

Juliano Zaiden Benvindo

On the Limits of Constitutional Adjudication

Deconstructing Balancing
and Judicial Activism



Springer

Professor Juliano Zaiden Benvindo
Faculty of Law
University of Brasília
Campus Darcy Ribeiro
Asa Norte
Faculdade de Direito
Brasília - DF
Brazil 70.919-970
juliano@unb.br

899-411

ISBN 978-3-642-11433-5 e-ISBN 978-3-642-11434-2
DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-11434-2
Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2010931461

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2010

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilm or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Violations are liable to prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Cover design: WMXDesign GmbH, Heidelberg, Germany

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

Part I German and Brazilian Constitutional Cultures: Constitutional Adjudication and Activism

1 An Approach to Decision-Making	3
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 The Crucifix Case	4
1.3 The Cannabis Case	11
1.4 The Ellwanger Case	19
1.5 Final Words	29
2 Balancing Within the Context of German Constitutionalism: The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i>'s Shift to Activism	31
2.1 Introduction	31
2.2 Balancing Within the Triadic Framework of the Principle of Proportionality: A Brief Introduction	39
2.3 The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> in the Postwar Crisis: The New Representative of the Legal and Social Order	48
2.4 The <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's Shift to Activism: From Subjective Rights to Objective Principles and the Consequences in Judicial Review	57
2.5 The Constitutional Scholarship Reaction Against the <i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 's Shift to Politics and the Irrationalism of Balancing	68
2.6 Final Words	80
3 Balancing Within the Context of Brazilian Constitutionalism: The <i>Supremo Tribunal Federal</i>'s Shift to Activism	83
3.1 Introduction	83
3.2 The <i>Supremo Tribunal Federal</i> in the Democratization Process: the Federal Constitution of 1988 and the Opening to Activism	88

3.3 Balancing in the Decisions of the Supremo Tribunal Federal: The Quest for Rationality in Decision-Making	109
3.4 Final Words	130

Part II The Debate on the Rationality of Balancing

4 The Aim to Rationalize Balancing Within the Context of Constitutional Courts' Activism	135
4.1 Introduction: The Quest for a Systematization and Rationalization of Balancing	135
4.2 Robert Alexy's Special Case Thesis (<i>Sonderfallthese</i>)	139
4.3 The Quest for the Rationality of Balancing: The Core of Robert Alexy's Theory of Constitutional Rights	143
4.4 Final Words	157
5 When <i>Différance</i> Comes to Light: Balancing Within the Context of Deconstruction	161
5.1 Introduction	161
5.2 Différance and the Political-Legal Realm of Deconstruction	166
5.2.1 Jacques Derrida and <i>Différance</i>	166
5.2.2 Différance and Constitutional Democracy: The Democracy to Come	174
5.2.3 The to Come in the Negotiation Between Constitutionalism and Democracy	182
5.2.4 Différance Within the Context of Decision-Making: The Negotiation Between Law and Justice and the First Insight into Legitimacy	186
5.3 Balancing Within the Context of <i>Différance</i>	194
5.3.1 Introduction	194
5.3.2 Balancing and the Logos of Correctness-Rationality	196
5.3.3 Balancing and the Logos of Legitimacy	218
5.4 Final Words	239
6 When Procedures Towards Mutual Understanding Come to Light: Balancing Within the Context of Proceduralism	243
6.1 Introduction	243
6.2 The Claim to Coherence in Robert Alexy's View: When Rights Lapse into General Practical Discourse	246
6.3 The Post-Metaphysical Response to Balancing as an Indispensable Instrument for Coherence: The Coherence and the Single Right Answer Within Democratic Procedures of Opinion – and Will Formation	250
6.3.1 Introduction	250

6.3.2	Klaus Günther's View: Coherence Through the Distinction Between Discourses of Justification and Discourses of Application	251
6.3.3	Ronald Dworkin's View: Integrity in Legal Reasoning and the Claim to the Single Right Answer as a Response to Coherence	265
6.3.4	Jürgen Habermas's View: Between Facts and Norms Within Democratic Procedures of Opinion – and Will Formation	279
6.4	The Metaphysics of Balancing from the Perspective of the Proceduralist Account	305
6.4.1	Introduction	305
6.4.2	The First Outcome: The Construction of an Axiological Content in the Structure of Principles	310
6.4.3	The Second and Third Outcomes: The Confusion between Discourses of Justification and Discourses of Application and the Loss of Protection of Minorities	315
6.4.4	The Fourth Outcome: The Relativization and Misunderstanding of the "Single Right Answer"	320
6.4.5	The Final Analysis: The Problem of Rationality in Alexy's Thinking	322
6.5	Final Words	326

Part III The Concept of Limited Rationality

7	Between <i>Différance</i> and Intersubjectivity: The Concept of Limited Rationality in Constitutional Democracy	333
7.1	Introduction	333
7.2	When Proceduralism and Deconstruction Are Placed Side by Side: The First Insight into the Limits of Reason	336
7.3	The Quest for Justice: A Dialogue Between Symmetry and Asymmetry?	342
7.3.1	Introduction	342
7.3.2	Is Really the Quest for Consensus Incompatible with Asymmetry? A Look Into Chantal Mouffe's "Agonist Model of Democracy"	345
7.3.3	The Internal Dialects Between Modern Equality and Individuality: The Symmetry and Asymmetry in Christoph Menke's Account	352
7.3.4	The Resolution as a Non-Resolution: The "Irresolvable But Productive Tension" Between <i>Différance</i> and Intersubjectivity in the Quest for Justice	358
7.4	Final Words	362

8	Between <i>Différance</i> and Intersubjectivity: The Concept of Limited Rationality in the Realm of Constitutional Adjudication	365
8.1	Introduction	365
8.2	The Concept of Limited Rationality in the Realm of Legal Adjudication: Intersubjectivity and <i>Différance</i> in a Complementary Fashion	367
8.3	The Concept of Limited Rationality In German and Brazilian Constitutional Realities	373
8.4	When the Concept of Limited Rationality Meets Constitutional Cases	385
8.4.1	Introduction	385
8.4.2	The Crucifix Case	386
8.4.3	The Cannabis Case	392
8.4.4	The Ellwanger Case	398
8.5	Final Words	404
	Conclusion	407
	Bibliography	413