

Compilation

1.0 INTRODUCTION

What does a country do when its own legal system once enabled genocide? For Germany, the answer was not just to rebuild — but to remember. In 1949, out of the ruins of the Nazi regime and the horrors of World War II, Germany enacted the Basic Law (Grundgesetz) — a constitution designed not only to govern, but to **guard**.

Unlike conventional constitutions, the Basic Law was written with the explicit goal of preventing the return of authoritarianism. It placed human dignity at its core, built strong checks and balances, and ensured that democracy could never be legally dismantled from within — as it once was under Adolf Hitler. Germany chose to call it “Basic Law” rather than “Constitution” because, at the time, the country was still divided — but the values it upheld were already intended to be permanent. This was not just about law; it was a moral framework forged from memory, justice, and accountability.[1]

Today, the Basic Law remains one of the most self-defensive, rights-oriented constitutions in the world — a living reminder that democracy must not only be practiced, but also protected.

2.0 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The end of World War II marked not only the military defeat of Nazi Germany but also the complete collapse of its political, moral, and legal order. The undercurrents of the war had not only left a death toll in the millions, but a struggling and starving population, left with nothing but a beaten-down government, desperate to do anything to rebuild itself. This monumental task of rebuilding not just infrastructure, but governance itself, had to be approached delicately, for fear of another Adolf Hitler reemerging. In the wake of such catastrophic failure, German constitutional development after 1945 was guided by a singular goal: creating a legal and political order that would make another dictatorship impossible. This effort culminated in the creation of the *Grundgesetz*, or Basic Law, in 1949.

In William L. Shirer’s words, The Weimar Republic's constitution is "on paper, the most liberal and democratic document of its kind the twentieth century had ever seen ... full of ingenious and admirable devices which seemed to guarantee the working of an almost flawless democracy".[2] Which is to say, it is an ambitious, yet as proven by history, largely

flawed document. Adolf Hitler's rise to power in 1933 was legally sanctioned within this constitutional framework. This isn't the first time a country's dictator used its Constitution as a means to exercise complete and total control over the state, and the sad fact is, it most likely won't be the last. To this day, stark comparisons can be made to other countries facing similar battles. Maybe not nearly to the extent of the holocaust, but if left unchecked, who knows how far they will go?

The Weimar Constitution, while appearing democratic and liberal on the surface, contained structural weaknesses that proved fatal under pressure. One of its most notorious features was **Article 48**,^[3] which allowed the President of the Republic to suspend civil liberties and rule by emergency decree during times of crisis. While the clause had originally been intended to be used as a safeguard against instability, falling into the wrong hands allowed it to be used as a tool to legitimize authoritarian rule. Not long after Adolf Hitler's appointment as chancellor, he called elections for 5 March. Six days before the election, on 27 February, the Reichstag building, home to the German Parliament, became the target for an arson attack which damaged the house of parliament in Berlin. The culprit: Marinus van der Lubbe, a Dutch council communist. With this, the nazis had an in, using the arson attack as a means to induce President Paul von Hindenburg to issue the Reichstag Fire Decree, officially the Presidential Decree for the Protection of People and State (*Verordnung des Reichspräsidenten zum Schutz von Volk und Staat*), suspending civil liberties, and pursue a "ruthless confrontation" with the Communists.

This arson attack became the beginning of Germany's downfall. Under the decree, which was issued on the basis of Article 48, the government was given authority to curtail fundamental constitutional rights. Constitutional restrictions on searches and confiscation of property were likewise rescinded.

The Weimar Constitution, while glinting with the hope of a liberal democracy, equipped with the mechanisms to protect itself in times of emergency, was used maliciously as an instrument of dictatorship and an affront to human rights. But with every cloud comes a silver lining, and in this experience, it is the resolution of the post-war constitutional designers that viewed to never again allow democracy to be subverted so profoundly.

3.0 UNIQUE PROVISIONS IN GRUNDGESETZ

As stated above, Germany's long and complex history has significantly shaped the constitution it has today. In this article, three important articles from the German constitution will be discussed, highlighting how historical events and experiences have influenced their content and significance.

3.1 Article 1 - Human Dignity is Inviolable

In Germany's post-WWII Basic Law (1949), Germany deliberately placed the phrase "Human dignity shall be inviolable"[4] at the very outset.[5] Framers stressed that dignity be made "paramount" in the new order so that "nothing like the Nazi era ever happens again".[6] Indeed, Article 1 is widely acknowledged as the *Grundgesetz*'s cornerstone – commentators call it "the most important article" to which all other rights refer-[7] and it is entrenched by the eternity clause (Article 79) so that its protection can never be amended or revoked.[8] German scholars therefore treat Article 1 as an absolute, non-derogable norm: it has been described as "absolute" and "eternal" and effectively the only absolute norm of the Basic Law.[9] The Federal Constitutional Court has repeatedly invoked Article 1 to invalidate laws or policies seen as degrading human dignity. For example, in the 2010 *Hartz IV* case the Court struck down the original unemployment-benefit formula for failing to guarantee the subsistence minimum required by human dignity.[10] Similarly, in its landmark 1983 "Census" judgment[11] the Court explicitly linked data-privacy to Article 1, creating a right of informational self-determination and forbidding invasive mass surveillance without consent.[12] In short, Germany's dignity clause has unrivaled legal force: it stands above ordinary rights, cannot be overridden by statute or constitutional amendment,[13] and thus offers a uniquely strong protection compared to most other nations.

3.2 Article 79(3) – The Eternity Clause

Article 79(3) of Germany's Basic Law famously enshrines an "Eternity Clause" forbidding any amendment that would undermine certain fundamental principles.[14] It provides that "an amendment to this Basic Law affecting ... the principles laid down in Article 1 and 20 shall be inadmissible".[15] Article 1 in turn proclaims that "Human dignity shall be inviolable; to respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority",[16] and Article 20(1) declares that "The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social Federal state"[17] (with further provisions establishing popular sovereignty, rule of law, and the right of resistance). Thus these core values – human dignity, democracy, federalism and the rule of law – are entrenched beyond change. This reflects the trauma of Weimar and Nazi rule: as

Kommers explains, the eternity clause “bans any constitutional amendment that would affect or undermine the dignitarian principles of Article 1 or the basic structural principles... set forth in Article 20” (namely federalism, separation of powers, rule of law and the social welfare state).[18] The framers – mindful of the Third Reich’s rise – believed this was the best way to “safeguard human dignity and preserve the ‘democratic and social federal state,’ now and in the future,” effectively “freezing” these principles against any legal reversal.[19] Indeed, commentators note that by design the clause makes the Basic Law’s “basic values” – democracy and dignity – permanently immune to majoritarian change, a mandate born “against the background of the Weimar Constitution, Nazi rule, and the Holocaust”.[20] In short, Article 79(3) embodies Germany’s post-1945 commitment to never again allow an authoritarian constitution: it locks Articles 1 and 20 as unamendable pillars of the democratic order and thus serves as a constitutional bulwark against any return to tyranny.

