INDEX

AB v. Pridwin Preparatory School (2020), 194, 236–239
Ackermann, Justice Laurie, 146, 173–174, 210, 217, 221
African National Congress (South Africa), 188, 190, 194–196, 200
African-Americans
  disenfranchisement of, 16–19
Afrikaaner ethnic nationalist party. *See* National Party (South Africa)
AGG (General Equal Treatment Act) (Germany), 163–184
Alexy, Robert, 4
Ambedkar, B. R., 101, 103, 107–108
American federalism, 65
American rights tradition, 93
ANC (African National Congress), 188, 190, 194–196, 198, 200
antidiscrimination, 9, 13–15. *See also* caste system; equality and antidiscrimination; racism
Anti-Discrimination Act (ADG), 175–181
Apartheid
  -era articulations of rights, 187, 201, 240
  housing policy legacy, 225–226
  inequalities in education under, 230–232
  post-Apartheid horizontality, 188–189
  post-Apartheid inequalities, 210–211
  post-Apartheid societal transformation, 188–189
  privatization of, 199
Aristotle
  authentic freedom, 27–28
  common good in, 32–36
  on civic friendship bonds, 36–37
  virtue, 33
Austin, Granville, 102–103
autonomy, 28–30, 146, 234–235, 244

Balkin, Jack, 37–38
Barak, Aharon, 154–155
Barkhuizen v. Napier (2007), 236–239
Baron v. Claytile Ltd (2017), 235–236
Basic Law (Germany, 1949), 3–4, 42–44, 148–154, 156–158, 164–168, 170–171, 210–213, 221–222
  contrasted with South African Final Constitution, 210–213, 215
Bauer, et al. case, 268
Beadica and Others v. Trustees of Oregon Trust (2020), 238–239
Bell v. Maryland (1964), 79–80, 82–83
Bellamy, Richard, 36, 52–54
Bhagwati, Justice P.N., 116, 118
Bhatia, Gautam, 117, 136–137
Big Tech, 10, 272–273
Bill of Rights for a New South Africa (1991), 195–196, 203–205
Black, Justice Hugo, 79–80, 83, 108
  Blinkfüer case, 169
Blue Moonlight Properties case (2011), 194, 229–230
Bommai, S. R. v. Union of India (1994), 127–128
Bradley, Justice Joseph, 67–69, 76, 83, 108
Brandwein, Pamela, 69

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

Brennan, Jr., Justice William J., 80, 83
Brown v. Board of Education (1954), 80, 236
Brugger, Winfried, 148–149

Carmichele v. Minister of Safety and Security, 216–217
caste system. *See also* equality and antidiscrimination; racism
  American, 9, 19, 60–61
  Fourteenth Amendment (US) and, 66
  Indian, 60–61, 101, 108–109, 112–113, 129–131
  religion and, 133–134
  republicanism and, 38
Centrist Republicans, 61, 67, 69
Chandrachud, Justice Dhananjaya, 137
Charter of Fundamental Rights (European Union), 243, 245–247, 262, 268–269
Cheadle, Halton, 199–201, 214–215
Cicero, 27–28, 35, 37
City of Johannesburg v. Blue Moonlight Properties (2011), 194, 229–230
civic education, 35–36
  Civil Code (Germany), 151–154, 156–157, 161, 164–169, 209
civil rights (US)
  Civil Rights Cases of 1883, 64, 67–74, 79, 83
  Civil Rights Act (1964) and, 84
  Civil Rights Act of 1875, 66–67
  Civil Rights Act of 1964, 64, 79, 83–86, 140
  Civil Rights Acts of 1866 and 1875, 107–108
  Civil Rights Movement, 80–81
  public/private divide and, 86–87
  Title II (Civil Rights Act), 84–85
Civil War Amendments (US)
  commitment to equality and, 66, 75
  racial equality and, 71–73
  Supreme Court interpretation of, 67
  transformative constitutional potential of, 99–100
Commerce Clause (US Constitution), 83–85
common good
  about, 22–23
  Aristotle on, 32–36
  as baseline for parity and duties, 8, 34, 144, 176–177, 256
  community and, 28–30
  constitutional rights and, 32, 43–44
  in early American political thought, 30
  European Union and, 253, 256
  Interim Constitution (South Africa) and, 200–201
  Machiavelli and, 34
  in *Modderklip* case (2005), 226–229
  nondomination and, 39–40
  religion and, 134
  shared ends and, 6, 31–32, 95–96
common law (background), 11
common law (South Africa)
  in *Carmichele v. Minister of Safety and Security*, 216
  Constitutional Court and, 209–210
  constitutional duties under, 216–217, 219–220, 235–236
  constitutional principles applied to, 202, 204–205, 222–242
  duty to provide housing and, 235–236
  Final Constitution, horizontality and, 214
  limits on constitutional duties, 146, 205–206, 222–235
  rule of defamation in, 91, 218–220
  socio-economic rights and, 228
common law (United States)
  constitutional principles applied to, 93–97
  Harlan's dissent in *Civil Rights Cases* and, 69–71
  rule of defamation in, 65, 91–92
community, 21–22, 31–32
Constitution Act of 1951 (India), 113
Constitutional Court (Germany). *See* Federal Constitutional Court (FCC) (Germany)
Constitutional Court (South Africa), 208–210, 213

