-to-center-to-left in Brazil vs. center-to-right in Mexico). Thus, if inferences regarding the causal role of ideas hold at the subnational level within each country, and these inferences also hold across the two countries despite their many differences, then we can be quite confident in the overall conclusion. Third, the multi-method research design sequences large-N regression analyses with small-N, textured, in-depth case studies in three states in each country (total of six case studies). Beyond the methodological gains of subnational analysis across two countries, triangulating among disparate data and methods in this way further enhances the validity of conclusions.

In sum, the substantive focus on subnational courts complements a burgeoning literature on comparative law and courts; the theoretical emphasis on the causal role of ideas speaks to a growing body of research on ideational forces in politics; and the combination of a subnational level of analysis in more than one country with both quantitative and qualitative methods intersects with a growing literature on territorial politics, multilevel politics, and mixed-methods research designs. My hope is that the book is appealing to a wide range of audiences: specialists in public law, political ideas, subnational politics, or multi-method research; policy audiences interested in factors that help or hinder legal reform; and more general audiences interested in Latin American politics, justice reform, democracy, and development. The consistent goal throughout this project has been to develop a better understanding of the political process of building democratic institutions. In this sense, the politics of court reform in the Brazilian and Mexican states have many lessons to offer those interested in the quality of democracy and democratization. This book aims to capture some of these lessons.

Acknowledgments

The pages ahead owe much to many people over more than a decade of work. At risk of overlooking some, I wish to thank individuals by name. First, I am deeply grateful to the members of my doctoral dissertation committee: William Stanley, Kenneth Roberts, Wendy Hansen, Benjamin Goldfrank, and Jeffrey Staton. All were crucial in different ways, and I cannot thank them enough for their support and encouragement over multiple years of academic and professional development.

William Stanley played a central role, as Director of Latin American Studies (LAS) at the University of New Mexico, in accepting me into the M.A. program in LAS in early 2001, despite what I readily admit was a mediocre college transcript and (perhaps because of) an unusual biography and resume in law enforcement. In that first year, I also participated in his seminar on Justice Reform in Latin America, and it was in part that class that convinced me to pursue doctoral studies in political science. I am grateful for his support from my earliest days in graduate school, and this project was inspired in many ways by his justice reform seminar and his encouragement in early efforts to study the rule of law, the administration of justice, and the legal dimensions of democracy in Latin America. His influence is felt throughout this manuscript.

Kenneth Roberts was an equally early and inspirational figure. His seminar on Latin American politics was also one of the main reasons I transferred from Latin American Studies in graduate school to political science. Later, his seminar on comparative politics solidified that trajectory. His style of thought and expression has influenced this project from its inception. Despite leaving UNM for Cornell before this project was complete, he remained an integral part of the dissertation committee and shaped many of the ideas presented here over subsequent revisions, especially in conceptualizing and theorizing the relationship between programmatic agents of reform and institutional change. His work on changes in partisan alignment and dealignment in the XX

Acknowledgments

aftermath of the neoliberal era in Latin America – and his willingness to share his thoughts on this work – also helped focus my argument about the relevance of ideas in the region. He continues to be a role model as teacher, mentor, and scholar.

Wendy Hansen's intellectual energy is reflected throughout this study, especially in Chapters 4 and 5, the large-N studies in Mexico and Brazil, respectively. Her critical eye in the statistical analyses and the speed with which she read multiple drafts of chapters continue to amaze me. Her willingness to leave her office door open came at her own peril, as I frequently took advantage of her generosity. In the future, I hope to be able to offer the same kind of constructive critiques and individual attention that she offered me and many of my colleagues in graduate school.

Benjamin Goldfrank has also provided generous critiques and encouragement, and has thoughtfully drawn my attention over the years to promising information, from a recent news story in Brazil to an upcoming publication. Early on, his seminar on Social Movements and the Left in Latin America influenced the way I thought about the effect of societal pressures on institutional change and performance. His insights have influenced this project from the start, and his familiarity with the Brazilian case helped shape Chapters 5 and 7, especially in thinking about the factors that distinguish local politics among Brazilian states, and politics between Brazil and Mexico.

