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I. INTRODUCTION

With the events that enabled the rise to power of Adolf Hitler in mind, Germany set out to protect itself from future anti-
democratic groups, which threatened their new government.¹ To
ensure that the opportunity for a similar party to the Nazi regime
would never again have the chance to take control, Germany
declared anti-democratic politics to be illegal inside their borders.²
Unlike the United States’ bipartisan democracy, Germany’s
current democracy is home to multiple political parties, many
donning members of parliament.³

Most anti-democratic groups in Germany can be outlawed
and disbanded by the Ministry of the Interior.⁴ However, if a group
is able to form a political party, they may be banned solely at the
direction of the Bundesverfassungsgericht, also known as the
German Federal Constitutional Court.⁵ The German democratic
government intentionally made it difficult to ban a political party
to avoid acts similar to those culminating in Adolf Hitler’s July 14,
1933 declaration that the Nazi regime was the only political party
in Germany, thereby outlawing the development of any opposing
party.⁶
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² Id.

³ Parliamentary Groups, DEUTSCHER BUNDESTAG,

⁴ Mudde, supra note 2.

⁵ The Federal Constitutional Court is the highest court in Germany and is
similar to the Supreme Court of the United States. If the Federal Constitutional
Court successfully bans a party, the party is unable to immediately reform and
subsequent parties of similar nature are outlawed as well. Id.

⁶ The Nazi party outlawed the Social Democratic Party (the only other
party with significant influence at the time) and disbanded all other smaller
parties in German government at the time. On July 14, 1933, the Nazi regime
passed the Law Against the Establishment of Parties, which stated that, “the
National Socialist German Workers Party constitutes the only political party in
Only two political parties have officially been banned in German history, and the last successful ban was approved 60 years ago. On March 1, 2016, the Bundesrat, also called the Upper House of Parliament, brought a case in front of the Federal Constitutional Court in an effort to ban the extreme right wing party in Germany known as the National Democratic Party. In German, the party is named the Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (hereinafter referred to as NPD).

II. GERMAN GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE

In order to understand the process of banning a German political party, some basic knowledge of their governmental structure is helpful. The structure of modern day Germany’s government is bicameral. The two houses are the Bundesrat (Upper House) and the Bundestag (Lower House). Either chamber may initiate legislation and the majority of bills must gain approval from both houses in order to pass. When the federal government proposes a bill, it must first be reviewed by the

Germany” and that attempts to create any other party would be punishable with “penal servitude up to three years or with imprisonment of six months to three years.” Denis Cummings, On This Day: Nazis Ban All Other Political Parties, FINDING DULCINIA (Jul. 14, 2011, 6:00 AM), http://www.findingdulcinea.com/news/on-this-day/July-August-08/On-this-Day--Nazis-Ban-All-Other-Political-Parties.html.

Peter Schwarz, German Constitutional Court Considers Banning Neo-Fascist NPD, WORLD SOCIALIST WEB SITE (Mar. 4, 2016), https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2016/03/04/npdb-m04.html.
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Upper House, and is then sent to the Lower House for approval. The Upper House serves as somewhat of an advisory board.

The Upper House consists of 69 members who represent the 16 Land governments. These members are appointed by their respective Land governments, and the number of delegates for each Land is directly proportionate to the population of that area. Although the Upper House is subordinate to the Lower House, the Upper House holds the power of absolute veto over any legislation affecting Land interests.

The Lower House is similar to the House of Representatives in the United States. This House consists of hundreds of members, each elected, and is the chief legislative body in Germany. The Lower House considers its legislative ability to be its most important responsibility.

III. THE NPD POLITICAL PARTY

The NPD was founded in 1964 and served as a catchall party for far-right activists, most of whom migrated from other smaller political parties. The founders of the party were former supporters of the Nazi regime and the early goal of the party was to stifle German guilt after World War II. In the late 1960’s, the NPD was nearly 30,000 members strong and was becoming an influential political party in Germany. With growing authority, and the horrors of World War II still fresh in the world’s mind, the party’s actions began to threaten West Germany’s relations with
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other European countries. Even today, the NPD is widely considered a neo-Nazi party by many German citizens.