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

constitutional duties, 23–24
  explained, 2
  horizontal application and, 47–51
constitutional patriotism (European Union), 252–254
constitutional rights
  Stadium Ban case (2008), 181–182
  about horizontal application of, 4, 11, 19, 32, 246, 271–272
  common good and, 32, 43–44
  in Germany, 43–44, 156–157, 161–162, 173
  in Germany and South Africa contrasted, 145, 217
  horizontal application in India, 107, 115–117, 123, 126
  horizontal application in South Africa, 201–202, 205–206, 218–219, 236–237
  in India and United States contrasted, 61, 65–66, 120, 143
  in *Lüth* decision (1958), 169
  Pruneyard Shopping Center v. Robins (1980), 94–95
  public/private boundaries and, 17
  public commitments and, 21–22
  of the state, 94–95
  state action doctrine, racism and, 73–74
  traditional model of, 1
  in United States, 85, 87
constitutionalism. *See also* constitutional projects
  "thin" and "thick", 208
  about, 3
  American, 3–6, 64, 93, 99–100
  American and Indian contrasted, 121–122, 140–141
  Basic Structure Doctrine (India) and, 113–114
  common good and, 42–44
  commonwealth model of, 277
  German, 148–149, 154, 156, 167–168
  German and South African contrasted, 147, 210–213, 222–242
  global, 3–4
  horizontality as republican vein, 7–8, 16–25, 41, 55–57
  horizontality in liberal, 7–8, 13, 15
  Indian, 104–105, 111–112, 118, 126–128
  Irish, 271–272
  postwar German, 44
  public/private divide and, 89–90
  republican, 271–272
  Shelley v. Kraemer (1948), 4–5, 74–79, 127–128
  South Africa, 186–187, 190, 215–223, 240
  subnational *res publica* and, 93–94
  total, 5
  traditional accounts of, 1, 10, 64, 73–74
  ubuntu and, 192–194
  vertical versus horizontal model, 8
contracts, 235–239
Corbett, Chief Justice Michael, 199–201
Costa case, 201
Court of Justice. *See* European Court of Justice (ECJ)
COVID-19 pandemic, 10
Critical Legal Studies movement, 17–18

Daly, Eoin, 33–34, 38–39, 276
Daniels v. Scribante (2017), 14, 45–50
Davis, Dennis, 206, 208, 210–212
De Klerk, Gert, 204
decolonization (South Africa), 190
Defrenne v. Sabena (1976), 261–262
Delhi Act of 2007 (India), 131–133
DeShaney v. Winnebago County (1989), 87–90, 119–121, 216
Devlin, John, 96
  dignity, 218–219
Dinan, John, 93
discrimination. *See* caste system; civil rights; equality and antidiscrimination; racism
Douglas, Justice William O., 79, 85
Drittwirkung, 3–4, 212, 222–242
Du Plessis v. De Klerk, 201, 203–210, 212, 219, 237
Dürig, Günter, 165, 174
duties of citizens, 6, 19–21

