

# Who Believes in Human Rights? Reflections on the European Convention

Many people believe passionately in human rights. Others – Bentham, Marx, cultural relativists and some feminists amongst them – dismiss the concept of human rights as practically and conceptually inadequate. This book reviews these classical critiques and shows how their insights are reflected in the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. At one level an original, accessible and insightful legal commentary on the European Convention, this book is also a ground-breaking work of theory which challenges human rights orthodoxy. Its novel identification of four human rights schools proposes that we alternatively conceive of these rights as given (natural school), agreed upon (deliberative school), fought for (protest school) and talked about (discourse school). Which of these concepts we adopt is determined by particular ways in which we believe, or do not believe, in human rights.

**Marie-Bénédicte Dembour** is Senior Lecturer in Law at the Sussex Law School, University of Sussex.



#### The Law in Context Series

Editors: William Twining (University College London) and Christopher McCrudden (Lincoln College, Oxford)

Since 1970 the Law in Context series has been in the forefront of the movement to broaden the study of law. It has been a vehicle for the publication of innovative scholarly books that treat law and legal phenomena critically in their social, political and economic contexts from a variety of perspectives. The series particularly aims to publish scholarly legal writing that brings fresh perspectives to bear on new and existing areas of law taught in universities. A contextual approach involves treating legal subjects broadly, using materials from other social sciences, and from any other discipline that helps to explain the operation in practice of the subject under discussion. It is hoped that this orientation is at once more stimulating and more realistic than the bare exposition of legal rules. The series includes original books that have a different emphasis from traditional legal textbooks, while maintaining the same high standards of scholarship. They are written primarily for undergraduate and graduate students of law and of other disciplines, but most also appeal to a wider readership. In the past, most books in the series have focused on English law, but recent publications include books on European law, globalisation, transnational legal processes, and comparative law.

#### **Books in the Series**

Anderson, Schum & Twining: Analysis of Evidence

Ashworth: Sentencing and Criminal Justice Barton & Douglas: Law and Parenthood

Beecher-Monas: Evaluating Scientific Evidence: An Interdisciplinary

Framework for Intellectual Due Process

Bell: French Legal Cultures Bercusson: European Labour Law Birkinshaw: European Public Law

Birkinshaw: Freedom of Information: The Law, the Practice and the Ideal

Cane: Atiyah's Accidents, Compensation and the Law Clarke & Kohler: Property Law: Commentary and Materials

Collins: The Law of Contract Davies: Perspectives on Labour Law

Dembour: Who Believes in Human Rights?: The European Convention in Question

de Sousa Santos: Toward a New Legal Common Sense

Diduck: Law's Families

Elworthy & Holder: Environmental Protection: Text and Materials

Fortin: Children's Rights and the Developing Law

Glover-Thomas: Reconstructing Mental Health Law and Policy

Gobert & Punch: Rethinking Corporate Crime

Harlow & Rawlings: Law and Administration: Text and Materials

Harris: An Introduction to Law

Harris, Campbell & Halson: Remedies in Contract and Tort Harvey: Seeking Asylum in the UK: Problems and Prospects Hervey & McHale: Health Law and the European Union

Lacey & Wells: Reconstructing Criminal Law



More information

Cambridge University Press 978-0-521-68307-4 - Who Believes in Human Rights?: Reflections on the European Convention Marie-Benedicte Dembour Frontmatter

Lewis: Choice and the Legal Order: Rising above Politics

Likosky: Transnational Legal Processes

Likosky: Law, Infrastructure and Human Rights

Maughan & Webb: Lawyering Skills and the Legal Process

McGlynn: Families and the European Union: Law, Politics and Pluralism

Moffat: Trusts Law: Text and Materials Norrie: Crime, Reason and History

O'Dair: Legal Ethics

Oliver: Common Values and the Public-Private Divide

Oliver & Drewry: The Law and Parliament Picciotto: International Business Taxation Reed: Internet Law: Text and Materials Richardson: Law, Process and Custody

Roberts & Palmer: Dispute Processes: ADR and the Primary Forms of Decision-Making

