

Proportionality Under Pressure: Comparative Constitutions and Constitutional Design and the Resilience of Fundamental Rights in the United States

[Mohd. Ruhul Amin](#)

Jun 2, 2025

Abstract

This article examines proportionality as a constitutional method for evaluating restrictions on fundamental rights during periods of institutional pressure. It describes proportionality as requiring a legitimate objective, a rational connection between the measure and that objective, consideration of less restrictive alternatives, and a balance between expected benefits and imposed burdens. The article mentions that proportionality becomes weak when courts accept official assertions without examining evidence, duration, exemptions, data quality, changing circumstances, or unequal effects. It also discusses emergency powers, legislative oversight, judicial access, institutional redundancy, and post-crisis review. Fundamental rights are most meaningfully tested when governments regulate unpopular groups, migrants, prisoners, protesters, controversial expression, and communities labelled as security threats. The article concludes that constitutional resilience depends on timely remedies, reasoned administrative records, periodic reassessment, distributional analysis, institutional memory, and accessible procedures capable of correcting harm while exceptional measures remain in operation.



In non-crisis situations, there each is significant backing even if only vague and short-term for fundamental rights. Proportionality provides a 'structure of argument' to consider restrictions while maintaining a balance between security and liberty in June 2025. A comparative constitutional design illustrates that it is not a catalogue of rights that is sufficient to make a constitution resilient. Institutions should be provided with evidence, learn from review, have time limits, remedies and be able to take a second look at earlier evidence.

Pressure tests the verity of constitutional obligations to inform decision making and its utility as primarily symbolic talk. The most compelling may warrant and require action, without lacking options and rationale, so that action can be warranted and justified on an on-going basis.

Proportionality offers a disciplined way of assessing rights limitations that may be called upon. There needs to be a legitimate objective to be achieved; there needs to be a contribution to the legitimate aim; less restrictive means need to be considered and the burden need to be proportionate to the expected benefit. But given a liturgical method based on courts and they rely on nothing or official proclamation is taken for granted, the method is weak. Strong review of scope, length and exemptions, data quality, distributional effects and changing circumstances. In addition, proportionality must be

periodically reassessed as what may be warranted in the context of an acute emergency may prove relentless or unduly onerous if circumstances evolve or facts and capacities change.

In times of perceived threat, emergency is a test for governments since speed and focus of power may be a legitimate response to a real threat. The very essence of the issue is when the aspect of exceptional power gets blurred. According to the Venice Commission guidance principles, it is important to have the legality, necessity, proportionality, temporariness, parliamentary control and judicial review. Those principles take out the "catch" and "anything goes" aspect of emergency power, and make it a tool for supervision.

A constitutional system must also have procedures for renewal, publication, keeping data, procurement, delegating and post-emergency audit. If they were not built in, a temporary measure can live on after the formal measure's expiration, via ordinary regulations or institutional habit, or technological infrastructures.

A comparison of the constitutions shows that there are a number of ways of limiting the exceptional powers. Some systems require legislative consent within certain time limits, some have restrictions on renewal, some have certain rights that cannot be refused, some distribute powers to territorial units, or put other mechanisms in place allowing for more rapid judicial review. There is no one single device which can ensure restraint. Political rules of the game that are not codified can be strong when the political actors take into account the institutional legitimacy, and can conversely be weak in a partisan-capture-ridden situation where strong text is required.

Two guardians can provide higher level of protection than one guardian. With executive rewards going to speed rather than accountability, courts, legislatures, federal institutions, auditors, organized civil society, and a free media are layered points of resistance.

Fundamental rights are resilient when protection persists in uncertain, fear-filled and politically-asymmetric contexts. The most difficult scenarios are related to the involvement of unpopular groups, controversial speech, migrants, prisoners, protesters and communities perceived as being a security threat. A corollary of equality under the law in times of peace, it provides some but not comprehensive information on constitutional strength. Resilience is evident when institutions uphold at the time of stress, individual determination, legal counsel, review, and reasoned justification all elements of the principles of due process.

Distributional analysis continues to be vital as a formally neutral rule could have a

concentrated and geographical effect through such a policy, for example as in the case of disability, language, income, immigration status and unequal access to digital systems. Therefore, it is necessary that problems of rights protection be dealt with not only on a doctrinal level but also from an empirical perspective regarding the implementation of rights.

S. courts serve as constitutional guardrails only if they have access, at the right time, with the right remedies, and right compliance. A decision issued after the emergency measure has expired may help to limousine the opportunities, but leave the affected alive helpless. The most significant decisions may be subject to "standing" rules, "secrecy", "classification", "cost" provisions or delay in the procedure. So, the effective judicial control requires accelerated processes, availability of evidence, concrete solutions and prevention of reprisals.