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

duties of private actors
enforceability of, 61–62
Fourteenth Amendment (US) and, 63
horizontal application discourse and, 13–14
indirect horizontal application and, 11–13
New York Times v. Sullivan (1964), 92
in public projects, 47–51
public/private divide and, 8–10, 86–87
shared ends and, 6, 226–229
in South African constitutional project, 219–221, 230–232
subnational *res publica* and, 93–94
duty
about, 256–257
American "rightsist" culture and, 19–20, 24, 57
authoritarian regimes and, 7
citizen, 120–121
civic, 47
common good and, 32–40
constitutional debate about, 61
constitutional duties (European Union), 243–245
constitutional duties (Germany), 168, 182
constitutional duties (South Africa), 189, 195, 213–214
constitutional rights and, 1–2
COVID-19 pandemic and, 273
equality and, 40–41
European "public thing" and, 245, 256–257, 265, 267–269
freedom as nondomination and, 40–42, 47
horizontal application of public commitments and, 47–51, 256–257
horizontal application of rights and, 14, 20–21, 47–51, 117–118, 139
liberal political thought about, 31
new republican elements in constitutionalism and, 25
parity effected by horizontal application and, 8, 22–25, 42, 275
positive rights applied horizontally, 232
to provide adequate housing (South Africa), 122–128, 225–226, 228–230, 235
to provide basic education (South Africa), 236
republican political thought about, 2, 7–8, 21, 31–38
socio-economic rights applied horizontally (South Africa), 233
vertical model of, 1, 19–21, 275
duty to protect
in Germany, 154–155, 158
in India, 118–122, 216–217
in United States, 121–122
United States and India contrasted, 121
state's duty, 88, 119–122

ECJ (European Court of Justice), 250, 255, 257, 261, 263
education
Brown v. Board of Education (1954), 80, 236
civic, 35–36
duty to provide (South Africa), 236
horizontal application of right to, 189–190, 223
inequalities under Apartheid, 230–232
reservations in education (India), 127–131, 133
right to (India), 47–48, 126–127
right to (South Africa), 230–232
Eisenhower, Dwight, 80–81
Elizabeth Port Municipality case (2004), 192–193, 227
Equal Protection Clause (US), 82. *See also* Fourteenth Amendment (US)
equality
Commerce Clause (US Constitution) and, 83–85
public/private divide and, 65, 81–86
Equality Act (2000) (South Africa), 222–239

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

equality and antidiscrimination
Civil Rights Cases of 1883 (US), 67–74
broadening state action and, 75–79
Civil Rights Act (1964) (US) and, 84
discrimination in *Shelly* and *Zoroastrian Cooperative* compared, 122–128
in Germany, 149–150, 175–178, 180–181
horizontal application in India and United States and, 60–62, 130–133
horizontal application of provisions, 13–14
in India, 62, 112–113
Indian Supreme Court commitments to, 141
republicanism and, 38
rights in India, 99–100
European Convention of Human Rights, 257
European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), 257–258
European Court of Justice (ECJ), 243, 250, 255, 257–258, 261–265
European Economic Community (EEC) Treaty, 259–260
European Union, 97–98
common good and, 97–98
horizontal direct effect, 260–270
Van Gend en Loos case (1963), 250, 256, 259–260
civic identity of, 251
direct effect and, 259–260
horizontality and, 10, 258–269
political identity of, 250–251
public/private divide in, 246
republican aspirations and, 246–251
republican politics and citizenship in, 252–254
sovereignty issues, 255–256
supranational integration of, 249–251
types of law, 262