Scott & Black: Cranston's Consumers and the Law

Seneviratne: Ombudsmen: Public Services and Administrative Justice

Stapleton: Product Liability

Tamanaha: The Struggle for Law as a Means to an End

Turpin: British Government and the Constitution: Text, Cases and Materials

Twining: Globalisation and Legal Theory

Twining: Rethinking Evidence

Twining & Miers: How to Do Things with Rules Ward: A Critical Introduction to European Law Ward: Shakespeare and Legal Imagination

Zander: Cases and Materials on the English Legal System

Zander: The Law-Making Process



# Who Believes in Human Rights?

Reflections on the European Convention

Marie-Bénédicte Dembour





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521683074

© Marie-Bénédicte Dembour 2006

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2006

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

ISBN-13 978-0-521-68307-4 paperback ISBN-10 0-521-68307-6 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



> To Bob, again To Ellis too, of course To Françoise and all judges and lawyers like her



# General table of contents

	Acknowledgements	page xvii
	Table of cases	XX
	List of tables	xxvii
1	Introduction	1
2	The Convention in outline	19
3	The Convention in a realist light	30
4	The Convention in a utilitarian light	68
5	The Convention in a Marxist light	114
6	The Convention in a particularist light	155
7	The Convention in a feminist light	188
8	The human rights creed in four schools	232
9	Conclusion: In praise of human rights nihilism	272
	Appendices	278
	Select Bibliography	285
	Index	296



# Detailed table of contents

Acknowledgements

	8	1 0
	Table of cases	XX
	List of tables	xxvii
1	Introduction	1
Hu	man rights as an article of faith	1
The	e short-sightedness of the universal assertion	2
Pra	ctical and conceptual critiques of human rights	4
Lib	eral and non-liberal critiques of human rights	6
Lin	king the classical critiques to the Strasbourg human	8
	rights case law	
	aleidoscopic reading of the Convention	10
	t one, but several concepts of human rights	10 11
	The moral stance of human rights nihilism	
Nei	ther simply for nor against human rights	12
2	The Convention in outline	19
The	e work of the Council of Europe	19
The	e rights guaranteed by the Convention	20
Ger	neral principles of interpretation	21
The	e original mechanism of enforcement	22
	e current mechanism of enforcement: Protocol 11	24
The future mechanism of enforcement: Protocol 14		25
Cor	nclusion	26
3	The Convention in a realist light	30
The	'Anarchical Fallacies' denounced by Bentham the 'realist'	30
•	Look to the letter, you find nonsense'	32
•	The order of chaos'	33
•	Look beyond the letter, you find nothing'	34

page xvii



#### xii Detailed table of contents

The relative protection of the European Convention and the margin of appreciation	35
Negating the Convention system? Derogations under	37
Article 15	σ,
Realism in international relations: Virtuous or vicious	39
raison d'état?	
Comparing Bentham and IR realism	41
The creation of the doctrine of the margin of appreciation	41
in the First Cyprus Case	
Underlying political games: The Second Cyprus Case	44
Realism and the Convention: Forsythe versus Allott and Imbert	45
The position of the Court in cases involving Article 15	47
Aksoy: Both a realist and a supranational decision	49
No realism without idealism, and vice versa	53
Benhebba: The statism of the French judge versus the	54
idealism of other judges	
A Court ready to stand up to the state: The remarkable	56
examples of McCann and Selmouni	
Conclusion	58
4 The Convention in a utilitarian light	68
To affirm or not to affirm rights: Utilitarianism and its	69
liberal detractors	
The balance of interests in the Convention and the	70
proportionality test applied by the Court	
The margin of appreciation and the proportionality test:	71
Dudgeon versus James and Others	
'Rights as Trumps': The absolutism of Dworkin	73
Article 3 lays down a negative absolute obligation:	74
Selmouni's reiteration	
Relative or absolute protection under Article 8? The Court's	75
majority versus Judge De Meyer in Z v. Finland	
Consequentialism versus absolutism, and the law of double effect	78
The recognition of positive obligations by the Court:	78
Utilitarian logic or application of the law of double effect?	
Absolutism: Possibly utilitarian up to the point of transgression	81
Pretty: A mixture of absolutist and consequentialist logics	81
Soering: Going beyond the absolute obligation contained	85
in Article 3	
From negative to positive obligations: The loss of the	87
human rights core	