The NPD’s influence waxed and waned over the past half a century but they were never able to earn a seat in German Parliament, thereby reaching Federal status, because they have never successfully secured the necessary percentage of voting supporters. In order to earn a seat in German Parliament, a political party must grasp 5% of the voting population to reach the threshold for representation. At their most influential time in the late 1960’s, the NPD was only able to secure 4.3%, falling just short of the required benchmark. Failing to reach the number of members necessary, the party began to lose power. From the 1970’s to early 1990’s the NPD was negligible in German society and was not even the most popular far-right political party in Deutschland.

In 1991, Gunter Deckert took over leadership of the NPD, and under his management the party polished their neo-Nazi attitude and ideology. In 1995, after only four years of leadership, Deckert was imprisoned for hate speech and was succeeded by Udo Voigt, who pushed the neo-Nazi ideology even further with the NPD party. Voigt is known for holding protest marches, which bring out mostly skinheads, and for his connections with David Duke, a known white supremacist who was a grand wizard in the American Ku Klux Klan. In an interview on Duke’s web radio show, Voigt referred to himself as the “true Chancellor of Germany,” claiming that Germany was an occupied country, and that he was working to gain control of the Republic to bring it back to the Germans. In 2006, Voigt, along with two other senior party officials, was handed a suspended 4-
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year jail sentence for inciting racial hatred and defamation by use of propaganda during the World Cup in Germany.

Between 2004 and 2006, under Voigt’s leadership, the NPD established itself once again as a growing force in the German government by achieving status and gaining seats in two state parliaments as well as several local councils. Current members of the NPD number around 5,200. They hold seats in the state parliaments of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and Saxony, both of which are in eastern Germany and are known for having many far-right thinkers. They also hold one seat in European Parliament, which is held by former party leader Udo Voigt. Keeping true to the party’s tradition, their seat-holding representative in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, Udo Pastoers, was charged for “inciting racial hatred” at a rally in 2009 for calling Germany a “Jews’ Republic” and using other racially charged epithets. Also Ralf Wohlleben, former NPD senior

36 The three NPD officials were handing out pamphlets stating that a black player was not worthy of playing on the Germany national team and that positions on the team should be reserved for white players only. The pamphlet was titled, “White, not just a jersey color! For a real NATIONAL team!” On the pamphlet was the picture of a white German soccer jersey with the number 25 printed on it. Patrick Owomoyela, a black footballer who was born in Hamburg, Germany, wore the number 25. Far-Right Politician Convicted Over Racist World Cup Flyers, Deutsche Welle (Apr. 24, 2009), http://www.dw.com/en/far-right-politician-convicted-over-racist-world-cup-flyers/a-4204566.


43 Pastoers was also quoted for his maligning of Turkish men as “semen cannons” who were, in his opinion, spoiling German blood by spreading their
member, is currently on trial for supporting the far-right militant group National Socialist Underground, which was found to have murdered 10 people between 2000 and 2006. Most of those murdered were of Turkish origin.

More recently, the NPD has attempted to change their image to attract a younger generation of supporters. Current chairman Frank Franz is a well-dressed, 37-year-old, self described “sartorial enthusiast”, who uses his image and social media accounts to appeal to Germany’s youth. European reporters have dubbed Franz a neo-Nazi hipster or “Nipster” and this image is part of the NPD’s revamped efforts to gain more followers. Neo-Nazis have “copied left-wing movements on how to act in public and dress”.