Federal Constitutional Court (FCC) (Germany), 149–150, 173, 221–242, 250, 268–269, 272
federal structure of United States, 97
Fedtke, Jorg, 156, 170–171
Fifteenth Amendment (US), 66
Final Constitution (South Africa)
Bill of Rights and, 195–196, 203–205, 213–214
contrasted with German Basic Law, 210–213
direct horizontal application of, 211–214
right to equality in, 213–215
Finn, Meghan, 237
Flume, Werner, 172
Fourteenth Amendment (US), 59–60, 63, 66, 68–69, 82–83
Frantziou, Eleni, 5, 265–268
fraternity, 106–108, 117, 139, 141
freedom
in Aristotle, 27–28
labor-republican view of, 117
neorepublican concepts of, 41–42
as nondomination, 33–34, 39–40, 47, 234–235
as noninterference, 13, 234–235
in Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 41
freedom of expression
background, 16
in Germany, 14, 43, 45, 160–161, 164, 167–169, 171, 179–180, 184
horizontal application of rights and, 19
in India, 14, 204, 218–219
in United States, 207
Friedman, Nick, 144, 188–189

Galanter, Marc, 103, 139–140
Galston, William, 23–24
Gardbaum, Stephen, 5, 119, 277
Garner v. Louisiana (1961), 79
General Equal Treatment Act (AGG), 163–184
general interest, *See* common good
general will, 34–35, 41–42
German Constitutional Court, 149–150, 173, 221–242, 250, 268–269, 272

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

Germany
Blinkfüer case, 169
Lüth case (1958), 42–44, 163–185, 188, 202, 209, 212
Mangold case (2005), 180
Mephisto case (1971), 168–169
Soraya case (1973), 169–170
Stadium Ban case (2018), 13–14, 181–184
Basic Law. *See* Basic Law (Germany, 1949)
common good, 155–156
equality in private sphere, 173–181
Federal Labor Court, 158–159, 161–163
horizontal application discourse, 144–146, 157–163, 179–180
horizontal application in, 9, 13–14, 143–144, 147–151, 170–173
horizontal application of personality rights, 160–161
horizontal effect of constitutional rights, 161–163
horizontality in new constitution, 157–163, 171–173
human dignity, constitutional commitment to, 154–157
identity of new constitution, 159–160
indirect horizontal application, 145
public law, scope of, 151–153
public priorities survey, 171
rights-centric discourse, 167–168
Weimar Constitution, 152–153
Glendon, Mary Ann, 19–21, 24, 121
Goldberg, Justice Arthur, 79, 85
Greene, Jamal, 19–21
Grootboom case (2005), 224–226
Grovey v. Townsend (1935), 17–18

Habermas, Jürgen, 251–254
Hailbronner, Michaela, 221–222
Hale, Robert, 17–18
Harlan II, Justice John Marshall, 79–80, 82
Harlan, Justice John Marshall, 64, 69–73, 80–81, 99
Harms, Justice Louis, 226
Hartz, Louis, 149
Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States (1964), 84–85
Henkin, Louis, 77–78
Hershkoff, Helen, 93–98, 228–229
Hickey, Tom, 33–34, 38–39, 53–54, 276
Hobbes, Thomas, 26–27
Holomisa, Bantu, 218–220
Honohan, Iseault, 36
horizontal application
by Indian Supreme Court, 115–119
in common law, 235–236
concepts of freedom and, 41–42
direct, 11–13, 116, 119, 158–162, 168–169, 201–202, 211, 238–239, 261
New York Times v. Sullivan (1964), 91–92
of transformational values, 222–242
political dimensions of, 57–58
reach of constitutional rights, 4
republican interpretations of (South Africa), 191–192
republican potential of, 59–62
horizontal application of constitution
Final Constitution (South Africa), 203–210
German constitutional principles and, 189–190
republican themes in (US and India), 59–62, 140
horizontal application of equality rights, 263–268, *See also* duty
Anti-Discrimination Act (Germany) and, 175–177, 179–180
as constitutional morality, 144
commitment to, 143–147, 172–173
constitutional duties (Germany), 178
Defrenne v. Sabena (1976), 261–263
European Union directives and, 185–186
in Final Constitution (South Africa), 213–215
in Germany, 150–151, 174–175, 179–180, 189–190, 211–212
in India and United States, 130–133
private sphere and, 146, 173–181
republican themes in (Germany and South Africa), 189–190

