

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-14

CONSTITUTIONAL COURTS AS GUARDIANS OF DEMOCRACY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN INDIA, GERMANY AND SOUTH AFRICA COMPARATIVE PUBLIC LAW

***Faiz Hasan, Dr. Chetan Trivedi**

Criminal Law, Amity Institute of Advanced Legal Studies Amity University Noida, Uttar
Pradesh.

Article Received: 27 August 2026

Article Revised: 15 September 2026

Published on: 05 October 2026

***Corresponding Author: Faiz Hasan**

Criminal Law, Amity Institute of Advanced Legal Studies Amity University Noida, Uttar
Pradesh.

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.6123>

ABSTRACT

Constitutional courts are often described as guardians of democracy, but their contribution to democratic government is more complicated than simply striking down unconstitutional laws. This research article compares the constitutional role of the Supreme Court of India, the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany and the Constitutional Court of South Africa. The study asks how each court protects constitutional democracy, how far judicial review may legitimately reach into political decision-making, and what the three systems can teach one another. The research adopts a doctrinal and comparative method, relying primarily on constitutional texts, leading judgments and official judicial materials, with supporting academic literature. The comparison shows three different institutional designs. India relies heavily on judicial review, fundamental rights and the basic structure doctrine. Germany places strong emphasis on human dignity, the free democratic basic order and an eternity clause. South Africa combines strong judicial review with an explicit commitment to participatory, accountable and open democracy. All three systems treat constitutionalism as more than majority rule, and courts protect democracy most effectively when judicial power is exercised through reasoned standards, institutional restraint and meaningful remedies. The article concludes that India can learn from Germany's structured protection of constitutional identity and South Africa's emphasis on participatory democracy, while preserving its own constitutional balance.

KEYWORDS: Constitutional courts; constitutional democracy; judicial review; basic structure; human dignity; participatory democracy.

1. INTRODUCTION

Democracy is commonly understood through elections, representative institutions and majority rule. Constitutional democracy, however, adds another dimension: political power must be exercised within legal limits and in a manner consistent with fundamental rights and constitutional values. This creates a continuing question for public law: who should protect the constitutional boundaries of democratic government when elected institutions themselves cross them? Constitutional courts are one of the principal answers.¹

India, Germany and South Africa provide particularly useful points of comparison. Each has a written constitution and a constitutional court or apex court with substantial authority to review state action. Yet the historical experiences behind their constitutional arrangements are very different. India emerged from colonial rule and adopted a detailed constitutional framework in 1950. Germany rebuilt its constitutional order after the experience of National Socialism and the collapse of the Weimar system; its Basic Law therefore gives unusually strong protection to human dignity and certain constitutional principles. South Africa's present constitutional order emerged from the transition away from apartheid and deliberately combines representative government with accountability, openness and public participation.² These three systems were selected because they represent distinct routes to the same problem: a judge-developed limit on constitutional change (India), a text-based limit (Germany), and a participatory and accountability-based conception of democratic legitimacy (South Africa).

The research problem is not whether courts exercise judicial review. It is whether and how judicial review strengthens democracy without turning judges into substitutes for elected institutions. The answer depends on institutional design, the scope of constitutional rights, amendment rules, access to courts and the remedies available after a constitutional violation.

This article therefore adopts a genuine comparative approach rather than presenting three isolated descriptions. It first identifies the constitutional basis of judicial review in each jurisdiction, then examines leading decisions concerning democratic structure, rights and accountability. It finally compares the three approaches, considers the reasons for their differences and draws lessons that may be relevant to India.

2. Statement of Problem

Constitutional courts have to protect the Constitution while respecting the democratic authority of legislatures and governments. The central problem is therefore one of constitutional balance. Excessive judicial deference may allow temporary majorities to weaken rights or institutional checks. Excessive judicial intervention may create concerns about judicial overreach and the

displacement of political choices. The comparative problem is to understand how India, Germany and South Africa structure this balance and whether particular safeguards in one system can be adapted, with caution, to another.

3. Research Questions

1. How do the constitutional systems of India, Germany and South Africa define the role of courts in protecting democratic government?
2. How have the three constitutional courts used judicial review to protect constitutional identity, rights, accountability and democratic participation?
3. What are the principal similarities and differences in the limits placed on legislative and executive power?
4. What lessons, if any, can India draw from the German and South African approaches without disturbing its own constitutional structure?