Detailed table of	f contents
'It all depends': From Bentham's felicific calculus to the	87
proportionality test of the Court	
The here and now of the casuistic approach of the Court:	90
Van Drooghenbroeck's critique	
Ever-changing context or permanent rules? The practical	91
resolution of the dilemma	
The moral limitation of the absolutist position: The example	92
of torture	
Av. United Kingdom: The devastating consequences of an	93
absolute privilege	
What the general interest does not require: The erosion of	95
civil liberties during the War on Terror	
Chassagnou: Where is the general interest?	97
Jersild: 'The individual versus the state' as a	99
fallacious dichotomy	
Conclusion	102
5 The Convention in a Marxist light	114
'On the Jewish Question': The denunciation of bourgeois rights	114
Does the Convention serve selfish man? Cosado Coca	116
versus Ianowski	110
Balibar and Lefort: The man is the citizen	119
Sunday Times and Janowski: Which interests are being pursued?	119
'On the Jewish Question' as a Marxian text	121
The rich more equal than the poor at Strasbourg?	121
Morvai's account	122
Gaining procedural efficiency: At the cost of bureaucratic	125
twitching?	123
Dragoi and the thousands and thousands of forgotten cases:	127
The indecency of the Strasbourg procedures	127
,	130
The legally-legal issues which retain the attention of the Court The persisting ignorance of racial discrimination by the Court:	
The false promise of <i>Nachova</i>	133
•	120
The capitalist foundation of the ECHR: Messochoritis and	138
the whole case law	120
Human emancipation: Found neither in human rights nor,	138
of course, in the Stalinist gulag	1.40
Thompson and Lefort: A valuable rule of law even in the face	140
of objectionable legal rules	
Ipek: Law is not just a sham	142
Conclusion	144



#### xiv Detailed table of contents

6 The Convention in a particularist light	155
The AAA Statement of 1947: An outdated view of culture	156
Cultural relativism: An embarrassing doctrine but also a valuable legacy	157
Handyside: The margin of appreciation as – seemingly – an expression of cultural relativism	159
Masquerading as an expression of cultural relativism: The abuse of the cultural argument	162
The real problem with cultural relativism: The tolerance of the intolerable $-T$ v. <i>United Kingdom</i>	163
The good side and inescapability of cultural relativism	165
Delcourt versus Borgers: Inaction versus action, or when is action required?	166
Johnston: An unfortunate cultural relativist application	168
The gloss of universalism in the application of Article 3 of the Convention: <i>Tyrer</i>	170
Rethinking the terms of the opposition: Universalism versus particularism	176
A brief but crucial point: Universalism is a doctrine too	178
Oscillating between universalism and particularism	
Conclusion	179
7 The Convention in a feminist light	188
Feminism and feminisms	189
The feminist liberal agenda: Working for sex equality	190
The presence of female judges at Strasbourg	191
Championing the equality of the sexes since ABC	192
What's in a name: Burghartz	193
The shortcomings of the 'Add Women and Stir' liberal approach	194
The woman's voice feminist agenda: Calling for women to be recognized as different from men	195
Is a distinctly female voice heard within the Court? An open question	196
Buckley and Chapman: Applicants who are mothers	197
The radical feminist agenda: Getting rid of patriarchy	201
A disappointing record on rape: X and Y, SW, Aydin and Stubbings	202
The right to have an abortion: Neither in the Convention	206



Detailed table	of contents
Women's 'non-feminist' choices: False consciousness or essentialism?	210
The post-modern feminist critique: Recognizing women	211
as different from one another	
When the Other is ignored: Karaduman and Dahlab	212
What is not in a name: The simply and shockingly	213
inadmissible <i>Halimi</i>	
Airey: An amazingly progressive judgment	215
Conclusion	218
8 The human rights creed in four schools	232
Wittgenstein's concept of 'family resemblance'	233
Human rights approached through a family	234
resemblance matrix	
The soothing or unsettling effect of the universality	236
of human rights: Donnelly versus Haarscher	
Haarscher's human rights vision: Asceticism or evangelism?	237
The foundational case law on transsexualism	238
Van Kück's 'normalization' from the perspective of the	241
natural and the protest schools	
Can we have human rights? The responses of the natural	243
and protest scholars	
Can human rights law embody human rights? The responses	244
of the natural and protest scholars	
Both natural and protest scholars believe in human rights	246
What is the basis of human rights? The response of the	246
natural scholars	
What is the basis of human rights? The response of the	247
protest scholars	
Those who do not believe in, but are committed to,	248
human rights: The deliberative scholars	
Those who are sceptical of human rights: The	249
discourse scholars	
Mapping the schools	253
Who's who: Naming some representatives of each school	253
Moving within the liberal and the non-liberal schools	258
The concept of human rights: Spun by the four schools	260
	200
9 Conclusion: In praise of human rights nihilism	272
The appeal of the critique(s) of human rights	272
Challenging the orthodoxy: In Nietzsche's footsteps	273
Why be afraid of human rights nihilism?	274