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

republican themes in (US and India) and, 59–62, 140, 163–181
waning support for (Germany), 186
horizontal application of European Union law. *See* European Union
horizontal application of rights
about, 1–2, 6, 272–274
constitutional politics and, 21
constitutional practice and, 8–10
European Union and, 243–246
international increase of, 4–5
judicial power and, 25
limitations analysis and, 20
limits on constitutional duties, 235–237
pros and cons of, 24–25
prospects for, 274–276
republican elements in, 20–21, 234–235
Shelley v. Kraemer (1948), 4–5, 74–79, 127–128
shift from vertical to, 4
horizontal effect. *See* horizontal application of rights
horizontal versus vertical rights paradigm, 16, 19–21, 278
horizontality,
European Union and, 97
in Germany, 9, 13–14, 143–144, 147–151, 170–173. *See also* Germany
in India, 9–10, 143. *See also* Indian Supreme Court
international instantiations of, 9
rights-centrism and, 7, 90
in United States, 9, 44–47, 60–62, 97–98, 130–133
housing policy (South Africa), 122–128, 225–230, 235–236
How Rights Went Wrong (Greene), 19–21
Howard, Jacob, 66
Human Rights Act (UK), 5

inaction. *See* state inaction
India
Emergency Era (1975-1977), 115
Hindu nationalism versus secularism and equality, 102
Indian Constituent Assembly, 62
Indian Constitution
about, 101
anti-exclusion principle, 101, 136–137
Basic Structure Doctrine and, 113–114, 130
Constitution Act of 1951, 113
Delhi Act of 2007, 131–133
Directive Principles and, 61–62, 102–103, 112–114, 128–131, 139–140
duties of citizens in, 101
horizontal application and, 9–10, 59–60, 99–100, 104–105, 114–115, 118–119, 128–141, 150
Indian Young Lawyers' Association v. State of Kerala (2018), 135
influence of US Constitution on, 61–62, 107–108
Koushal v. Naz Foundation (2013), 137–138
minimal secularism standard, 137
Navtej Singh Johar and Others v. Union of India (2018), 137–138
Naz Foundation v. Union of India (2009), 137–140
nondiscrimination clauses in, 108–111
private actors and, 101
public discourses and constitutional line compared, 103–104
ratification, deliberations preceding, 106–111
religion and horizontal rights, 133–140
Saifuddin v. State of Bombay (1962), 137
same-sex couples, rights of, 137–140
scope of, 102–103
state's duty to protect, 118–122, 216–217, *See also* duty to protect
Subcommittee on Fundamental Rights, 108–109
traditional rights versus social revolution in, 102–103
transformative versus conservative constitutional discourses, 105–106
Indian Medical Association v. Union of India, 127–130

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

Indian Supreme Court
early conservatism, 111–115
horizontal application by, 115–117
indirect horizontal application by, 116
public/private divide in, 111–112
Indian Young Lawyers' Association v. State of Kerala (2018), 135
indirect horizontal application, 5, 11–13
by Indian Supreme Court, 116
in Germany, 145
New York Times Co. v. Sullivan (1964), 90–92
People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India (1982), 117–119
socio-economic rights and, 95–96
indirect third-party effect, 3–4
individual rights, 30–32
Inkatha Freedom Party (South Africa), 199
insulated private actors, 3, 99, 101, 150, 236–237, 240, 246
interconnectedness of public/private enterprise, 14–15
Interim Constitution (South Africa)
common good and, 200–201
constitutional commitments of, 216–217
evolution of, 196–204
state action doctrine and, 201–202
International Transport Workers' Federation and Finnish Seamen's Union v. Viking Line ABP and OÜ Viking Line Eesti (2007), 263–268