3.3 Article 21(2) – Militant Democracy

Article 21(2) of the German *Grundgesetz* was drafted in conscious response to the Weimar Republic’s collapse and the Nazi seizure of power, embedding a “militant democracy” (*wehrhafte Demokratie*) ethos into the constitution.[21] It provides that any party which, by its aims or members’ conduct, “seeks to undermine or abolish the free democratic basic order or to endanger the existence of the Federal Republic of Germany” is unconstitutional.[22] Crucially only the Federal Constitutional Court may declare a party unlawful, making it a very high threshold. This approach reflects postwar Germany’s resolve to avoid the “defenselessness” of Weimar (which was “ultimately destroyed” by its extremist foes).[23] Indeed, the Basic Law is explicitly designed as a counter-model to Weimar and a bulwark against tyranny – a “democracy determined and able to defend itself (‘militant democracy’)” in the Court’s words.[24] In practice Article 21(2) has been applied primarily on the far right and far left: in the 1950s the Federal Constitutional Court banned the neo-Nazi Socialist Reich Party and the Communist Party of Germany as unconstitutional.[25] More recent efforts show the same principle: a 2003 attempt to outlaw the far-right NPD failed for lack of evidence that it could succeed, and in 2017 the Court likewise held that although the NPD’s goals were anti-democratic, the party was “too weak to endanger democracy” – so it could not be banned.[26] (Current debate has turned to whether the rising AfD harbors similar threats.)[27]

By contrast, neither the United States nor the United Kingdom has an equivalent constitutional power to ban political parties. The U.S. First Amendment's broad protection of speech and association generally forbids outlawing political groups on ideological grounds – even explicitly hateful movements have been permitted to organize or march (as in the famous Skokie case) so long as they do not commit violence.

Likewise, British authorities do not suspend parties merely for extremist views; instead they rely on ordinary criminal or anti-terror laws to target violence. As a UK government statement acknowledges, Islamist and neo-Nazi agitators “operate lawfully” in Britain even while they “advocate... the replacement of democracy with an Islamist or Nazi society”.[28] These contrasts underscore Germany's unique self-defense philosophy: its Basic Law enshrines an active duty to protect liberal democracy from anti-constitutional parties,[29] whereas Anglo-American systems typically trust open debate and law-enforcement to curb extremism.

Malaysia, on the other hand, adopts a more executive-centered model of democratic protection. Under the *Societies Act 1966*,[30] the Registrar of Societies (RoS) can refuse to register or dissolve political parties deemed a threat to public order, morality, or national security—without judicial oversight.[31] Unlike Germany's judicialized model, this approach centralizes discretion within the executive branch. Historically, this has led to the banning of groups like *Parti Komunis Malaya*, and laws such as the *Sedition Act 1948*[32] and *Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012* (SOSMA)[33] have been used to curtail political expression.[34] While both Germany and Malaysia attempt to safeguard their democratic orders, Germany's reliance on constitutional adjudication provides stronger checks and balances, whereas Malaysia's model is more susceptible to politicization.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Germany's Basic Law stands as a powerful example of how a nation can respond to historical tragedy with moral clarity and legal resilience. Born from the ashes of the Nazi regime and the failings of the Weimar Republic, the Grundgesetz is more than just a legal document — it is a constitutional commitment to dignity, democracy, and the rule of law. Through unique provisions like Article 1's inviolable dignity, Article 79's Eternity Clause, and Article 21's

militant democracy, Germany has ensured that the horrors of the past cannot be repeated through legal loopholes or political manipulation. Unlike systems that prioritise executive power or rely solely on open debate, Germany's constitution actively defends itself against threats. In doing so, it offers a model for other nations grappling with authoritarian tendencies: that democracy must not only be celebrated but vigilantly protected — in memory of what was lost, and in hope of what can be preserved.

REFERENCES

[1] Hans Vorländer, “Basic Law: democracy in Germany”, *deutschland.de* (Dec. 3, 2019). Retrieved from <https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/basic-law-democracy-in-germany>. Site accessed 11 May 2025.

[2] William L Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany* (Simon & Schuster, 1960).

[3] *Weimar Constitution* (Germany) art 48.

[4] Art. 1(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[5] *deutschland.de*. (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed <https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in,%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[6] handbook germany together. (2025 Feb 4). German Basic Law- What are My Rights?. Site accessed <https://handbookgermany.de/en/basic-law>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[7] handbook germany together. (2025 Feb 4). German Basic Law- What are My Rights?. Site accessed <https://handbookgermany.de/en/basic-law> . Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[8] deutschland.de. (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed

<<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in,%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[9] Aharon Barak. (2015 Feb, 05). Human Dignity: *The Constitutional Value and the Constitutional Right*. Cambridge University Press. pp.225-242; Veronica Federico, Christian Lahusen. (2018). Solidarity as a Public Virtue? Law and Public Policies in the European Union. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. pp. 71.

[10] ESCR-Net member: the Program on Human Rights and the Global Economy (PHRGE) at Northeastern University. (2020, March 26). Hartz IV GFCC, Judgment of the First Senate of 09 February 2010 -1 BvL 1/09, 1 BvL 3/09, 1 BvL 4/09. ESCR Net- International Network for Economic, Social & Cultural Rights. Site accessed <<https://www.escr-net.org/caselaw/2020/hartz-iv-gfcc-judgment-first-senate-09-february-2010-1-bvl-109-1-bvl-309-1-bvl-409/>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[11] c Census Act, BVerfGE 65, 1.

[12] Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. (2013, Oct 11). Volkszählungsurteil in englischer Sprache: Census Act. Site accessed <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CyWbo0QoTDy649I2pcm_jABncZPRhzAS9aDBsRDveG4/edit?tab=t.39wgn3hk4k0z>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[13] deutschland.de. (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed

<<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in,%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025; Veronica Federico, Christian Lahusen. (2018). Solidarity as a Public Virtue? Law and Public Policies in the European Union. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. pp. 71.

[14] Anita Blagojević. (n.d.). PROCEDURES REGARDING NATIONAL IDENTITY CLAUSE IN THE NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT'S AND THE CJEU'S

CASE-LAW. EU AND COMPARATIVE LAW ISSUES AND CHALLENGES SERIES.
pp.215.

[15] Art. 79(3). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[16] Art. 1(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[17] Art. 20(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[18] Kommers DP. (2019, June 24). The Basic Law: A Fifty Year Assessment. German Law Journal. 2019;20(4):571-582.

[19] Kommers DP. (2019, June 24). The Basic Law: A Fifty Year Assessment. German Law Journal. 2019;20(4):571-582.

[20] Yaniv Rozai. (2024, Aug 01). Liberty of the Press Forever? Traumatic Constitutionalism and Freedom of the Press in Mexico. Verfassungsblog. Site accessed <<https://verfassungsblog.de/liberty-of-the-press-forever/#:~:text=Perhaps%20the%20best%20example%20is,the%20background%20of%20the%20Weimar>>. Site accessed 09 May 2025.