#### xvi Detailed table of contents

Appendix 1	278
Appendix 2	283
Select bibliography	285
Index	296



# Acknowledgements

This book has been a long time in gestation. Its academic origin can be traced to my having been asked to teach 'Human and Civil Rights' on my arrival at the University of Sussex in 1991. The personal debts I have accumulated since then are enormous, varied and numerous. The task of remembering all the friends, colleagues and students who have been generous with their help is daunting. I have tried, but must offer my apologies to anyone I may have forgotten at the moment of writing these words.

At Sussex, three people clearly stand out: Jane Cowan (Social Anthropology), Emily Haslam (Law, now Kent) and Neil Stammers (Politics). Jane, my friend since our common induction day in 1991, has been privy to the development of this project through our too infrequent visits to the local pub. Being able to take for granted her emotional support and her intellectual trust has been extremely valuable. Emily has been the first person to read a draft of any passage which can be found in this book. Her unmitigated enthusiasm, her honest reactions and her obvious confidence in the final product always spurred me to continue trying. Neil read the next version after Emily. He enlightened me on many aspects of political theory over necessarily long lunches and saved me from publishing more than one erroneous statement.

I have been helped by many other people at Sussex. Craig Barker (Law), Jo Bridgeman (Law), Elizabeth Craig (Law), Zdenek Kavan (International Relations), Charlotte Skeet (Law), Martin Shaw (International Relations) and Richard Wilson (Social Anthropology, now Connecticut) have read one chapter or another. Students have helped me to identify problems and formulate my positions. Matthias Hinderer (former MA in Human Rights), Mark Jordan (former LLM in International Criminal Law) and Trine Lester (former MA in Migration Studies) have commented on several chapters. My former secretary Amanda Collins, author of a book published by University of Michigan Press, never tired of discussing arguments, structures and titles even after she left Sussex. Cherry Horwill brought the meticulousness of her librarianship skills to the editing of the text. Christopher Gane (former Director of the School of Legal Studies, now Aberdeen) and Malcolm Ross (current Head of the Sussex Law School) must be acknowledged for their full support - as well as, in Christopher's case, for having

xvii



xviii Acknowledgements

opened my mind in the early 1990s to the richness of the Strasbourg case law. I have presented individual chapters at various research seminars, especially but not only at Sussex, and have invariably benefited from the reactions of the audiences.

In the course of writing the book, I have called upon a number of scholars whose advice has proved infinitely precious. Bill Bowring (Law, London Metropolitan) has supported the project from beginning to end and has shared with me his ECHR expertise. Louis Wolcher (Law, Washington) took an interest in my project when I first presented it at the Critical Legal Conference of 2001 and has given me invaluable leads whenever I have called upon him. Upendra Baxi (Law, Warwick) became an inestimable correspondent after I met him at a conference in 2003. Right from the start, Gerd Baumann (Anthropology, Amsterdam) encouraged the development of this project. He too became enlisted in reading several chapters. Referring to Wittgenstein's family resemblance concept drew me to call back on Thomas Spitzley (Philosophy, Duisburg), who provided me with punctilious comments on Chapter 8. Serge Gutwirth (Law, Vrije Universiteit Brussel) read some sections of the book. Various people have supplied references and facts, including Kevin Boyle (Law, Essex), Vincent Decroly, Jacqueline Hodgson (Law, Warwick), Heather Keating (Law, Sussex), Philip Leach (Law, London Metropolitan) and Colin Samson (Sociology, Essex). I had the good fortune to be supported at the outset of this project by Brian Simpson (Law, Michigan) and Chris Brown (International Relations, LSE). Towards its end, William Twining (Law, UCL), the editor of the series in which the book is published, sent me penetrating comments, the implications of which I feel I still need to work out. This leads me to stress, more generally, that none of the individuals mentioned in these pages should be held responsible for any error or weakness of judgement or argument from which the book may suffer.

