

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910826987703321
Autore	Miller Kenneth P
Titolo	Direct democracy and the courts // Kenneth P. Miller
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Cambridge ; ; New York, : Cambridge University Press, 2009
ISBN	1-107-19426-1 0-511-69992-1 0-511-64781-6 9786612393853 1-282-39385-5 0-511-80520-9 0-511-65189-9 0-511-63277-0 0-511-63156-1 0-511-63397-1
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (viii, 278 pages) : digital, PDF file(s)
Disciplina	328.273
Soggetti	Direct democracy - United States Judicial review - United States
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Title from publisher's bibliographic system (viewed on 08 Oct 2015).
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Introduction: A clash of rising powers -- The quest for majority rule -- The epic debate -- Direct democracy gathers force -- Countering the majority -- The counter-majoritarian power -- The courts at work -- Conflicts over rights -- Conflicts over powers -- The majority strikes back -- The people's check on the courts -- Conclusion: A new Constitutional equilibrium -- Appendix. Post-election initiative Invalidations.
Sommario/riassunto	Who should have the last word on fundamental policy issues? This book analyzes the rise of two contenders - the people, through direct democracy, and the courts. Now available in nearly half the states, direct democracy has surged in recent decades. Through ballot measures, voters have slashed taxes, mandated government spending, imposed term limits on elected officials, enacted campaign finance

reform, barred affirmative action, banned same-sex marriage, and adopted many other controversial laws. In several states, citizens now bypass legislatures to make the most important policy decisions. However, the 'people's rule' is not absolute. This book demonstrates that courts have used an expanding power of judicial review to invalidate citizen-enacted laws at remarkably high rates. The resulting conflict between the people and the courts threatens to produce a popular backlash against judges and raises profound questions about the proper scope of popular sovereignty and judicial power in a constitutional system.