[21] Gonalo de Almeida Ribeiro. (2024, March 30). As Good as It Gets. Verfassungsblog. Site accessed <<https://verfassungsblog.de/as-good-as-it-gets/#:~:text=to%20reorganise%2C%20under%20a%20form,of%20Germany%20shall%20be%20unconstitutional%E2%80%9D>>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[22] Art. 21(2). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[23] Bundesamt f r Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed <https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20Weimar%20Republic%2C,democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[24] Bundesamt f r Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed <https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20W>

eimar%20Republic%2C,democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[25] Federal Constitutional Court Verdict Banning the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) and the Concluding Justification (August 17, 1956). German History in Documents and Images. Site accessed <<https://germanhistorydocs.org/en/occupation-and-the-emergence-of-two-states-1945-1961/g hdi:document-3097>>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[26] Claudia E. Haupt. (2025). DEMOCRATIC SELF-DEFENSE. Fordham Law Review [Vol.93, 2025]. pp. 1398.

[27] Claudia E. Haupt. (2025). DEMOCRATIC SELF-DEFENSE. Fordham Law Review [Vol.93, 2025]. pp. 1398.

[28] Michael Gove.(2024, March 14). Extremism Definition and Community Engagement Volume 747: debated on Thursday 14 March 2024. Column 452.

[29] Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed <https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20Weimar%20Republic%2C,democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[30] Societies Act 1966 (Act 832) (Malaysia).

[31] S.5 Societies Act 1966 (Act 832) (Malaysia).

[32] Sedition Act 1948 (Act 15) (Malaysia).

[33] Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012 (SOSMA) (Act 747) (Malaysia).

[34] Mohamad Ezri b Abdul Wahab. (2025, Feb 20). Press Release | SOSMA Has No Place in Malaysia. Malaysian Bar. Site accessed <<https://www.malaysianbar.org.my/article/news/press-statements/press-statements/press-release-sosma-has-no-place-in-malaysia>>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

Skeletal

Title: A Constitution Built to Never Forget: Germany's Legal Response to Its Darkest Past

Parts	Content	PIC
Introduction	<u>The Story Behind Germany's Basic Law</u> <i>"What does a country do when its own laws once enabled genocide? In Germany's case, it rewrote its Constitution — with justice, memory, and democracy at its core."</i> Brief background: - Germany's Basic Law (Grundgesetz) was enacted in 1949, amidst the ruins of WWII. - Born out of a conscious effort to never repeat the horrors of the Nazi regime, it is one of the most structurally self-defensive and human-rights-centric constitutions in the world. Note from KSA: [Basically, you just have to convey the message: "Germany's constitution is not just law, it is a moral and legal safeguard against the return of dictatorship."] [Less than 100 Words]	Angus
Content 1	<u>Historical Context that Sparked Constitutional Development</u> Germany After 1945 — From Collapse to Constitution • After WWII, Nazi Germany had collapsed. Its previous constitution — the Weimar Constitution (https://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/ghi_wr_weimarconstitution_eng.pdf) — had allowed authoritarianism to rise legally (e.g., Hitler used Article 48 to assume emergency powers).	Sofea

	• The Holocaust and fascism had deeply discredited centralized, unchecked government power. • In 1949, the Western Allies and German leaders created the Basic Law as the constitution of West Germany, designed to protect democracy from its enemies. • They avoided calling it a “permanent constitution” (hence “Basic Law”) until reunification. • Core goals: Prevent dictatorship, protect dignity, decentralize power, and ensure judicial oversight. Note from KSA: Draw a clean and tight line from the fall of the Nazi regime → distrust in populist power → need for unbreakable democratic principles → rise of a “defensive democracy” via the Basic Law. [~1000 Words]	
Content 2	<u>Unique Provisions / Policies in Germany</u> Here are three provisions I recommend as the core focus, each being quite special globally, I would provide other provisions for the PIC to consider as well: 1. Article 1 – Human Dignity is Inviolable Why it’s special: It is the first sentence of the constitution: <i>"Die Würde des Menschen ist unantastbar."</i> It holds <i>foundational status</i> , the core of all rights in Germany. Even Parliament cannot override this clause. Courts have invoked it to strike down unjust laws, invasive	KSA

	surveillance, and harsh welfare cuts. !!! Very few countries give such strong legal force to moral dignity. 2. Article 79(3) – The Eternity Clause Why it's special: Some parts of the Constitution can never be amended, including: • Article 1 (Human Dignity), • Article 20 (Democracy, Rule of Law, Federalism). This is Germany's "constitutional firewall" against future tyrants. → Unlike most other countries, even with a supermajority, Parliament cannot legally remove democracy. 3. Article 21(2) – Militant Democracy Why it's special: Political parties that aim to undermine democracy can be banned. • Germany has banned neo-Nazi and extremist parties under this clause. • The idea is that democracy must defend itself — a lesson from the Nazis' legal rise to power in the 1930s. Other interesting provisions/ policies to consider: • Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht): One of the most respected and active constitutional courts in the world. • Article 102 – Death Penalty Abolished: Fully abolished since	
--	--	--

	1949 — a strong signal of a justice system rooted in dignity. <i>[Not recommended though, I don't think CK will like this one since we have one info. about this already, though that is in Malaysia.]</i> • Civilian Control over the Military (Art. 87a): Prevents military overreach; direct response to Nazi-era abuses. • Parliamentary Oversight Committees & Intelligence Checks: Enshrined for national security to prevent deep-state authoritarianism. • Proportional Representation with 5% Threshold: Balances inclusivity with stability. Note from KSA: Frame each provision not only as “interesting” but as a direct lesson from historical trauma. [~1000 Words]	
Conclusion	Conclude everything	

The Basic Law (Grundgesetz):

https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_gg/englisch_gg.html

Intro

1.0 Introduction

What does a country do when its own legal system once enabled genocide? For Germany, the answer was not just to rebuild — but to remember. In 1949, out of the ruins of the Nazi regime and the horrors of World War II, Germany enacted the Basic Law (Grundgesetz) — a constitution designed not only to govern, but to guard.

Unlike conventional constitutions, the Basic Law was written with the explicit goal of preventing the return of authoritarianism. It placed human dignity at its core, built strong checks and balances, and ensured that democracy could never be legally dismantled from within — as it once was under Adolf Hitler. Germany chose to call it “Basic Law” rather than “Constitution” because, at the time, the country was still divided — but the values it upheld were already intended to be permanent. This was not just about law; it was a moral framework forged from memory, justice, and accountability.¹

Today, the Basic Law remains one of the most self-defensive, rights-oriented constitutions in the world — a living reminder that democracy must not only be practiced, but also protected.

¹ Hans Vorländer, “Basic Law: democracy in Germany”, *deutschland.de* (Dec. 3, 2019). Retrieved from <<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/basic-law-democracy-in-germany>>. Site accessed 11 May 2025.

References - Intro

1. Hans Vorländer, "Basic Law: democracy in Germany", *deutschland.de* (Dec. 3, 2019). Retrieved from <<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/basic-law-democracy-in-germany>>. Site accessed 11 May 2025.