Jeffrey Staton discussed an early version of the qualitative chapter on Mexico (Chapter 6) at the 2008 meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, after which I asked if he would consider being an outside reader for the dissertation. Fortunately for me, he agreed to do so, and both the theoretical and empirical chapters reflect his critical but supportive energy. He has been both generous and influential since those early days, and continues to influence the way I think about comparative law and courts. His fluency in matters judicial gave focus to the empirical implications of alternative theories of judicial empowerment in Chapter 2, and his expertise on the Mexican judiciary helped me think more carefully about court politics in Mexico.

Several academic homes supported the development of this manuscript. I owe a great debt to the Department of Political Science, the School of Law, and the Latin American and Iberian Institute at the University of New Mexico. In addition to faculty on my dissertation committee, I extend a special thanks to Melissa Binder, Joann Buehler, Christopher Butler, Christian Fritz (whose "flying fish" metaphor is still with me), Kathryn Hochstettler, Timothy Krebs, Leila Lehnen, Margo Milleret, Jennifer Moore, Mark Peceny (seeking "Truth with a capital "T" in his "unlimited free time"), Kathy Powers, and Richard Wood. Faculty, staff, and graduate colleagues at UNM provided a lively and

Acknowledgments

supportive environment in which to develop the skills and ideas for this project, as well as to succeed in the multiple other challenges of a graduate career, including funding competitions, teaching, and job placement. Those graduate school experiences drive me to strive for and help build a similar combination of intellectual excitement, collegiality, and friendship elsewhere.

Beyond UNM, I am also indebted to the Center for Economic Research and Teaching (Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, CIDE) and the Legal Research Institute at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, UNAM-III) in Mexico City, and to both the Getulio Vargas Foundation (Fundação Getulio Vargas, FGV) and Brazilian Center for Judicial Studies and Research (Centro Brasileiro de Estudos e Pesquisas Judiciais, CEBEPEJ) in São Paulo for hosting my fieldwork during parts of 2006, 2007, and 2008. At CIDE, I am particularly grateful to Gustavo Fondevila, who played a key role in opening the institution's law school to me in 2006, and to Julio Ríos-Figueroa, who facilitated my participation in the research seminar of the politics department in 2008. I would also like to thank the participants of research seminars in both the law school and the politics department, including Marcelo Bergman, Ana Laura Magaloni, Gabriel Negretto, and Andreas Schedler. At UNAM's Legal Research Institute, I am especially grateful to Jose Antonio Caballero, who provided key access to the legislative archives at the Institute. At FGV, I am especially grateful to Rafael Alves, who was instrumental in bringing me inside the institution, Gustavo Alves Pinto, Luciana Gross Cunha, and to the participants of the law school's (Direito-GV) faculty research workshop in 2007. At CEBEPEJ, I thank Maria Tereza Sadek, who met with me several times to discuss the direction of my work. Notably, both CIDE and FGV have young law schools that are at the forefront of legal education in each country, and I am still realizing the extent to which my stays at each institution shaped my perceptions of the junctures between law and politics in Mexico and Brazil.

Since 2009, four institutions have provided academic homes, including two postdoctoral fellowships. First, a postdoctoral fellowship at the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies (USMEX) at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) in 2009–2010 provided an intellectually stimulating space that was highly conducive to polishing the quantitative and qualitative work in Mexico. Indeed, versions of Chapters 4 and 6 have been published in the *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization,* and *Comparative Politics,* respectively, due in large measure to the work I was able to complete at USMEX. I am deeply grateful to the USMEX community of students, visiting scholars, and faculty, and extend a special thanks to Luz Marina Arias, Scott Desposato,

xxi

xxii

Acknowledgments

Alberto Diaz-Cayeros, Imke Harbers, Joy Langston, Rosario Aguilar Pariente, Jennifer Piscopo, Sebastian Saiegh, Mikael Wolfe, Rihan Yeh, and Barbara Zepeda. Second, the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth, where I was an assistant professor in 2010–2011, provided a reduced teaching load to its first-year faculty that was conducive to pursuing my publishing goals. At UMD, I am particularly grateful to Michael Baum, Robert Darst, Shannon Jenkins, and Doug Roscoe.