NPD spokesman Klaus Beier has responded to such comments by stating, “Our goals have not changed [the NPD is merely trying] to conduct politics in 2015.” He also claims that they have been elected by 18-24 year-olds and that the party wishes to “speak their language”. NPD official Patrick Schroeder has also been referred to as a “Nipster”. Schroeder operates a nationalist YouTube channel named FSN.tv and is known as the “nice-neo-Nazi” by German press due to his easy going demeanor and his openness to work with journalists. Schroeder claims that the NPD is in a political fight saying, "We’re not trying to be a subculture. As a movement, we should work in that way - that
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more people become the so-called Nipsters so they can go better into the mainstream." Freelance Journalist Felix Huesmann warns that even though many neo-Nazis have altered their image, “they all share the same ideology—and that’s an ideology from 1933, not 2015.” The NPD’s newfound image has not generated dramatic gains at the ballot box, but the reimage efforts are still young.

IV. BANNING A POLITICAL PARTY IN GERMANY

The post-war Federal Constitutional Court has only banned two parties in Germany, both in the 1950’s. In 1952, the Socialist Reich Party (known in Germany as SPR), a successor of the Nazi party, was outlawed, and some members even faced criminal charges because they adamantly advocated for a “solution to the Jewish question”. The process was then repeated against the German Communist Party in 1956 and was eventually successful after the party called for a “revolutionary overthrow” of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. The German Communist Party believed that there was “no peaceful path to socialism” and pursued a “dictatorship of the proletariat”. The ban resulted in a confiscation of the party’s finances and finances of many of the members, many members received long prison terms, and public shaming of members including loss of positions in their professions. Post war German politicians made it possible to ban a political party because they believed that if the Nazi party had been disallowed early enough, Hitler would not have risen to power and the dark cloud over Germany’s history would have never amassed.
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Since the gravity of consequences to the members of a banned political party is so devastating, only a constitutional body may submit an application to disband and forever ban a political party.⁶³ Plainly stated, the application must be filed by the Upper House, the Lower House, the Federal Government, or any mix of the three.⁶⁴ In order for the ban to be successful, it must be proven that the party is unconstitutional⁶⁵ and it must receive six judges’ approval out of the possible eight Constitutional Court judges.⁶⁶

Although the two previously banned parties held significant resemblances to the Nazi party, a mere similarity to the Nazi regime is not enough to ban a political party from existence.⁶⁷ The key to a successful ban is convincing the Court that the party is attempting to, and indeed has potential to, destroy democracy through violent acts⁶⁸ and is creating a “climate of fear”.⁶⁹ They must show that under the Grundgestz, Germany’s Basic Law⁷⁰, the party possesses an “aggressive and combative attitude.”⁷¹ It must also be shown under article 21 of the Grundgestz that the party, “by reason of their aims or the behavior of their adherents, seek to undermine or abolish the free democratic basic order or to endanger the existence of the Federal Republic of Germany.”⁷² Furthermore, even if the Constitutional Court agrees to the ban, the losing party may appeal to the European Court of Human
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Rights on contentions that it violates free speech.\textsuperscript{73} This makes a lasting ban even more time consuming and difficult.

There are many obstacles to banning a political party in Germany. President of the Federal Constitutional Court\textsuperscript{74}, Andreas Vosskuhle, has said the exercising of this political power “is a sharp and double-edged sword that must be used with great caution . . . it limits freedom in order to preserve freedom. . . freedom can be abused to abolish freedom and thus turned against itself.”\textsuperscript{75} For this reason, the bar to banning a party in Germany was set intentionally high. German politicians did not wish to impede too heavily on free speech and did not wish to easily outlaw political opponents the way the Nazi regime did leading into World War II.\textsuperscript{76}

V. ATTEMPT NUMBER ONE

In 2001,\textsuperscript{77} the Upper House, Lower House, and Federal Government worked together to file an application to force the NPD to stand trial in front of the Federal Constitutional Court in an attempt to ban the political party in Germany.\textsuperscript{78} In 2003, the Court denied the application because it was discovered that the Office for the Protection of the Constitution, a high level governmental agency, had infiltrated the NPD and achieved executive status in the party.\textsuperscript{79}