Jacobsohn, Gary, 277
on *DeShaney v. Winnebago County* (1989), 87–90, 119–121, 216
on horizontal application in India, 133, 150
on Indian Constitution, 104, 113, 128
on Indian independence, 102
on public/private divide, 277–278
Jafta, Justice Chris, 239–240
Jefferson, Thomas, 2–3
judicial decision-making, horizontal application and, 50–51, 54–55, 221–222
Juma Musjid case (2011), 230–232

Kalyvas, Andreas, 6, 26, 56
Katzenbach v. McClung (1964), 84–85
Katznelson, Ira, 6, 26, 56
Kennedy, John F., 80–81
Kentridge, Justice Sydney, 205, 208
Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, 113–114
Khaitan, Tarunabh, 137–138
Khumalo and Others v. Holomisa, 218–221, 223, 231
King v. De Jager, 222–239
Koushal v. Naz Foundation (2013), 137
Kriegler, Justice Johann, 207–208
Krishnaswamy, Sudhir, 111–112, 116–117, 120–121
Kumm, Mattias, 5–6

Laborde, Cecile, 28, 137
Langa, Justice Pius, 227
Legal Realists, 17–18
Liberal Beginnings: Making a Republic for the Moderns (Kalyvas and Katznelson), 56
liberal constitutionalism, 4
horizontal application and, 20–24, 55–57
Kalyvas and Katznelson on, 56
liberal tradition, 16, 21, 25–32
liberalism, perfectionist, 28–30
Liebenberg, Sandra, 235
Lisbon Treaty case (2009), 250
Locke, John, 26–27
Lüth case (1958), 42–44, 163–185, 188, 202, 209, 212, 255–256

Maas, Willem, 250
Macedo, Stephen, 23–24
Machiavelli, 34
Madison, James, 39
Madlanga, Justice Mbuyiseli, 221
Manhattan Community Access Corp v. Halleck (2019), 18–19
Marsh v. Alabama (1946), 77
Marshall, Justice John, 96–97, 277
Masiya v. Director of Public Prosecutions (2007), 220–221

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

Mathews, Jud, 57, 162, 171, 173, 221–222
Maynor, John, 28
McCulloch v. Maryland (1819), 96–97
Mehta, M. C. v. State of Tamil Nadu (1996), 48
Mhlantla, Justice Nonkosi, 239–240
Michelman, Frank, 51–52, 145, 188, 209
Miller, David, 251–254
Modderklip Boerdery (Pty) Ltd. v. Modder East Squatters & Anor. (2001), 226–229
Modderklip case (2005), 193–194
Modiri, Joel, 190
Mokgoro, Justice J., 192
Moseneke, Justice Dikgang, 221

National Party (South Africa), 188. *See also* Interim Constitution (South Africa)
Navtej Singh Johar and Others v. Union of India (2018), 137–138
Naz Foundation v. Union of India (2009), 137
Nehru, Jawaharlal, 101–103, 106, 128
neighbourliness, 223–224, 227
neorepublicanism, 2
New York Times Co. v. Sullivan (1964), 65, 90–92
Nipperdey, Hans Carl, 158–163
Nolan, Aoife, 231–232

O'Regan, Justice Kate, 218–219
objective rights, 4, 45, 155–156
On Duties (Cicero), 35