Third, a postdoctoral fellowship at the Kellogg Institute for International Studies at the University of Notre Dame (2011–2012) provided an extraordinarily generous and lively intellectual environment in which to develop the ideas presented here. At Kellogg, I am particularly indebted to Scott Mainwaring who, over the course of two or three conversations, helped disentangle an intellectual "knot" in the analysis of the influence of political parties in Brazil (Chapter 5), giving the entire manuscript greater continuity and consistency. Scott also encouraged the central argument about the causal role of ideas, and his enthusiasm for the project helped me maintain momentum at times when my own energy has waned. My thanks, as well, to the broader Kellogg community, especially to Michael Coppedge, Robert Fishman, John Gerring, Samuel Handlin, Noam Lupu, Elizabeth Rankin, and Denise Wright.

Fourth, the Department of Political Science in the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy at the University at Albany has been a warm and supportive working environment. I am especially grateful to the Dean of Rockefeller College, David Rousseau, and to the chair of the Department of Political Science, Julie Novkov, for encouraging my research. Julie has engaged in a sustained effort to build a public law community at the University at Albany. She was also a source of ongoing advice and encouragement since I joined the department, and provided very direct support for completing this book in the form of a department-sponsored workshop for the manuscript on April 26, 2013. For their comments and criticisms at that workshop I am grateful to Tulia Falleti, Sally Friedman, Kenneth Kersch, Scott Lemieux, Robert Nakamura, Julie Novkov, and Udi Sommer. I am particularly indebted to Tulia Falleti and Kenneth Kersch for their generosity in the form of energetic critiques combined with enthusiasm for the project, and for their careful reading of and feedback on an earlier draft, including multiple pages of invaluable notes and additional commentary even after the workshop.

Beyond these academic homes, I am deeply grateful to the engaging and nourishing professional relationships that have evolved with other scholars, especially in the communities of comparative law and courts, Latin American politics, and subnational politics. Among those who have contributed in various ways, large and small, to the development of this project from my

Acknowledgments

early days at UNM are John Ackerman, Karina Ansolabehere, Ana Arjona, Alejandra Armesto, Caroline Beer, Mary Bellman, Marcelo Bergman, Ernani Carvalho, Matthew Cleary, Humberto Dantas, Luciano Da Ros, Angélica Durán-Martinez, Jeffrey Drope, Meg Edwards, David Fleischer, Gustavo Fondevila, Janice Gallagher, Carlos Gervasoni, Tom Ginsburg, Agustina Giraudy, Imke Harbers, Doug Hecock, Lisa Hilbink, Eric Jepsen, Diana Kapiszewski, Matthew Lieber, Veronica Michel, Eduardo Moncada, Kimberly Nolan, Rodrigo Nunes, Eric Olson, Sergio Praça, Jessica Rich, Julio Rios-Figueroa, Alba Ruibal, Maria Tereza Sadek, Steve Samford, Christina Schatzman, Andrew Seeley, David Shirk, Richard Snyder, Celina Souza, Brian Taylor, and Matthew Taylor.

This project would not have been possible without generous funding support. Field research was assisted by three main sources: (1) the International Dissertation Research Fellowship Program of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC-IDRF) with funds provided by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; (2) the National Science Foundation's Law and Social Sciences Program (NSF Grant No. SES-0617767); and (3) the Fulbright U.S. Student Program. Graduate Assistantships from the Department of Political Science and a Doctoral Fellowship from the Latin American and Iberian Institute (LAII) at UNM also provided essential support. A Foreign Language and Areas Studies fellowship from the U.S. Department of Education (Title VI-FLAS) fellowship facilitated my study of Portuguese between 2004 and 2006, and funding for preliminary dissertation research in Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina was provided by the LAII, with funds from the Tinker Foundation and the Hewlett Foundation, and by the Graduate Research Development Fund at UNM.

