

## **UC Merced**

### **Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society**

#### **Title**

Supreme Court Oral Arguments by Amicus Curiae: A comparative analysis

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8bw2v5nz>

#### **Journal**

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, 45(45)

#### **Author**

Sagi, Eyal

#### **Publication Date**

2023

Peer reviewed

# Supreme Court Oral Arguments by Amicus Curiae: A comparative analysis

Eyal Sagi

University of St. Francis, Joliet, Illinois, United States

## Abstract

The legal system is concerned with interpreting and applying existing laws to real world circumstances. In the U.S., the final arbiters of these laws are the nine justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. The cases presented before the court generally involve disputes between two parties, the petitioner and the respondent. However, in some cases third parties provide additional information to the court as amici curiae ('friends of the court'). The present study uses corpus statistics and moral foundation theory to explore and compare the types of arguments brought up by the different parties during oral arguments over the past 6 decades, with a focus on amicus curiae arguments and how they affect the results of the case. Overall, the results show that both amici and respondents rely on moral arguments more frequently than petitioners do.