4. Research Objectives

- To examine the constitutional foundations of judicial review in India, Germany and South Africa.
- To analyse leading judicial decisions in which constitutional courts have protected democratic institutions, rights or accountability.
- To compare the different forms of constitutional entrenchment and judicial remedies in the three jurisdictions.
- To identify practical and doctrinal lessons relevant to the Indian constitutional framework.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research uses doctrinal and comparative legal methods. Primary materials include the Constitution of India, the German Basic Law, the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, and selected judgments of the Supreme Court of India, the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany and the Constitutional Court of South Africa. Official court materials were preferred for verification of constitutional provisions and judgments. Secondary material is used to explain comparative constitutional ideas. The article is qualitative and doctrinal; no empirical survey or questionnaire has been undertaken, because the research questions concern constitutional doctrine and judicial reasoning rather than stakeholder opinion. The comparison is organised around judicial review, constitutional identity, fundamental rights, democratic participation, accountability and remedies.

6. Research Hypothesis

Constitutional courts contribute to democratic stability not merely by invalidating unconstitutional state action, but by maintaining the conditions under which democratic government remains rights-respecting, accountable and constitutionally limited. The three jurisdictions demonstrate different institutional routes to this objective: India through basic structure review and rights-based judicial review, Germany through a strongly value-bound constitutional order, and South Africa through rights protection combined with participatory and accountable constitutional government.

7. Literature Review

Comparative constitutional scholarship has long examined the relationship between courts, democracy and constitutional supremacy. The central debate is not simply whether judicial review is desirable, but whether constitutional courts can claim legitimacy when unelected judges invalidate decisions made by elected representatives.³ The literature commonly contrasts majoritarian accounts of democracy, of which the classical doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty is the best-known example, with constitutional accounts that treat rights and institutional limits as conditions of democratic government.⁴

Indian constitutional scholarship has paid particular attention to the basic structure doctrine, judicial review and the relationship between Parliament and the Supreme Court. The doctrine developed through *Kesavananda Bharati* and later cases is especially important because it places substantive limits on the amending power.⁵ German constitutional scholarship, by contrast, places significant emphasis on constitutional identity, human dignity and the free democratic basic order.⁶ The Basic Law itself protects certain principles against amendment, reducing the risk that a temporary constitutional majority can legally abolish the foundations of the constitutional order.⁷

South African scholarship and jurisprudence highlight a different dimension: the constitutional order expressly connects democracy with accountability, responsiveness and openness. In *Doctors for Life International*, the Constitutional Court treated public involvement in law-making as a constitutional requirement rather than a matter of political courtesy.⁸ The South African model therefore expands the idea of democratic guardianship beyond the protection of rights against government to the quality of democratic law-making itself.

The literature thus establishes the legitimacy debate and describes each system, but it tends to treat the three models separately. What remains unresolved is how they compare in practice, and what a court in one system can responsibly borrow from another.⁹ The gap addressed by

this article is the need to place these three approaches together and examine their practical consequences. The comparison suggests that constitutional guardianship has several dimensions: preventing constitutional destruction, protecting individual rights, preserving institutional accountability and ensuring meaningful participation. No single model fully captures all of these dimensions.

8. Constitutional Framework and Judicial Role

8.1 India: Judicial Review and the Basic Structure

The Indian Constitution gives courts a significant role in enforcing constitutional limits. Fundamental rights are judicially enforceable, and Articles 32 and 226 provide important routes for constitutional remedies. Article 13 invalidates laws inconsistent with fundamental rights, while Article 368 establishes the constitutional amendment procedure.¹⁰ The central development, however, is the basic structure doctrine.

In *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, the Supreme Court held, by a closely divided Constitution Bench, that Parliament's power to amend the Constitution is not unlimited.¹¹ The Court's later jurisprudence has treated features such as constitutional supremacy, republican and democratic government, separation of powers, judicial review and the rule of law as connected with the Constitution's basic structure. The significance of the doctrine is that a parliamentary majority cannot use the amendment power to legally destroy the constitutional identity within which that majority itself exercises power.

