

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | xii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| 1 The global spread of proportionality and some analytical similarities with balancing | 10 |
| The spread of proportionality | 10 |
| Resistance to proportionality | 14 |
| Analytical similarities between balancing and proportionality | 16 |
| 2 History | 24 |
| The origins of proportionality in German administrative law | 24 |
| Proportionality and <i>Rechtsstaat</i> | 25 |
| Judicial review and the development of the principle of proportionality | 26 |
| Proportionality, natural law, and formalism | 28 |
| Conclusion | 32 |
| The origins of balancing in American constitutional jurisprudence | 32 |
| Balancing as a critique of formalism and Langdellianism | 33 |
| Langdellianism | 33 |
| Balancing as anti-Langdellianism | 34 |
| Progressive balancing in constitutional law: balancing and anti-formalism in constitutional law | 37 |
| Lochnerism | 37 |
| Balancing as anti-Lochnerism | 38 |
| Progressive balancing during the McCarthy era | 41 |
| Conclusion | 43 |
| 3 Culture | 44 |
| The German communitarian and organic conception of the state | 44 |
| Proportionality as an intrinsic element of the communitarian and organic conception of the state | 49 |
| The American individualistic and suspicion-based conception of the state | 52 |
| The suspicion-based conception of the state and balancing | 57 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| | Pragmatic versus conceptual balancing | 58 |
| | Political culture and the expansiveness of rights | 60 |
| 4 | Impact, intent, and indifference | 64 |
| | Impact-based and intent-based constitutional models: the ideal types | 64 |
| | The European impact-based model | 64 |
| | The American intent-based model | 66 |
| | Impact-based and intent-based: exceptions | 71 |
| | Intent-based: indifferent infringement of the Constitution | 73 |
| | Two illustrations: <i>Minnesota v. Barber</i> and the indifferent bomber | 73 |
| | Indifference in experimental philosophy: the Knobe Effect | 76 |
| | Possible objections | 78 |
| 5 | Epistemology | 82 |
| | Rules and standards in the USA | 82 |
| | American epistemological skepticism | 82 |
| | Epistemological skepticism and rules and standards | 85 |
| | Epistemological skepticism and rules | 85 |
| | Epistemological skepticism and standards: balancing and minimalism | 87 |
| | European epistemological optimism | 90 |
| | Epistemological optimism and standards | 91 |
| | Proportionality and epistemological optimism | 92 |
| | Balancing, proportionality, and control | 94 |
| | Vertical and horizontal control | 95 |
| | The size of the system and docket: America versus Israel | 97 |
| | Supreme Court coherency | 100 |
| 6 | Justification and authority | 103 |
| | A functional accounting for the spread of proportionality | 104 |
| | Early legal development | 104 |
| | Pluralism and conflict management | 106 |
| | A global community of judges and <i>lingua franca</i> | 109 |
| | Judicial power | 110 |
| | Culture of justification and culture of authority | 111 |
| | Division of labor and “black holes” | 113 |
| | The meaning of rights | 118 |
| | The role of text and interpretation | 119 |
| | Finality and the limits of reason | 120 |
| | Pluralist versus substantive/deliberative democracy | 121 |
| | The historical roots of the culture of justification | 122 |
| | The impact of legal culture on balancing and proportionality | 126 |
| | The administratization of constitutional law | 129 |

CONTENTS

xi

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 7 | The effects of proportionality | 133 |
| | “Race to the top” | 134 |
| | The German baggage of proportionality | 136 |
| | Canada | 139 |
| | Israel | 142 |
| | Canada and Israel: foreign law citation | 146 |
| | Common law baggage? Some objections | 148 |
| | Proportionality’s doctrinal imperialism | 150 |
| | <i>Conclusion</i> | 153 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 159 |