According to the government, the informants were only supposed to observe the party’s actions and gather information to report back to investigating officials.\textsuperscript{80} The agents however reached leadership positions within the NPD, thereby placing themselves in a position to create evidence against the party by
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facilitating illegal acts.\textsuperscript{81} Judges were skeptical to grant the application because they feared that government spies had reached high levels in the organization in a deliberate attempt to create an exaggerated extremist image of the party.\textsuperscript{82} Judges were wary to attempt to distinguish NPD actions from those of undercover government informants.\textsuperscript{83} This notion of impropriety prejudiced the case enough for the Federal Constitutional Court to dismiss the application without prejudice.\textsuperscript{84}

VI. A SECOND BITE AT THE APPLE

Germany’s recent efforts to provide asylum to displaced people from Syria are commendable and are viewed by some nations as incredibly altruistic.\textsuperscript{85} However, many other nations and some of its own citizens have criticized their government’s empathy.\textsuperscript{86} As record numbers of refugees cross German borders,\textsuperscript{87} the country is becoming polarized and some right wing extremists are growing increasingly dangerous, creating a surge in hate crimes.\textsuperscript{88} German authorities reported 817 assaults against centers for refugees in 2015, which is four times as many reported the year before.\textsuperscript{89} In total, Germany reported 1610 crimes classified as offenses against refugees in 2015, nearly double the amount from the previous year.\textsuperscript{90} Even more disturbing is the fact that the German Federal Criminal Police Office reported that more than two thirds of the recorded offenders of these crimes lacked previous criminal records.\textsuperscript{91}

The Minister of the Interior, Thomas de Maiziere, fears that this data may indicate that “xenophobia and right-wing
extremism could creep into the center of [German] society.”92 Security Officials in Germany believe that the far-right NPD political party orchestrates many of the attacks.93 German politicians have accused the NPD of, at least indirectly, being the “intellectual instigators” of violent attacks on minorities within the country’s borders.94 Justice Minister Heiko Maas called recent attacks on refugee camps by extremists, who may or may not be connected to the NPD party, “shameful” and vowed to bring the culprits to justice.95

Fueling the belief that the NPD is behind the violence is the fact that the party has been particularly outspoken with its opinions against Germany accepting refugees. In late January 2016, the NPD proposed a bill to the Mucklenberg-Western Pomeranian Government, advocating fines or imprisonment for every foreigner entering Germany without proper paperwork.96 This proposal, like several other similarly minded proposals initiated by the NPD,97 was voted down.98 The party has also referred to immigration as genocide, claiming that the mixing of other ethnicities into the German gene pool is dampening the German race.99 Party leaders have also preached the belief that people with Asian or African backgrounds will “never be German,” no matter their citizenship.100 Also, in early 2016, Frank Franz sent letters to police and army troops, reminding them that former

92 Id.
94 Woolf, supra note 28.
95 Germany’s Top Court Mulls Banning Extremist NPD, supra note 79.
96 Reyasam, supra note 39.
97 In 2013, the NPD proposed a bill that called for any products sold in Germany that were manufactured in Israel must be prominently marked for “clear designation of origin.” Benjamin Weinthal, German Neo-Nazi’s Submit Anti-Israel Legislation, JEWISH WORLD (June 15, 2013, 11:57 PM). http://www.jpost.com/Jewish-World/Jewish-News/German-neo-Nazis-submit-anti-Israel-legislation-316667. The idea behind the bill mirrors the Nazi model of boycotting Jewish business in 1933. Id. This model brought about the slogan, “Germans defend yourselves. Do not buy from Jews!” Id.
98 Reyasam, supra note 39.
100 Reyasam, supra note 39.
East Germany security forces defied the state and stood by the people.\textsuperscript{101} Some observers viewed these letters as an attempt at a coup d’état.\textsuperscript{102}

Galvanized by the fear of future race crimes and xenophobic actions, and armed with over 1,000 pages of new evidence,\textsuperscript{103} the Upper House of Parliament once again filed an application to the Federal Constitutional Court in a second attempt to ban the NPD in 2013.\textsuperscript{104} This time however, although all parties in the Upper House supported the motion, the Upper House acted without the help of the Lower House or the Federal Government.\textsuperscript{105}