parity effected by horizontal application
  about/defined, 22
  common good and, 8, 34, 144, 176–177, 256
  constitutional actors and, 150, 215
  duty and, 23–24, 42
  European Union and, 243–244, 246, 256, 269
  German law and, 157–158, 172
  new German constitutional order and, 23
  between private behavior and constitutional values, 19, 162, 171–172, 176–178, 188, 211
  in public and private spaces, 8–10, 15, 51, 156
  of rights and, 42–47
  republican features of, 24–25, 42–47, 56, 148, 243–244, 246, 271
  scope of, 215, 222–242, 275
Patel, Sardar Vallabhbhai, 109
People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India (1982), 115–118
Pettit, Philip, 28, 33–34, 38–42, 47, 152
politeia, 35
The Politics (Aristotle), 28
Polybius, 27–28
Port Elizabeth Municipality v. Various Occupiers (2004), 192–193, 227
Praeg, Leonhard, 192
President of South Africa v. Modderklip (2005), 193–194, 226–229
Preuss, Ulrich, 43–44
private law doctrine, 94–95
private spaces, adjudication of, 20–21, 94–95, 101. *See also* insulated private actors
Pruneyard Shopping Center v. Robins (1980), 93–94
public interest. *See* common good
public projects, 14–15, 19, 47, 137
"public thing", 22, 34–35, 44, 256–257, 260–261, 265, 269, 278. *See also res publica*
public/private divide,
  "white primary" cases (US), 16–19
  constitutional law and, 86–90
  equality and, 81–86
  in European Union, 246
  in Germany, 151–153, 162–163, 176
  homogenization and, 277
  horizontal application and, 18–21, 246
  preservation of, 63–65, 73–75, 83, 86–87, 90, 121
  state action doctrine and, 63–65, 73–75, 83, 86–87, 90, 92–94, 99, 121
  subnational narrowing of, 93–94

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

public/private divide (cont.)
in United States, 61–64, 74–75, 86–87, 92
in United States and India contrasted, 61–62

Quint, Peter, 149, 152, 158, 160

racism. *See also* caste system; civil rights; equality and antidiscrimination
American, 7, 9, 19, 57–58
Indian, 57–58
Radical Republicans, 61, 67, 69, 99, 103–104
Rawls, John, 28
Raz, Joseph, 24, 28–30
religious conflict, 62, 127–128, 133–137
republican constitutionalism, 276
republican interpretation of horizontality
about, 2, 6
application of equality rights, 59–62, 140, 163–181
authoritarian regimes and, 7
consideration in applicaton of, 10–12
discourse about, 7–9, 15, 42, 163–184
illiberal society and, 6
liberal constitutionalism and, 7–8
normative assessments of, 7
republican political theory
about, 2, 7–8, 32–34
constitutional politics and, 15
European Union in, 246–251, 256
horizontal application and, 22, 59–62
republicanism
as corrective to liberalism and, 56–57
civic, 21, 24, 31
egalitarian, 37–38
horizontal application in South African constitutionalism and, 215–216
horizontal application of rights and, 10, 22–24
res publica. *See also* "public thing"
American, 71, 93–94
European, 245, 265, 267–269
in Cicero, 35
Right to Be Forgotten cases, 268–269
right to property, 226–230
rights relationships, 18–19, 22
rights-centrism
American constitutionalism and, 95, 99–100
horizontal shift and, 2–6, 99
horizontality contrasted with, 7, 90
Robertson, David, 205, 207–208
Rosenfeld, Michel, 249–250
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 34–35, 41
Roux, Theunis, 220
Roznai, Yaniv, 102, 104, 113, 128

Sachs, Justice Albie, 192–193, 198–199, 207–208, 221, 224, 227
Saifuddin v. State of Bombay (1962), 137
Scheppele, Kim Lane, 9, 59
Schmidt, Christopher, 79–80, 84
Schmitt, Gary, 30–32
Shah, K. T., 106–107
Shamdasani, PD v. Central Bank of India (1952), 111
Shelley v. Kraemer (1948), 4–5, 74–79, 127–128
Sinha, Chief Justice Bhuvaneshwar Prasad, 137
slavery. *See also* Thirteenth Amendment (US)
Smith v. Allwright (1944), 17
social contract, 34–35
social stratification. *See* caste system; equality and antidiscrimination; racism
socio-economic rights
"total constitutionalism" and, 221–222
common law (South Africa) and, 228
duty applied horizontally (South Africa), 233
goal of self-sufficiency and, 37–38
in *Juma Musjid* (2011), 230–232
indirect horizontal application of, 95–96
Sommeregger, Georg, 144, 180
Soobramoney v. Minister of Health, KwaZulu-Natal (1997), 224–225