Content 1

2.0 Historical Context

The end of World War II marked not only the military defeat of Nazi Germany but also the complete collapse of its political, moral, and legal order. The undercurrents of the war had not only left a death toll in the millions, but a struggling and starving population, left with nothing but a beaten-down government, desperate to do anything to rebuild itself. This monumental task of rebuilding not just infrastructure, but governance itself, had to be approached delicately, for fear of another Adolf Hitler reemerging. In the wake of such catastrophic failure, German constitutional development after 1945 was guided by a singular goal: creating a legal and political order that would make another dictatorship impossible. This effort culminated in the creation of the *Grundgesetz*, or Basic Law, in 1949.

In William L. Shirer's words, The Weimar Republic's constitution is "on paper, the most liberal and democratic document of its kind the twentieth century had ever seen ... full of ingenious and admirable devices which seemed to guarantee the working of an almost flawless democracy".² Which is to say, it is an ambitious, yet as proven by history, largely flawed document. Adolf Hitler's rise to power in 1933 was legally sanctioned within this constitutional framework. This isn't the first time a country's dictator used its Constitution as a means to exercise complete and total control over the state, and the sad fact is, it most likely won't be the last. To this day, stark comparisons can be made to other countries facing similar battles. Maybe not nearly to the extent of the holocaust, but if left unchecked, who knows how far they will go?

The Weimar Constitution, while appearing democratic and liberal on the surface, contained structural weaknesses that proved fatal under pressure. One of its most notorious features was **Article 48**,³ which allowed the President of the Republic to suspend civil liberties and rule by emergency decree during times of crisis. While the clause had originally been intended to be used as a safeguard against instability, falling into the wrong hands allowed it to be used as a tool to legitimize authoritarian rule. Not long after Adolf Hitler's appointment as chancellor, he called elections for 5 March. Six days before the election, on 27 February, the Reichstag building, home to the German Parliament, became the target for an arson attack which damaged the house of parliament in Berlin. The culprit: Marinus van der Lubbe, a Dutch council communist. With this, the nazis had an in, using the arson attack as a means to induce President Paul von Hindenburg to issue the Reichstag Fire Decree, officially the Presidential Decree for the Protection of People and State (*Verordnung des Reichspräsidenten zum Schutz von Volk und Staat*), suspending civil liberties, and pursue a "ruthless confrontation" with the Communists

This arson attack became the beginning of Germany's downfall. Under the decree, which was issued on the basis of Article 48, the government was given authority to curtail

² William L Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany* (Simon & Schuster, 1960).

³ *Weimar Constitution* (Germany) art 48.

fundamental constitutional rights. Constitutional restrictions on searches and confiscation of property were likewise rescinded.

The Weimar Constitution, while glinting with the hope of a liberal democracy, equipped with the mechanisms to protect itself in times of emergency, was used maliciously as an instrument of dictatorship and an affront to human rights. But with every cloud comes a silver lining, and in this experience, it is the resolution of the post-war constitutional designers that viewed to never again allow democracy to be subverted so profoundly.

Content 2

2.0 Unique Provisions in *Grundgesetz*:

As stated above, Germany's long and complex history has significantly shaped the constitution it has today. In this article, three important articles from the German constitution will be discussed, highlighting how historical events and experiences have influenced their content and significance.

2.1 Article 1 - Human dignity is inviolable.

In Germany's post-WWII Basic Law (1949), Germany deliberately placed the phrase "Human dignity shall be inviolable"⁴ at the very outset.⁵ Framers stressed that dignity be made "paramount" in the new order so that "nothing like the Nazi era ever happens again".⁶ Indeed, Article 1 is widely acknowledged as the *Grundgesetz*'s cornerstone – commentators call it "the most important article" to which all other rights refer⁷ and it is entrenched by the eternity clause (Article 79) so that its protection can never be amended or revoked.⁸ German scholars therefore treat Article 1 as an absolute, non-derogable norm: it has been described as "absolute" and "eternal" and effectively the only absolute norm of the Basic Law.⁹ The Federal Constitutional Court has repeatedly invoked Article 1 to invalidate laws or policies seen as degrading human dignity. For example, in the 2010 *Hartz IV* case the Court struck down the original unemployment-benefit formula for failing to guarantee the subsistence minimum required by human dignity.¹⁰ Similarly, in its landmark 1983 "Census" judgment¹¹

⁴ Art. 1(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

⁵ [deutschland.de](https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in.%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights). (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed <<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in.%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

⁶ handbook germany together. (2025 Feb 4). German Basic Law- What are My Rights?. Site accessed <<https://handbookgermany.de/en/basic-law>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

⁷ handbook germany together. (2025 Feb 4). German Basic Law- What are My Rights?. Site accessed <<https://handbookgermany.de/en/basic-law>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

⁸ [deutschland.de](https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in.%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights). (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed <<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in.%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

⁹ Aharon Barak. (2015 Feb, 05). Human Dignity: *The Constitutional Value and the Constitutional Right*. Cambridge University Press. pp.225-242; Veronica Federico, Christian Lahusen. (2018). Solidarity as a Public Virtue? Law and Public Policies in the European Union. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. pp. 71.

¹⁰ ESCR-Net member: the Program on Human Rights and the Global Economy (PHRGE) at Northeastern University. (2020, March 26). Hartz IV GFCC, Judgment of the First Senate of 09 February 2010 -1 BvL 1/09, 1 BvL 3/09, 1 BvL 4/09. ESCR Net- International Network for Economic, Social & Cultural Rights. Site accessed <<https://www.escr-net.org/caselaw/2020/hartz-iv-gfcc-judgment-first-senate-09-february-2010-1-bvl-109-1-bvl-309-1-bvl-409/>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

¹¹ Census Act, BVerfGE 65, 1.

the Court explicitly linked data-privacy to Article 1, creating a right of informational self-determination and forbidding invasive mass surveillance without consent.¹² In short, Germany's dignity clause has unrivaled legal force: it stands above ordinary rights, cannot be overridden by statute or constitutional amendment,¹³ and thus offers a uniquely strong protection compared to most other nations.

2.2 Article 79(3) – The Eternity Clause.

Article 79(3) of Germany's Basic Law famously enshrines an "Eternity Clause" forbidding any amendment that would undermine certain fundamental principles.¹⁴ It provides that "an amendment to this Basic Law affecting ... the principles laid down in Article 1 and 20 shall be inadmissible".¹⁵ Article 1 in turn proclaims that "Human dignity shall be inviolable; to respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority",¹⁶ and Article 20(1) declares that "The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social Federal state"¹⁷ (with further provisions establishing popular sovereignty, rule of law, and the right of resistance). Thus these core values – human dignity, democracy, federalism and the rule of law – are entrenched beyond change. This reflects the trauma of Weimar and Nazi rule: as Kommers explains, the eternity clause "bans any constitutional amendment that would affect or undermine the dignitarian principles of Article 1 or the basic structural principles... set forth in Article 20" (namely federalism, separation of powers, rule of law and the social welfare state).¹⁸ The framers – mindful of the Third Reich's rise – believed this was the best way to "safeguard human dignity and preserve the 'democratic and social federal state,' now and in the future," effectively "freezing" these principles against any legal reversal.¹⁹ Indeed,

¹² Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. (2013, Oct 11). Volkszählungsurteil in englischer Sprache: Census Act. Site accessed

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CyWbo0QoTDy649I2pcm_jABncZPRhzAS9aDBsRDveG4/edit?tab=t.39wgn3hk4k0z>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

¹³ [deutschland.de](https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in.%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights). (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed <<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in.%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025; Veronica Federico, Christian Lahusen. (2018). Solidarity as a Public Virtue? Law and Public Policies in the European Union. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. pp. 71.