When the application was filed, the Upper House assured the Court that all of their undercover agents had been “deactivated.”\textsuperscript{106} The Upper House’s new investigation into the NPD does not involve undercover agents, but instead relies upon surveillance of the party. After it was shown that the undercover agents were deactivated and that new developments had been made,\textsuperscript{107} the Constitutional Court accepted the application and granted hearings on the topic, which are currently underway.\textsuperscript{108} The Upper House intends to show that the NPD “shares essential characteristics with the Nazi party,” although that assertion will not be enough to complete a successful ban of the party.\textsuperscript{109}

On March 1, 2016, the hearings began.\textsuperscript{110} On the first day, the Constitutional Court listened to the NPD’s argument that undercover state officials were still in the ranks of the NPD and that they have not only made the party seem more violent than
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they truly are, but that they also spied on the NPD’s legal arguments in an unfair and illegal manner.\textsuperscript{111} The Justices have already denied the viability of these arguments and the Court has refused to entertain further discussion concerning the issue of governmental informants.\textsuperscript{112}

On March 1, 2016, NPD leader, Franz,\textsuperscript{113} was effectively cross-examined\textsuperscript{114} in the Federal Constitutional Court.\textsuperscript{115} When asked if the NPD considered the “national community” of Germany to be all citizens or just “ethnic Germans,” Franz’s reply was that a “nation is defined by a common language, culture, and history, and . . . the members of a nation are not interchangeable.”\textsuperscript{116} Franz further stated that a “national community comprises citizens” and that the NPD follows the 1913 Citizenship Law.\textsuperscript{117} This law is based on the idea known as \textit{Jus sanguinis}, or the “right of blood principle.”\textsuperscript{118} Citizenship is therefore determined by bloodline rather than place of birth.\textsuperscript{119}

When further pressed as to whether or not a person born in Germany but an offspring of an Asian mother and an African father could be German, Franz answered that he would not
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\textsuperscript{113} Franz was elected as the NPD leader in November 2014 after the former leader, Holger Apfel (known anti-Semite who has said on record that the Holocaust Memorial in Berlin should be razed to the ground), resigned under a shroud of personal controversy. \textit{Germany’s NPD Leader Slams German Authorities’ Banning of Latest Dresden Anti-Islamification Rally}, \textit{NEW OBSERVER} (Jan. 19, 2015), http://newobserveronline.com/germanys-ndp-leader-slams-german-authorities-banning-latest-dresden-anti-islamification-rally; Crossland, \textit{supra} note 43. Franz took control after an extended period of instability for the party, has since been working to modernize the country’s view of the NPD, and has begun what he believes to be a makeover of the party’s propaganda. \textit{Id}.
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entertain hypothetical questions. At this point, one Justice peppered Franz with questions about an NPD brochure saying, “Integration is genocide.” Franz replied that he agrees that this is bold language but also admitted that the NPD advocates for disallowing foreigners to own German land and excluding foreigners from health and pension insurance. Franz claimed that the NPD also wants to withdraw citizenship from migrants who have been granted it and that the only people who should be granted citizenship are those who have “rendered outstanding services to the country.”

However, the trial was not one sided and the Upper House seemed to lack compelling evidence that the party threatened democracy in Germany. Some of the Justices pointed out that the NPD is a small party with minimal political influence. After reading statements from the Government’s own reports echoing this fact, Judge Muller asked the Government, “Where is there a danger for democracy?” The question was met with silence. Vosskuhle later asked the Government to provide evidence that the NPD engaged in “destructive behavior, which threatened the democratic order.” One report claimed that the prosecution could provide no evidence to the request.