An earlier version of Chapter 4 appeared in the Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization (February 2013) as "Elections, Ideology, or Opposition: Assessing Competing Explanations of Judicial Spending in the Mexican States," and is adapted here with permission. Also, an earlier version of Chapter 6 appeared in Comparative Politics (July 2012) as "Crafting Courts in New Democracies: Ideology and Judicial Council Reforms in Three Mexican States," and is adapted here with permission. Lastly, a variation and more limited version of the qualitative analysis of one of the Brazilian states in Chapter 7 appeared as a chapter in the volume edited by Moira B. MacKinnon and Ludovico Feoli, Representation and Effectiveness in Latin American Democracies: Congress, Judiciary, and Civil Society (Routledge, 2013), specifically "Courting from the Left: Effectiveness and Representativeness in the Brazilian State of Acre."

Throughout nearly two years of fieldwork in multiple locations within two different countries, I incurred many debts to many people. It is not

xxiii

xxiv

Acknowledgments

possible to list all of these individuals here, many of whom preferred to remain anonymous, but I would like to extend a very warm "gracias" and "obrigado" to all interview participants, lawyers, court staff, archivists, and academics who helped and guided me, many of whom became friends along the way. I remember you, and your generosity and support lead me to hope that I may someday be able to help someone else in their work as you helped me. Among friendships built as a result of working on this project, I would like to thank Krista Brune, Christian Ernst, Alejandro Gonzalez, Felipe Hevia, Arno Lehnen, Leila Lehnen, Fernando Neisser, Erika Pires Ramos, and Leah Rimkus. I also wish to thank the many scholars and students conducting their own research abroad and with whom I was fortunate enough to overlap during fieldwork, including the Fulbright and SSRC communities.

Two of the happiest moments in the trajectory of this manuscript were when John Berger at Cambridge University Press agreed to read the prospectus and then send out the full manuscript for review. The happier moment, of course, was when the publishing board extended the book contract, but the project would not have made it that far without John's support. I am grateful to him for his enthusiasm for the project, along with his patience and advice along the way. I also thank the three anonymous reviewers and the copyeditors for helping improve the pages ahead.

Closer to home, I would like to thank my family and friends. To my mom, sister, and stepfather – I cannot thank you enough. I wish we could have been geographically closer over the last few years, but I always felt your love and support and you have never been far from my heart. There is a lot that goes into an academic project over nearly a decade, but even more goes into nurturing family relationships. I dedicate this book to you. To friends developed and consolidated in New Mexico – you are my second family. I cannot imagine the eight years of law school and graduate school without you. It is unfair to some extent to single out anyone, but I feel a special debt to Doug Hecock and Justin Miller, both of whom – due to the duration of our friendships since we first met in college and due to the intensity with which we later pursued shared interests together in graduate school and law school – shaped my intellectual development (and appreciation for gerber) in crucial ways.

Finally, I thank Heather and Odin. Heather has watched me struggle with the final stages of this project while we jointly negotiated and balanced multiple other demands and challenges – geographic, emotional, professional – in our lives as we sought to build a family of our own. I am deeply grateful for the time she has given me to work on this project and the extra energy she has dedicated in other areas of our lives to make that possible. While supportive of the effort and energy yielding these pages, you – and now you and Odin – have

Acknowledgments

XXV

remained a constant and steady reminder that there is far more to life than work. The meaning of that simple idea is sometimes easier to grasp in theory than in practice, but it is nonetheless an idea to which you help me recommit myself every day we are together. If there is any symmetry between the argument in this book and the causal forces shaping our own lives, I hope it is that commitments to these kinds of ideas have meaningful and observable effects.