¹⁴ Anita Blagojević. (n.d.). PROCEDURES REGARDING NATIONAL IDENTITY CLAUSE IN THE NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT'S AND THE CJEU'S CASE-LAW. EU AND COMPARATIVE LAW ISSUES AND CHALLENGES SERIES. pp.215.

¹⁵ Art. 79(3). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

¹⁶ Art. 1(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

¹⁷ Art. 20(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

¹⁸ Kommers DP. (2019, June 24). The Basic Law: A Fifty Year Assessment. German Law Journal. 2019;20(4):571-582.

¹⁹ Kommers DP. (2019, June 24). The Basic Law: A Fifty Year Assessment. German Law Journal. 2019;20(4):571-582.

commentators note that by design the clause makes the Basic Law's "basic values" – democracy and dignity – permanently immune to majoritarian change, a mandate born "against the background of the Weimar Constitution, Nazi rule, and the Holocaust".²⁰ In short, Article 79(3) embodies Germany's post-1945 commitment to never again allow an authoritarian constitution: it locks Articles 1 and 20 as unamendable pillars of the democratic order and thus serves as a constitutional bulwark against any return to tyranny.

2.3 Article 21(2) – Militant Democracy

Article 21(2) of the German *Grundgesetz* was drafted in conscious response to the Weimar Republic's collapse and the Nazi seizure of power, embedding a "militant democracy" (*wehrhafte Demokratie*) ethos into the constitution.²¹ It provides that any party which, by its aims or members' conduct, "seeks to undermine or abolish the free democratic basic order or to endanger the existence of the Federal Republic of Germany" is unconstitutional.²² Crucially only the Federal Constitutional Court may declare a party unlawful, making it a very high threshold. This approach reflects postwar Germany's resolve to avoid the "defenselessness" of Weimar (which was "ultimately destroyed" by its extremist foes).²³ Indeed, the Basic Law is explicitly designed as a counter-model to Weimar and a bulwark against tyranny – a "democracy determined and able to defend itself ('militant democracy')" in the Court's words.²⁴ In practice Article 21(2) has been applied primarily on the far right and far left: in the 1950s the Federal Constitutional Court banned the neo-Nazi Socialist Reich Party and the Communist Party of Germany as unconstitutional.²⁵ More recent efforts

²⁰ Yaniv Rozai. (2024, Aug 01). Liberty of the Press Forever? Traumatic Constitutionalism and Freedom of the Press in Mexico. *Verfassungsblog*. Site accessed <https://verfassungsblog.de/liberty-of-the-press-forever/#:~:text=Perhaps%20the%20best%20example%20is,the%20background%20of%20the%20Weimar>. Site accessed 09 May 2025.

²¹ Gonalo de Almeida Ribeiro. (2024, March 30). As Good as It Gets. *Verfassungsblog*. Site accessed <https://verfassungsblog.de/as-good-as-it-gets/#:~:text=to%20reorganise%2C%20under%20any%20form,of%20Germany%20shall%20be%20unconstitutional%E2%80%9D>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

²² Art. 21(2). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

²³ Bundesamt fr Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20Weimar%20Republic%2C,democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

²⁴ Bundesamt fr Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20Weimar%20Republic%2C,democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

²⁵ Federal Constitutional Court Verdict Banning the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) and the Concluding Justification (August 17, 1956). *German History in Documents and Images*. Site accessed

show the same principle: a 2003 attempt to outlaw the far-right NPD failed for lack of evidence that it could succeed, and in 2017 the Court likewise held that although the NPD's goals were anti-democratic, the party was "too weak to endanger democracy" – so it could not be banned.²⁶(Current debate has turned to whether the rising AfD harbors similar threats.)²⁷

By contrast, neither the United States nor the United Kingdom has an equivalent constitutional power to ban political parties. The U.S. First Amendment's broad protection of speech and association generally forbids outlawing political groups on ideological grounds – even explicitly hateful movements have been permitted to organize or march (as in the famous Skokie case) so long as they do not commit violence.

Likewise, British authorities do not suspend parties merely for extremist views; instead they rely on ordinary criminal or anti-terror laws to target violence. As a UK government statement acknowledges, Islamist and neo-Nazi agitators "operate lawfully" in Britain even while they "advocate... the replacement of democracy with an Islamist or Nazi society".²⁸ These contrasts underscore Germany's unique self-defense philosophy: its Basic Law enshrines an active duty to protect liberal democracy from anti-constitutional parties,²⁹ whereas Anglo-American systems typically trust open debate and law-enforcement to curb extremism.

Malaysia, on the other hand, adopts a more executive-centered model of democratic protection. Under the *Societies Act 1966*,³⁰ the Registrar of Societies (RoS) can refuse to register or dissolve political parties deemed a threat to public order, morality, or national security—without judicial oversight.³¹ Unlike Germany's judicialized model, this approach centralizes discretion within the executive branch. Historically, this has led to the banning of

<<https://germanhistorydocs.org/en/occupation-and-the-emergence-of-two-states-1945-1961/ghdi:document-3097>>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

²⁶ Claudia E. Haupt. (2025). DEMOCRATIC SELF-DEFENSE. Fordham Law Review [Vol.93, 2025]. pp. 1398

²⁷ Claudia E. Haupt. (2025). DEMOCRATIC SELF-DEFENSE. Fordham Law Review [Vol.93, 2025]. pp. 1398

²⁸ Michael Gove.(2024, March 14). Extremism Definition and Community Engagement Volume 747: debated on Thursday 14 March 2024. Column 452.

²⁹ Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed <https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20Weimar%20Republic%20C.democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

³⁰ Societies Act 1966 (Act 832) (Malaysia).

³¹ S.5 Societies Act 1966 (Act 832) (Malaysia).

groups like *Parti Komunis Malaya*, and laws such as the *Sedition Act 1948*³² and *Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012 (SOSMA)*³³ have been used to curtail political expression.³⁴ While both Germany and Malaysia attempt to safeguard their democratic orders, Germany's reliance on constitutional adjudication provides stronger checks and balances, whereas Malaysia's model is more susceptible to politicization.

³² Sedition Act 1948 (Act 15) (Malaysia).

³³ Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012 (SOSMA) (Act 747) (Malaysia).