The Justices are currently deliberating over the arguments that were presented. From the final date of the trial, the NPD has six weeks to submit any further comments. At the end of the six weeks, the prosecution will be given six weeks to respond.
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The NPD has been considered xenophobic and anti-Semitic ever since the party was established in the 1960’s. Germany’s Upper House, Bundesrat, is currently arguing that the NPD is “essentially identical” to the platform on which Hitler stood.\textsuperscript{133} German law does not ensure the same rights as the American Constitution; for example, freedom of speech is more limited in Germany than it is in America, partially due to the events that gave rise to the Second World War.\textsuperscript{134} For example, it is illegal in Germany to publicly deny or downplay the holocaust.\textsuperscript{135} This type of restriction on speech would not survive the scrutiny of the First Amendment to the American Constitution.\textsuperscript{136}

\textbf{VII. IS THE EFFORT TO BAN THE NPD FROM GERMANY A WINNING VENTURE?}

One may ask if it is worth it to face the uphill battle and exert considerable effort in attempting to ban a political party with such little influence. Proponents of the attempt argue that legitimate political parties in Germany receive federal funding and it is not right to to endow such a party with taxpayer money.\textsuperscript{137} Huesmann explains these concerns by stating, “We don’t want to fund Nazi propaganda and right-wing violence.”\textsuperscript{138} Further, many believe that the NPD tarnishes Germany’s reputation in the global community and gives neo-Nazis a political platform to spread ideas of racism, xenophobia, and hate.\textsuperscript{139}

Germany has placed considerable effort in painting themselves in a favorable light for foreign affairs since the Second World War; as the Interior Minister of Mecklenberg-Western Pomerania has stated, “No other country has a history like ours, . . . [b]ecause of that, we have a responsibility to make sure that history is never again repeated on German soil.”\textsuperscript{140}
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Many people, including Justice Minister Heiko Maas, believe that this effort to ban the NPD is a waste of time because even a successful ban will not eradicate far-right extremists. Some scholars believe that a successful ban will just push current NPD members into other parties or that they will create dangerous underground groups. Other critics lack confidence that the Upper House will be able to meet the high bar necessary for the attempted ban to be successful. Other concerns include a worry: that a second failed attempt to disband the NPD may work against the government by giving an image of legitimacy to the NPD, thereby affording them more strength; that the campaign will give the NPD a national stage; and that even a successful ban will only turn the party members into martyrs for their racist cause.

Timo Reinfrank, of the anti-racist Amadeu Antonio Foundation, argues, "Right now, there are so many other things to do rather than focus on a ban of the NPD, which is only part of the problem . . . . The urgent priority is to prevent right-wing attacks against refugee shelters."

Perhaps these are all reasons why the Lower House and the Federal Government declined to join the Upper House’s renewed efforts. They may also have refused in order to avoid the embarrassment of a potentially second failed attempt.

Renewing the application to ban this party is a bold move by the Upper House. However, if it is true that the NPD is the puppet master behind some of the violent acts against refugees, then something does need to be done to protect the lives of those in danger. This is especially true with the recent enormous influx of migrants into Germany who seek asylum from the persecution taking place in their own countries.
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Unfortunately, if this attempted ban is premature, the repercussions could potentially be an embarrassed government and a stronger extreme right party. If the Upper House fails for a second time against this party, it is possible that the Federal Constitutional Court will decline to entertain a third attempt. Therefore, this may be the last chance to officially cut off the party from government funding, barring any outrageous future acts that may be attributed to the NPD. For this reason, the Upper House probably desires aid from the Lower House and Federal Government in this ongoing attempt. Although Angela Merkel’s government supports the effort, they have not officially joined the legal campaign.

This author, however, believes that it was a wise tactical decision for the Lower House and the Federal Government to refrain from joining the effort if they believe that the Upper House lacks evidence to make a successful ban. Perhaps the refusal to join will allow a renewed attempt in the future, if the current effort is unsuccessful, that may be led by the Lower House and the Federal Government since the case and parties will be new.

---

147 I.e., the Upper House does not have considerable evidence to support its case.
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