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

Soraya case (1973), 169–170
South African constitutional project
  common good and, 227–229
  Court's role in, 221–222
  duties of private actors in, 219–221, 230–233
  equality and housing guarantee and, 229–230
  horizontal application and, 9, 13–14, 144, 147, 188–192, 196, 218–220
  horizontal application of constitution and, 22, 188–190, 222–242
  horizontal application of equality rights and, 146–147, 187, 190
  republican interpretation of, 196, 227–229
sovereignty, 96–97, 255–256
Spitz, Richard, 199–200
Stadium Ban case (2008), 13–14, 181–184
state action doctrine
  1960s sit-ins (US) and, 78–79
  about, 64–65
  evolution of, 62, 81–82
  freedom of speech and, 92
  indirect horizontal application and, 89–90
  judicial interpretations of, 88–90
  narrowed public/private divide and, 92–94, 99
  preservation of public/private divide and, 63–65, 73–75, 83, 86–87, 90, 121
  racism and, 63–64
  Shelley v. Kraemer (1948), 4–5, 74–79, 127–128
  South Africa's Interim Constitution and, 201–202
  tragic outcomes of, 87–90
state constitutional rights, 94–95
state inaction, 3, 88, 120–121, 129, 216–217
S*tate of Madras v. Champakam Dorairajan*, 112–113
State of West Bengal v. Union of India, 115
Stone Sweet, Alec, 173, 259
Storing, Herbert, 19–21, 24, 30–31
subjective rights, 4, 155, 164
subnational constitutionalism, 93–94

Technical Committee on Fundamental Rights (South Africa), 199
testamentary decisions, 222–239
Theme Committee Four on Fundamental Rights (South Africa), 203
Theron, Justice Leona, 238
Thirteenth Amendment (US), 63, 66–68
Title II (Civil Rights Act), 84–85
total constitutionalism, 5
Treaty of Lisbon, 249–250
Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, 261
Tribe, Laurence, 199–201
Tushnet, Mark, 5, 14–15, 17–18, 51

ubuntu (South Africa), 192–195, 229
United States,
  Amendments to constitution, 59–60, 63, 66, 68–69, 82–83
  Commerce Clause, US Constitution, 83–85
  Equal Protection Clause, 82
  federal structure of, 97–98
  Fifteenth Amendment (US), 66
  Fourteenth Amendment, 59–60, 63, 66, 68–69, 82–83
  Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States (1964), 84–85
  horizontality in, 9, 44–47, 60–62, 97–98, 130–133
  public/private divide in, 61–64, 74–75, 86–90, 92
  Thirteenth Amendment, 63, 66–68
United States v. Cruikshank (1874), 69
Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 62

value monism, 176–177
Van der Walt, Johan, 255–256, 263–268
Van Gend en Loos case (1963), 250, 256, 259–260
Verma, Chief Justice J. S., 120–121

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012

vertical model of rights
  Civil Rights Act of 1964 (US) and, 85–86, 140
  defined, 1–2, 8
  horizontal model contrasted, 16, 19–21, 278
  settled, 140
Victor, Justice Margie, 222–240
Vidya Verma v. Dr Shiv Narain Verma (1956), 111
Viking case (2007), 263–265
Vinson, Justice Fred M., 76
Violence Against Women Act (United States), 121
Viroli, Maurizio, 36–37
virtue, 23–24, 33–34, 36–39, 49–50, 176, 179

Warren, Chief Justice Earl, 81–82
The Washington Post, 81
Weak Courts, Strong Rights (Tushnet), 5
Webking, Robert, 30–32
Wechsler, Herbert, 77
Weimar Constitution (Germany), 152–153
welfare liberalism, 28–30
welfare states, 14–15
White, Justice Byron Raymond, 79–80
White, Morton, 2–3
"white primary" cases, 16–19
Wood, Gordon, 30–31
Woolman, Stuart, 208, 210–211, 220–221

Zackin, Emily, 93, 96
Zitzke, Emile, 190
Zölibat case (1957), 161–163
Zoroastrian Cooperative Housing Society v. District Registrar, 122–128

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 19:27:28, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009293723.012