³⁴ Mohamad Ezri b Abdul Wahab. (2025, Feb 20). Press Release | SOSMA Has No Place in Malaysia. Malaysian Bar. Site accessed <<https://www.malaysianbar.org.my/article/news/press-statements/press-statements/press-release-sosma-has-no-place-in-malaysia>>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

References -2.0

References:

1. Art. 1(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.
2. deutschland.de. (2021, March 1). *Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law*. Site accessed <https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.
3. handbook germany together. (2025, Feb 4). *German Basic Law - What are My Rights?*. Site accessed <https://handbookgermany.de/en/basic-law>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.
4. deutschland.de. (2021, March 1). *Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law*. Site accessed <https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.
5. Aharon Barak. (2015, Feb 05). *Human Dignity: The Constitutional Value and the Constitutional Right*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 225–242
6. Veronica Federico, Christian Lahusen. (2018). *Solidarity as a Public Virtue? Law and Public Policies in the European Union*. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. pp. 71.
7. ESCR-Net member: the Program on Human Rights and the Global Economy (PHRGE) at Northeastern University. (2020, March 26). *Hartz IV GFCC, Judgment of the First Senate of 09 February 2010 -1 BvL 1/09, 1 BvL 3/09, 1 BvL 4/09*. Site accessed <https://www.escr-net.org/caselaw/2020/hartz-iv-gfcc-judgment-first-senate-09-february-2010-1-bvl-109-1-bvl-309-1-bvl-409/>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.
8. Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. (2013, Oct 11). *Volkszählungsurteil in englischer Sprache: Census Act*. Site accessed https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CyWbo0QoTDy649I2pcm_jABncZPRhzAS9aDBsRDveG4/edit. Last accessed 08 May 2025.
9. Anita Blagojević. (n.d.). *Procedures Regarding National Identity Clause in the National Constitutional Court's and the CJEU's Case-Law. EU and Comparative Law Issues and Challenges Series*. pp. 215.
10. Art. 79(3). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

11. Art. 1(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.
12. Art. 20(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.
13. Kommers, D.P. (2019, June 24). *The Basic Law: A Fifty Year Assessment*. *German Law Journal*, 20(4), 571–582.
14. Yaniv Roznai. (2024, Aug 01). *Liberty of the Press Forever? Traumatic Constitutionalism and Freedom of the Press in Mexico*. *Verfassungsblog*. Site accessed <https://verfassungsblog.de/liberty-of-the-press-forever/>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.
15. Gonalo de Almeida Ribeiro. (2024, March 30). *As Good as It Gets*. *Verfassungsblog*. Site accessed <https://verfassungsblog.de/as-good-as-it-gets/>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.
16. Art. 21(2). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.
17. Bundesamt fr Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). *Protecting the Constitution*. Site accessed https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html. Last accessed 09 May 2025.
18. Federal Constitutional Court Verdict Banning the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) and the Concluding Justification (August 17, 1956). *German History in Documents and Images*. Site accessed <https://germanhistorydocs.org/en/occupation-and-the-emergence-of-two-states-1945-1961/ghdi:document-3097>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.
19. Claudia E. Haupt. (2025). *Democratic Self-Defense*. *Fordham Law Review*, Vol. 93, pp. 1398.
20. Michael Gove. (2024, March 14). *Extremism Definition and Community Engagement*. *Hansard Volume 747*, Column 452.
21. Bundesamt fr Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). *Protecting the Constitution*. Site accessed https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html. Last accessed 09 May 2025.
22. Societies Act 1966 (Act 832) (Malaysia).

23. S.5 Societies Act 1966 (Act 832) (Malaysia).
24. Sedition Act 1948 (Act 15) (Malaysia).
25. Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012 (SOSMA) (Act 747) (Malaysia).
26. Mohamad Ezri b Abdul Wahab. (2025, Feb 20). *Press Release | SOSMA Has No Place in Malaysia*. *Malaysian Bar*. Site accessed <https://www.malaysianbar.org.my/article/news/press-statements/press-statements/press-release-sosma-has-no-place-in-malaysia>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

Conclusion

4.0 Conclusion

Germany's Basic Law stands as a powerful example of how a nation can respond to historical tragedy with moral clarity and legal resilience. Born from the ashes of the Nazi regime and the failings of the Weimar Republic, the Grundgesetz is more than just a legal document — it is a constitutional commitment to dignity, democracy, and the rule of law. Through unique provisions like Article 1's inviolable dignity, Article 79's Eternity Clause, and Article 21's militant democracy, Germany has ensured that the horrors of the past cannot be repeated through legal loopholes or political manipulation. Unlike systems that prioritise executive power or rely solely on open debate, Germany's constitution actively defends itself against threats. In doing so, it offers a model for other nations grappling with authoritarian tendencies: that democracy must not only be celebrated but vigilantly protected — in memory of what was lost, and in hope of what can be preserved.

Back-up

1.0 Introduction

What does a country do when its own legal system once enabled genocide? For Germany, the answer was not just to rebuild — but to remember. In 1949, out of the ruins of the Nazi regime and the horrors of World War II, Germany enacted the Basic Law (Grundgesetz) — a constitution designed not only to govern, but to **guard**.

Unlike conventional constitutions, the Basic Law was written with the explicit goal of preventing the return of authoritarianism. It placed human dignity at its core, built strong checks and balances, and ensured that democracy could never be legally dismantled from within — as it once was under Adolf Hitler. Germany chose to call it “Basic Law” rather than “Constitution” because, at the time, the country was still divided — but the values it upheld were already intended to be permanent. This was not just about law; it was a moral framework forged from memory, justice, and accountability.[1]

Today, the Basic Law remains one of the most self-defensive, rights-oriented constitutions in the world — a living reminder that democracy must not only be practiced, but also protected.

2.0 Historical Context

The end of World War II marked not only the military defeat of Nazi Germany but also the complete collapse of its political, moral, and legal order. The undercurrents of the war had not only left a death toll in the millions, but a struggling and starving population, left with nothing but a beaten-down government, desperate to do anything to rebuild itself. This monumental task of rebuilding not just infrastructure, but governance itself, had to be approached delicately, for fear of another Adolf Hitler reemerging. In the wake of such catastrophic failure, German constitutional development after 1945 was guided by a singular goal: creating a legal and political order that would make another dictatorship impossible. This effort culminated in the creation of the *Grundgesetz*, or Basic Law, in 1949.

In William L. Shirer’s words, The Weimar Republic's constitution is "on paper, the most liberal and democratic document of its kind the twentieth century had ever seen ... full of ingenious and admirable devices which seemed to guarantee the working of an almost flawless democracy".[2] Which is to say, it is an ambitious, yet as proven by history, largely

flawed document. Adolf Hitler's rise to power in 1933 was legally sanctioned within this constitutional framework. This isn't the first time a country's dictator used its Constitution as a means to exercise complete and total control over the state, and the sad fact is, it most likely won't be the last. To this day, stark comparisons can be made to other countries facing similar battles. Maybe not nearly to the extent of the holocaust, but if left unchecked, who knows how far they will go?