Administrative records explanations of reasons and alternatives also are relied upon by courts. Without any track of executive actions to challenge, there is no way to determine whether other freedoms are being violated; words in the Constitution can turn into a political broadside instead of a limit on what the executive branch can do.

Proper legislative control provides people with a democratic mandate and checks on control, yet formal approval can disguise weak control. There must be staff, committee documents, powers to convene hearings, openness for opposition participation and powers to curtail or cancel delegated powers in effective committees. The question of renewal should be based on new evidence, instead of the original crisis story. Budget review is important as well, as great programs will prevail after legal disputes settle.

Public reporting can help to promote accountability, though with some sensitive data, carefully designed access rather than blanket secrecy would be the best way to promote accountability. Institutional pressures are a good indicator of the legislatures' performance as autonomous monitors or functionaries of the executive party leadership.

Many long run rights effects have been shown to occur after the attention from the public has been diverted elsewhere. Databases stay in place, emergency contracts turn into permanent ones, special enforcement units become assigned new mandates and broad definitions move to conventional policy. Residue can also remain on the grounds of precedent: when a precedent is approved, sub-sequent officials refer to the precedent in order to argue that the precedent is precedent, and hence, that it is acceptable. To have a sunset clause, you must have more than just a line with an expiration date.

There is a need for records to be deleted or properly reauthorized; powers delegated must be examined, affected parties to be given access to Remedios, legislatures provided with evidence of unequal burdens. In the phase following the crisis, this structured residue auditing, instead of an 'all's-well' assumption, should be part of post-crisis governance.

Evaluate the difference between commitment, capacity, behaviors and outcome in measurement. Behavior is seen in administrative decisions patterns and outcomes are seen in safety, access, equality and remedy. Mixed together, all four categories provide for some less false optimism.

Improvement in documentation can happen with abuse ongoing or an improvement in an outcome with an "unrelated" even in the economic sphere. Mechanisms are identified through longitudinal data and matched comparisons, through case tracking and with affected populations. Data quality is also an issue since official records of violations may underestimate violations; civil society records may focus on "visible" violations and legal records may not include violation of informal settlements or intimidation.

Constitutional review does not stop with declaration; it is remedy that will decide. Such effective relief may be achieved via the release, reinstatement, compensation, correction of data, deletion of records, revision of policy, monitoring, and be implemented as a new decision within lawful criteria. So, relief will be different, depending on the harm, and will be useless if it is too late. Oversight bodies and courts must also look at recurrence because they could be in a case where a defective rule has only been taken out, and the problem remains.

Remedy design is a linkage between legal doctrine and legal action. Constitution starts working when institutions understand there will be a response to unlawful behaviors right away, and not just for one exceptional circumstance or conforms to the law and moves on.

Sun kind design must be able to attribute responsibility, and not presume, or hope, that all institutions will "naturally" relax extraordinary custom. An audit can identify emergency authorities and contracts, personnel units, guidance documents and pending cases and categories each of these for repealing, renewing, deleting, compensating or common-law review. One way that the publication will help hold people accountable is by safeguarding sensitive information granted legislative or judicial access. The structured exit mechanism also contributes to a better preparedness for the future, as learning takes place in institutional structures and is based on evidence and not on political memory. The duration of Temporary power shall remain temporary only when an owner, date and a

record for review shall have been provided.

In the proportionality analysis distributional effects should not and cannot be excluded. A seemingly moderate restriction might have an extreme cost on a small community, and be moderate on the population as a whole. Such factors as disability, income, language, geography, family status and immigration status should therefore all be taken into consideration by courts and agencies. Comparable details are required about alternatives as a technically available alternative may not be accessible to those who have the heaviest burden.

Another factor that is important for resilience: institutional memory. Assessment decision, evidence, dissenting etc., assessment and outcomes of review should be retained for future audit. Public institutions can then find out, which of their assumptions were right and which of the limitation caused unnecessary suffering. Proportionality goes further than just "dr. on the spot" and should become a lesson to be learnt and become an administrative body to enhance future crisis responses.

Proficiency of constitutional resilience is not demonstrated by the elegance of the text or a well-known decision. Proof exists where power is curtailed in real time, equality is maintained and harm is remedied with universally available solutions by the institutions. There is a redundancy, proportionality, temporariness, evidence and a continuity of review which are supported by comparative design. They also have the benefit of providing protections to legitimate emergency action, provide clarity of authority and preserve trust. The best way to protect a democracy is to prevent any one interest from being able to make what is a temporary necessity into a permanent gain, and to keep no restraint out of controversy.