

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 <i>Différance</i> and the Political-Legal Realm of Deconstruction	166
5.2.1 Jacques Derrida and <i>Différance</i>	166
5.2.2 <i>Différance</i> 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 <i>Différance</i> 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 *Différance* 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 *Différance* and Intersubjectivity in the Quest for Justice 358

7.4 Final Words 362

8 Between *Différance* 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 *Différance* 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