The Weimar Constitution, while appearing democratic and liberal on the surface, contained structural weaknesses that proved fatal under pressure. One of its most notorious features was **Article 48**,^[3] which allowed the President of the Republic to suspend civil liberties and rule by emergency decree during times of crisis. While the clause had originally been intended to be used as a safeguard against instability, falling into the wrong hands allowed it to be used as a tool to legitimize authoritarian rule. Not long after Adolf Hitler's appointment as chancellor, he called elections for 5 March. Six days before the election, on 27 February, the Reichstag building, home to the German Parliament, became the target for an arson attack which damaged the house of parliament in Berlin. The culprit: Marinus van der Lubbe, a Dutch council communist. With this, the nazis had an in, using the arson attack as a means to induce President Paul von Hindenburg to issue the Reichstag Fire Decree, officially the Presidential Decree for the Protection of People and State (*Verordnung des Reichspräsidenten zum Schutz von Volk und Staat*), suspending civil liberties, and pursue a "ruthless confrontation" with the Communists

This arson attack became the beginning of Germany's downfall. Under the decree, which was issued on the basis of Article 48, the government was given authority to curtail fundamental constitutional rights. Constitutional restrictions on searches and confiscation of property were likewise rescinded.

The Weimar Constitution, while glinting with the hope of a liberal democracy, equipped with the mechanisms to protect itself in times of emergency, was used maliciously as an instrument of dictatorship and an affront to human rights. But with every cloud comes a silver lining, and in this experience, it is the resolution of the post-war constitutional designers that viewed to never again allow democracy to be subverted so profoundly.

3.0 Unique Provisions in *Grundgesetz*:

As stated above, Germany's long and complex history has significantly shaped the constitution it has today. In this article, three important articles from the German constitution will be discussed, highlighting how historical events and experiences have influenced their content and significance.

3.1 Article 1 - Human dignity is inviolable.

In Germany's post-WWII Basic Law (1949), Germany deliberately placed the phrase "Human dignity shall be inviolable"[4] at the very outset.[5] Framers stressed that dignity be made "paramount" in the new order so that "nothing like the Nazi era ever happens again".[6] Indeed, Article 1 is widely acknowledged as the *Grundgesetz*'s cornerstone – commentators call it "the most important article" to which all other rights refer-[7] and it is entrenched by the eternity clause (Article 79) so that its protection can never be amended or revoked.[8] German scholars therefore treat Article 1 as an absolute, non-derogable norm: it has been described as "absolute" and "eternal" and effectively the only absolute norm of the Basic Law.[9] The Federal Constitutional Court has repeatedly invoked Article 1 to invalidate laws or policies seen as degrading human dignity. For example, in the 2010 *Hartz IV* case the Court struck down the original unemployment-benefit formula for failing to guarantee the subsistence minimum required by human dignity.[10] Similarly, in its landmark 1983 "Census" judgment[11] the Court explicitly linked data-privacy to Article 1, creating a right of informational self-determination and forbidding invasive mass surveillance without consent.[12] In short, Germany's dignity clause has unrivaled legal force: it stands above ordinary rights, cannot be overridden by statute or constitutional amendment,[13] and thus offers a uniquely strong protection compared to most other nations.

3.2 Article 79(3) – The Eternity Clause.

Article 79(3) of Germany's Basic Law famously enshrines an "Eternity Clause" forbidding any amendment that would undermine certain fundamental principles.[14] It provides that "an amendment to this Basic Law affecting ... the principles laid down in Article 1 and 20 shall be inadmissible".[15] Article 1 in turn proclaims that "Human dignity shall be inviolable; to respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority",[16] and Article 20(1) declares that "The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social Federal state"[17] (with further provisions establishing popular sovereignty, rule of law, and the right of resistance). Thus these core values – human dignity, democracy, federalism and the rule of law – are entrenched beyond change. This reflects the trauma of Weimar and Nazi rule: as

Kommers explains, the eternity clause “bans any constitutional amendment that would affect or undermine the dignitarian principles of Article 1 or the basic structural principles... set forth in Article 20” (namely federalism, separation of powers, rule of law and the social welfare state).[18] The framers – mindful of the Third Reich’s rise – believed this was the best way to “safeguard human dignity and preserve the ‘democratic and social federal state,’ now and in the future,” effectively “freezing” these principles against any legal reversal.[19] Indeed, commentators note that by design the clause makes the Basic Law’s “basic values” – democracy and dignity – permanently immune to majoritarian change, a mandate born “against the background of the Weimar Constitution, Nazi rule, and the Holocaust”.[20] In short, Article 79(3) embodies Germany’s post-1945 commitment to never again allow an authoritarian constitution: it locks Articles 1 and 20 as unamendable pillars of the democratic order and thus serves as a constitutional bulwark against any return to tyranny.

3.3 Article 21(2) – Militant Democracy

Article 21(2) of the German *Grundgesetz* was drafted in conscious response to the Weimar Republic’s collapse and the Nazi seizure of power, embedding a “militant democracy” (*wehrhafte Demokratie*) ethos into the constitution.[21] It provides that any party which, by its aims or members’ conduct, “seeks to undermine or abolish the free democratic basic order or to endanger the existence of the Federal Republic of Germany” is unconstitutional.[22] Crucially only the Federal Constitutional Court may declare a party unlawful, making it a very high threshold. This approach reflects postwar Germany’s resolve to avoid the “defenselessness” of Weimar (which was “ultimately destroyed” by its extremist foes).[23] Indeed, the Basic Law is explicitly designed as a counter-model to Weimar and a bulwark against tyranny – a “democracy determined and able to defend itself (‘militant democracy’)” in the Court’s words.[24] In practice Article 21(2) has been applied primarily on the far right and far left: in the 1950s the Federal Constitutional Court banned the neo-Nazi Socialist Reich Party and the Communist Party of Germany as unconstitutional.[25] More recent efforts show the same principle: a 2003 attempt to outlaw the far-right NPD failed for lack of evidence that it could succeed, and in 2017 the Court likewise held that although the NPD’s goals were anti-democratic, the party was “too weak to endanger democracy” – so it could not be banned.[26] (Current debate has turned to whether the rising AfD harbors similar threats.)[27]

By contrast, neither the United States nor the United Kingdom has an equivalent constitutional power to ban political parties. The U.S. First Amendment's broad protection of speech and association generally forbids outlawing political groups on ideological grounds – even explicitly hateful movements have been permitted to organize or march (as in the famous Skokie case) so long as they do not commit violence.

Likewise, British authorities do not suspend parties merely for extremist views; instead they rely on ordinary criminal or anti-terror laws to target violence. As a UK government statement acknowledges, Islamist and neo-Nazi agitators “operate lawfully” in Britain even while they “advocate... the replacement of democracy with an Islamist or Nazi society”.[28] These contrasts underscore Germany's unique self-defense philosophy: its Basic Law enshrines an active duty to protect liberal democracy from anti-constitutional parties,[29] whereas Anglo-American systems typically trust open debate and law-enforcement to curb extremism.