The doctrine was reinforced in *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain* and *Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India*.¹² In *Minerva Mills*, the Court treated limited amending power and the balance between Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles as central constitutional concerns.¹³ The doctrine therefore functions as a form of democratic self-protection: ordinary political majorities can govern, and constitutional amendments can be made, but neither can abolish the fundamental framework of constitutional democracy.

The strength of the Indian approach is also its difficulty. The Constitution does not provide a closed list of basic features. The doctrine has therefore developed through judicial reasoning.¹⁴ This flexibility has allowed the Court to respond to new threats to constitutional structure, but it also means that the judiciary has considerable responsibility in identifying the constitutional boundary.

8.2 Germany: The Federal Constitutional Court and the Free Democratic Basic Order

Germany offers a more explicitly entrenched model. The Basic Law places human dignity at the beginning of its fundamental-rights framework and expressly protects the principles of

democracy, rule of law, federalism and the social state. Article 79(3), commonly called the eternity clause, prevents amendments affecting certain fundamental principles.¹⁵ The Federal Constitutional Court describes itself as the guardian of the Basic Law and has final authority on constitutional interpretation.¹⁶

The German model developed in direct response to the historical failure of constitutional democracy during the twentieth century. The Court has consequently treated democracy as more than the existence of elections. In the party-ban cases, it has protected the free democratic basic order and the conditions of open political competition.¹⁷ In its election-related and party-financing jurisprudence, the Court has emphasised that state authority derives from the people and that democratic participation depends on free and equal political processes.¹⁸

A particularly important feature is the connection between democracy and human dignity. The Court's constitutional reasoning does not treat majority will as unlimited. A law must comply not only with formal legislative procedures but also with the higher constitutional values protected by the Basic Law. At the same time, the Court's own description of its function stresses that it is not a political body: its standard of review is the Basic Law, not political expediency.¹⁹

The German approach therefore combines strong judicial review with strong textual entrenchment. The Court is powerful, but the Constitution supplies unusually explicit limits on constitutional change. This reduces, although it does not eliminate, the risk that judicial review becomes an open-ended exercise in political preference.

8.3 South Africa: Constitutional Review, Accountability and Participation

South Africa's Constitutional Court was established within a constitutional order deliberately designed to break with apartheid and build a democratic society based on rights, equality and accountable government. The Constitution places constitutional supremacy at the centre of the legal order and gives the Constitutional Court authority over constitutional disputes.²⁰

The South African model is distinctive because democratic legitimacy is understood in both representative and participatory terms. In *Doctors for Life International v. Speaker of the National Assembly*, the Court held that Parliament has a constitutional duty to facilitate public involvement in legislative processes.²¹ The decision connected this requirement to the founding values of accountability, responsiveness and openness. Public participation was therefore treated as part of constitutional democracy itself, not simply as good legislative practice.

In *Economic Freedom Fighters v. Speaker of the National Assembly*, the Court demonstrated another dimension of democratic guardianship: institutional accountability. The Court held that remedial action by the Public Protector in the Nkandla matter was binding and that the

President's failure to comply was inconsistent with the Constitution.²² The case illustrates how a constitutional court can protect accountability mechanisms even when the dispute involves senior political office-holders. The Court's judgment of 8 May 2026 in a further case brought by the same party concerned the National Assembly's handling of the section 89 independent panel report on the Phala Phala matter, and again turned on the Assembly's process rather than on any finding about the President's personal liability.²³

The South African experience shows that courts can guard democracy without reducing democracy to elections. The Constitution requires institutions to remain open to public participation and accountable to constitutional standards. This creates a wider conception of judicial review in which institutional process can itself become a constitutional question.

9. Comparative Judicial Analysis

9.1 Constitutional Identity and Amendment Power

India and Germany both recognise that constitutional democracy can be undermined through formally legal constitutional change. India developed this protection judicially through the basic structure doctrine. Germany protects core principles through express constitutional entrenchment, especially Article 79(3).²⁴ The institutional route is therefore different. India's limit is principally judge-developed, whereas Germany's is strongly text-based. The practical consequence is that Indian courts must articulate and justify the content of the basic structure through precedent, while the German Court operates within a more explicit textual framework.

9.2 Rights and Democratic Majorities

All three systems reject the idea that a numerical majority has unlimited constitutional authority. In India, fundamental rights and constitutional structure limit ordinary legislative and amending power. In Germany, human dignity and the free democratic basic order provide particularly strong substantive constraints. In South Africa, the Bill of Rights and constitutional supremacy similarly limit public power.²⁵ The common principle is that democracy is not exhausted by counting votes; constitutional democracy also protects the legal conditions that allow individuals and groups to participate as equal citizens.

9.3 Accountability and Separation of Powers

The three jurisdictions also differ in how judicial review interacts with institutional accountability. India has developed strong judicial review of executive and legislative action, while Germany has a highly structured constitutional jurisdiction with multiple proceedings for reviewing state action and protecting constitutional rights.²⁶ South Africa makes accountability, responsiveness and openness express constitutional values and has used judicial remedies to

enforce institutional duties. The South African approach is especially significant because it treats constitutional accountability as an ongoing feature of government rather than something triggered only by an individual rights claim.

9.4 Democratic Participation

Participation is a particularly clear point of difference. India recognises political participation through elections, representation and constitutional rights, but its constitutional litigation has traditionally concentrated heavily on rights and institutional structure. Germany strongly protects the conditions for free political participation and equal political competition. South Africa goes further by constitutionally requiring public involvement in legislative processes. The South African experience therefore offers a useful reminder that democratic legitimacy is strengthened when citizens have meaningful opportunities to engage with law-making between elections.

9.5 Judicial Restraint and Institutional Legitimacy

A constitutional court cannot protect democracy simply by exercising maximum power. Judicial legitimacy depends on legal reasoning, transparent standards and respect for the institutional role of legislatures and governments; the concern that constitutional adjudication may transfer political power to courts is a familiar one.²⁷ The German Court expressly describes its task as defining the constitutional framework within which policy can develop. The South African Court has similarly recognised that Parliament retains discretion over the practical design of public participation, provided the constitutional duty is fulfilled.²⁸ India faces the same institutional challenge in its basic structure jurisprudence: the doctrine must remain anchored in constitutional text, structure, history and precedent rather than becoming a free-standing judicial policy power.

9.6 Reasons for the Differences

The differences are best explained by constitutional history and drafting. India's Constituent Assembly did not include an eternity clause, and the basic structure doctrine emerged only when the Supreme Court confronted a series of amendments that threatened rights and judicial review. Germany's framers wrote substantive limits into the text because they drafted in the shadow of the collapse of the Weimar order. South Africa's participatory commitments reflect a transition in which exclusion from law-making had been a defining feature of the previous regime. These histories also explain why the courts' self-understanding and remedies differ, and why any borrowing between systems must be selective.²⁹

10. Similarities, Differences and Practical Consequences

The following table summarises the comparison drawn in Part 9.

Issue	India	Germany	South Africa
Core role	Judicial review; rights; constitutional structure	Guardian of Basic Law; rights; democratic order	Constitutional supremacy; rights; accountability
Constitutional identity	Basic structure doctrine developed by courts	Strong textual entrenchment under Basic Law, including Art. 79(3)	Foundational values and supremacy of the Constitution
Democratic protection	Limits majoritarian constitutional change	Protects free democratic basic order and dignity	Protects representative and participatory democracy
Institutional concern	Judicial power versus parliamentary amendment power	Constitutional review versus democratic self-government	Accountability and meaningful public participation
Distinctive lesson	Substantive limits on amendment	Explicit protection of constitutional identity	Democracy includes ongoing public participation

11. Critical Analysis

The comparison suggests that the phrase “guardian of democracy” should not be understood as giving courts a general mandate to correct every political decision. A court is a guardian in a constitutional sense: it protects the legal framework within which democratic decisions are made. This distinction is important because policy choices normally involve competing social priorities that are institutionally suited to legislative debate. Courts are most clearly justified when the question is whether government has crossed a constitutional boundary.

India’s basic structure doctrine is powerful because it protects constitutional continuity. Its main challenge is that the content of the doctrine is not exhaustively listed. The legitimacy of future applications therefore depends on disciplined reasoning and careful attention to precedent. Germany provides a useful comparative example because many core principles are textually entrenched. However, Germany’s model cannot simply be transplanted into India: the two constitutional histories and institutional structures are different.

South Africa provides a different lesson. Its jurisprudence shows that democracy can be weakened not only by unconstitutional legislation but also by failures of participation and accountability. This is particularly relevant in modern democracies where formal elections may coexist with public disengagement, unequal access to institutions and weak oversight. Judicial review of procedure can therefore protect the quality of democratic government without deciding the policy merits of legislation.