Malaysia, on the other hand, adopts a more executive-centered model of democratic protection. Under the *Societies Act 1966*,[30] the Registrar of Societies (RoS) can refuse to register or dissolve political parties deemed a threat to public order, morality, or national security—without judicial oversight.[31] Unlike Germany's judicialized model, this approach centralizes discretion within the executive branch. Historically, this has led to the banning of groups like *Parti Komunis Malaya*, and laws such as the *Sedition Act 1948*[32] and *Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012* (SOSMA)[33] have been used to curtail political expression.[34] While both Germany and Malaysia attempt to safeguard their democratic orders, Germany's reliance on constitutional adjudication provides stronger checks and balances, whereas Malaysia's model is more susceptible to politicization.

4.0 Conclusion

Germany's Basic Law stands as a powerful example of how a nation can respond to historical tragedy with moral clarity and legal resilience. Born from the ashes of the Nazi regime and the failings of the Weimar Republic, the Grundgesetz is more than just a legal document — it is a constitutional commitment to dignity, democracy, and the rule of law. Through unique provisions like Article 1's inviolable dignity, Article 79's Eternity Clause, and Article 21's militant democracy, Germany has ensured that the horrors of the past cannot

be repeated through legal loopholes or political manipulation. Unlike systems that prioritise executive power or rely solely on open debate, Germany's constitution actively defends itself against threats. In doing so, it offers a model for other nations grappling with authoritarian tendencies: that democracy must not only be celebrated but vigilantly protected — in memory of what was lost, and in hope of what can be preserved.

References

- [1] Hans Vorländer, "Basic Law: democracy in Germany", *deutschland.de* (Dec. 3, 2019). Retrieved from <https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/basic-law-democracy-in-germany>. Site accessed 11 May 2025.
- [2] William L Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany* (Simon & Schuster, 1960).
- [3] *Weimar Constitution* (Germany) art 48.
- [4] Art. 1(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.
- [5] deutschland.de. (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed <https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in,%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.
- [6] handbook germany together. (2025 Feb 4). German Basic Law- What are My Rights?. Site accessed <https://handbookgermany.de/en/basic-law>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.
- [7] handbook germany together. (2025 Feb 4). German Basic Law- What are My Rights?. Site accessed <https://handbookgermany.de/en/basic-law> . Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[8] deutschland.de. (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed

<<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in,%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[9] Aharon Barak. (2015 Feb, 05). Human Dignity: *The Constitutional Value and the Constitutional Right*. Cambridge University Press. pp.225-242; Veronica Federico, Christian Lahusen. (2018). Solidarity as a Public Virtue? Law and Public Policies in the European Union. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. pp. 71.

[10] ESCR-Net member: the Program on Human Rights and the Global Economy (PHRGE) at Northeastern University. (2020, March 26). Hartz IV GFCC, Judgment of the First Senate of 09 February 2010 -1 BvL 1/09, 1 BvL 3/09, 1 BvL 4/09. ESCR Net- International Network for Economic, Social & Cultural Rights. Site accessed <<https://www.escr-net.org/caselaw/2020/hartz-iv-gfcc-judgment-first-senate-09-february-2010-1-bvl-109-1-bvl-309-1-bvl-409/>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[11] c Census Act, BVerfGE 65, 1.

[12] Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. (2013, Oct 11). Volkszählungsurteil in englischer Sprache: Census Act. Site accessed <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CyWbo0QoTDy649I2pcm_jABncZPRhzAS9aDBsRDveG4/edit?tab=t.39wgn3hk4k0z>. Last accessed 08 May 2025.

[13] deutschland.de. (2021, March 1). Germany celebrates 75 years of the Basic Law. Site accessed

<<https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/politics/75-years-of-the-basic-law-in-germany#:~:text=The%20Basic%20Law%20adopted%20in,%E2%80%9D%20Further%20fundamental%20rights>>. Last accessed 08 May 2025; Veronica Federico, Christian Lahusen. (2018). Solidarity as a Public Virtue? Law and Public Policies in the European Union. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft. pp. 71.

[14] Anita Blagojević. (n.d.). PROCEDURES REGARDING NATIONAL IDENTITY CLAUSE IN THE NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT'S AND THE CJEU'S

CASE-LAW. EU AND COMPARATIVE LAW ISSUES AND CHALLENGES SERIES.
pp.215.

[15] Art. 79(3). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[16] Art. 1(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[17] Art. 20(1). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[18] Kommers DP. (2019, June 24). The Basic Law: A Fifty Year Assessment. German Law Journal. 2019;20(4):571-582.

[19] Kommers DP. (2019, June 24). The Basic Law: A Fifty Year Assessment. German Law Journal. 2019;20(4):571-582.

[20] Yaniv Rozai. (2024, Aug 01). Liberty of the Press Forever? Traumatic Constitutionalism and Freedom of the Press in Mexico. Verfassungsblog. Site accessed <<https://verfassungsblog.de/liberty-of-the-press-forever/#:~:text=Perhaps%20the%20best%20example%20is,the%20background%20of%20the%20Weimar>>. Site accessed 09 May 2025.

[21] Gonalo de Almeida Ribeiro. (2024, March 30). As Good as It Gets. Verfassungsblog. Site accessed <<https://verfassungsblog.de/as-good-as-it-gets/#:~:text=to%20reorganise%2C%20under%20any%20form,of%20Germany%20shall%20be%20unconstitutional%E2%80%9D>>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[22] Art. 21(2). Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[23] Bundesamt fr Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed <https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20Weimar%20Republic%2C,democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[24] Bundesamt fr Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed <https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20W>

eimar%20Republic%2C,democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[25] Federal Constitutional Court Verdict Banning the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) and the Concluding Justification (August 17, 1956). German History in Documents and Images. Site accessed <<https://germanhistorydocs.org/en/occupation-and-the-emergence-of-two-states-1945-1961/g-hdi:document-3097>>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[26] Claudia E. Haupt. (2025). DEMOCRATIC SELF-DEFENSE. Fordham Law Review [Vol.93, 2025]. pp. 1398

[27] Claudia E. Haupt. (2025). DEMOCRATIC SELF-DEFENSE. Fordham Law Review [Vol.93, 2025]. pp. 1398

[28] Michael Gove.(2024, March 14). Extremism Definition and Community Engagement Volume 747: debated on Thursday 14 March 2024. Column 452.

[29] Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz. (n.d.). Protecting the Constitution. Site accessed <https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/EN/about-us/mission-and-working-methods/protecting-the-constitution/protecting-the-constitution_article.html#:~:text=In%20Germany%20the%20Weimar%20Republic%2C,democracy%20for%20many%20more%20decades>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

[30] Societies Act 1966 (Act 832) (Malaysia).

[31] S.5 Societies Act 1966 (Act 832) (Malaysia).

[32] Sedition Act 1948 (Act 15) (Malaysia).

[33] Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012 (SOSMA) (Act 747) (Malaysia).

[34] Mohamad Ezri b Abdul Wahab. (2025, Feb 20). Press Release | SOSMA Has No Place in Malaysia. Malaysian Bar. Site accessed <<https://www.malaysianbar.org.my/article/news/press-statements/press-statements/press-release-sosma-has-no-place-in-malaysia>>. Last accessed 09 May 2025.