The strongest comparative conclusion is consequently plural rather than uniform.

Constitutional democracy requires several safeguards working together: enforceable rights, institutional separation, independent courts, lawful elections, accountability mechanisms and meaningful avenues for public participation. A court that protects only one of these elements may leave important weaknesses elsewhere. The Indian constitutional framework already contains many of these components; the comparative value of Germany and South Africa lies in showing how different institutions can reinforce them.

12. FINDINGS

- All three jurisdictions treat constitutional supremacy as a limit on ordinary political power, although the institutional expression of that principle differs.
- India and Germany provide especially strong examples of constitutional protection against changes that could undermine the constitutional order itself.
- South Africa demonstrates that democratic guardianship can include judicial enforcement of legislative participation and political accountability.
- Judicial review is most defensible when courts apply identifiable constitutional standards rather than substituting their own policy preferences.
- The comparative evidence supports a broad understanding of democratic protection: rights, constitutional structure, accountability and participation are mutually reinforcing.

13. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

India should continue to preserve the basic structure doctrine but should maintain clear reasoning about why a particular constitutional principle forms part of the basic structure. This can reduce uncertainty and strengthen the legitimacy of constitutional adjudication.

Indian constitutional institutions can also learn from the South African emphasis on meaningful participation. Where legislation has major constitutional or social consequences, transparent consultation and accessible legislative information can improve the quality and legitimacy of law-making without transferring legislative power to courts.

The German model suggests the value of clearly articulating constitutional identity and the relationship between democratic government, human dignity and institutional limits. Indian courts can use comparative material as persuasive reasoning while remaining faithful to the Indian constitutional text and its own precedent.

Finally, constitutional courts should prefer remedies that restore constitutional functioning while respecting institutional roles. A remedy should be effective enough to enforce the Constitution but carefully tailored so that the judiciary does not unnecessarily take over

functions belonging to elected institutions.

14. CONCLUSION

Constitutional courts can act as guardians of democracy because constitutional democracy requires more than periodic elections and majority rule. India, Germany and South Africa demonstrate three different but overlapping models of constitutional guardianship. India has developed a strong judicial role through fundamental-rights review and the basic structure doctrine. Germany combines powerful constitutional review with explicit protection of human dignity, democratic government and an eternity clause. South Africa adds a particularly strong participatory and accountability-based conception of democracy. The comparison does not establish that one model should simply replace another. Instead, it shows that democratic constitutionalism is strongest when rights, institutional limits, public participation and accountability reinforce each other. For India, the most useful comparative lesson is therefore not institutional imitation but constitutional learning: preserve the strengths of judicial review while continuing to develop principled standards, meaningful democratic participation and effective accountability. Courts remain guardians not because they govern, but because they help ensure that government remains within the constitutional conditions that make democratic self-government possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Constitutions and Statutory Materials

1. Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland [Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany], 1949.
2. The Constitution of India, 1950.
3. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996.

Cases

4. *Doctors for Life International v. Speaker of the National Assembly*, 2006 (6) SA 416 (CC) : [2006] ZACC 11.
5. *Economic Freedom Fighters v. Speaker of the National Assembly; Democratic Alliance v.*
6. *Speaker of the National Assembly*, 2016 (3) SA 580 (CC) : [2016] ZACC 11.
7. *Economic Freedom Fighters v. Speaker of the National Assembly*, CCT 35/24, [2026] ZACC 17 (Constitutional Court of South Africa, 8 May 2026).
8. *Entscheidungen des Bundesverfassungsgerichts* [BVerfGE] 2, 1 (1952); 5, 85 (1956);

20, 56

9. (1966); 123, 267 (2009).
10. *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain*, AIR 1975 SC 2299 : 1975 Supp SCC 1.
11. *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, AIR 1973 SC 1461 : (1973) 4 SCC 225.
12. *Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India*, AIR 1980 SC 1789 : (1980) 3 SCC 625.

Books

13. Choudhry, Sujit (ed.), *The Migration of Constitutional Ideas* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
14. Dicey, A.V., *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution* (Macmillan, London, 8th edn., 1915).
15. Hirschl, Ran, *Towards Juristocracy: The Origins and Consequences of the New Constitutionalism* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 2004).
16. Kommers, Donald P. and Miller, Russell A., *The Constitutional Jurisprudence of the Federal Republic of Germany* (Duke University Press, Durham, 3rd edn., 2012).
17. Krishnaswamy, Sudhir, *Democracy and Constitutionalism in India: A Study of the Basic Structure Doctrine* (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2009).
18. Roznai, Yaniv, *Unconstitutional Constitutional Amendments: The Limits of Amendment Powers* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2017).
19. Wade, H.W.R. and Forsyth, C.F., *Administrative Law* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 11th edn., 2014).

Articles

20. Tushnet, Mark, "New Forms of Judicial Review and the Persistence of Rights- and Democracy-Based Worries" 38 Wake Forest Law Review 813 (2003).

Official Online Materials

21. Constitutional Court of South Africa, official judgments and case collection, available at
22. <https://www.concourt.org.za>.
23. Federal Constitutional Court of Germany, official Basic Law and decisions database, available at <https://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de>.
24. Supreme Court of India, official judgment database and constitutional materials, available at
25. <https://www.sci.gov.in>.
26. Ran Hirschl, *Towards Juristocracy: The Origins and Consequences of the New Constitutionalism* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 2004).

27. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, s. 1(d).
28. Mark Tushnet, “New Forms of Judicial Review and the Persistence of Rights- and Democracy-Based Worries” 38 Wake Forest Law Review 813 (2003); *see also* Hirschl, *supra* note 1.
29. A.V. Dicey, *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution* (Macmillan, London, 8th edn., 1915);
30. H.W.R. Wade and C.F. Forsyth, *Administrative Law* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 11th edn., 2014).
31. Sudhir Krishnaswamy, *Democracy and Constitutionalism in India: A Study of the Basic Structure Doctrine* (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2009).
32. Donald P. Kommers and Russell A. Miller, *The Constitutional Jurisprudence of the Federal Republic of Germany* (Duke University Press, Durham, 3rd edn., 2012).
33. Yaniv Roznai, *Unconstitutional Constitutional Amendments: The Limits of Amendment Powers* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2017).
34. Doctors for Life International v. Speaker of the National Assembly, 2006 (6) SA 416 (CC) : [2006] ZACC 11.
35. Sujit Choudhry (ed.), *The Migration of Constitutional Ideas* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
36. The Constitution of India, arts. 13, 32, 226 and 368.
37. Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461 : (1973) 4 SCC 225.
38. Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain, AIR 1975 SC 2299 : 1975 Supp SCC 1.
39. Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1980 SC 1789 : (1980) 3 SCC 625.
40. Krishnaswamy, *supra* note 5, presents this open-endedness as the central conceptual challenge of the doctrine.
41. Grundgesetz [Basic Law], arts. 1, 20 and 79(3).
42. Federal Constitutional Court of Germany, official website, “The Basic Law”, *available at* <https://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de>.
43. Entscheidungen des Bundesverfassungsgerichts [BVerfGE] 2, 1 (1952) (Socialist Reich Party case); BVerfGE
44. 5, 85 (1956) (Communist Party of Germany case); *see also* Grundgesetz, art. 21(2).
45. BVerfGE 20, 56 (1966) (Party Financing case); BVerfGE 123, 267 (2009) (Lisbon Treaty case) (BVerfG, Judgment of 30 June 2009, 2 BvE 2/08).
46. Kommers and Miller, *supra* note 6.
47. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, ss. 2, 165, 167 and 172.

48. *Doctors for Life International*, *supra* note 8; The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, ss. 59(1)(a) and 72(1)(a).
49. *Economic Freedom Fighters v. Speaker of the National Assembly; Democratic Alliance v. Speaker of the National Assembly*, 2016 (3) SA 580 (CC) : [2016] ZACC 11; The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, ss. 83 and 182.
50. *Economic Freedom Fighters v. Speaker of the National Assembly*, CCT 35/24, [2026] ZACC 17 (Constitutional Court of South Africa, 8 May 2026).
51. Roznai, *supra* note 7, examines both models within a wider comparative account of limits on amendment powers.
52. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, ss. 2 and 7.
53. Grundgesetz, art. 93.
54. Hirschl, *supra* note 1.
55. *Doctors for Life International*, *supra* note 8.
56. Choudhry, *supra* note 9.