Given my Belgian origin, I had thought it would be a good idea to meet the Belgian judge at the European Court of Human Rights. What I had not been expecting was to be invited to be on tutoiement terms immediately (using 'tu' rather than 'vous'!), being offered the keys of her flat in her absence and being encouraged to carry on an intellectual exchange. Françoise Tulkens offered both general and specific comments on drafts of virtually the whole book. My thanks go to her for her warmth, generosity and intellectual engagement. Françoise is not the only exceptional person I have met at the Court. I wish to single out Magda Mierzewska, from the Registry, with whom I have had the good fortune to coauthor two articles and who also read some chapters. Unfortunately I shall merely list the other people I have met at Strasbourg alphabetically in order to avoid increasingly impossible refinements. In the course of four periods of one week I have spent at Strasbourg between July 2001 and April 2003, I was privileged to meet the following judges: Corneliu Bîrsan (Romanian), Giovanni Bonello (Maltese), Josep Casadevall (Andorran), Jean-Paul Costa (French), Marc Fischbach (Luxembourger), Lech Garlicki (Polish), Hanne Sophie Greve (Norwegian),



Acknowledgements

xix

Anatoly Kovler (Russian), Wilhelmina Thomassen (Dutch) and Boštjan Zupančič (Slovenian); the following members of the Registry: Anna Austin, Michaele de Salvia, Anne Gillet, Roderick Liddel, Paul Mahoney, Nico Moll, Klaudiusj Ryngielewicz and Wolfgang Strasser; and other individuals from various sections of the Council of Europe, including Andrew Drzemczewski, Pierre-Henri Imbert, Heinrich Klebes, Simon Palmer, Sonia Parayre, Fredrik Sundberg and Tatiana Termacic. I met further people who enlightened me on aspects of the Convention or the Council of Europe not directly relevant to this book and whom I hope to be able to thank in separate publications. Sylvie Ruffenach, Françoise's secretary, has facilitated my research. Nora Binder and Delphine De Angelis, the librarians of the Court's library, have been generous with their time and skills. Laurent Viotti (External Relations) facilitated my first visit to the Court.

Staff at Cambridge University Press, including Finola O'Sullivan, Jane O'Regan and Jayne Aldhouse, have been exemplarily helpful and efficient. Laurence Marsh, who copy-edited the book, suggested the term 'reflections' for the subtitle.

This book would not have been possible without the financial support of a number of institutions. I am grateful to the Leverhulme Trust for a part-time Research Fellowship in 2001–2003 during which the bulk of this book was written, the AHRC for a study leave in the summer of 2004, and the University of Sussex for a study leave in the spring of 2004. My gratitude also goes to the European University Institute, Florence, for a Jean Monnet Fellowship in January–June 1995 during which I started to think about 'The Idea of Human Rights'.

The book owes a lot to my son Ellis, now six, whose arrival led me to devise a research project which would involve relatively little travelling. It also owes much to his father, Bob Morton, my companion of ten years. Bob has been the source of the love and balance without which I could not have worked effectively. He too has read many chapters. He is also the person whom anyone should thank if they find the style accessible and appreciate, amongst other things, the sparse use of 'quotation marks' which, unrestrained, my post-modern self would have put everywhere in the text.



# Table of cases, with information on sources

All the cases listed below have been decided by the European Court (or former Commission) of Human Rights. They consist of judgments except when otherwise indicated – as reports of the Commission or decisions of admissibility.

Each reference comprises the name of the case, application number, date of the judgment or decision, location of the official report (when available) and publication in the *European Human Rights Reports* of Sweet and Maxwell (when available). The official reporting was in Series A Nos. 1–338 until 1996 and in the *Reports of Judgments and Decisions* between 1996 and 1998. Since 1999, it takes place in the Reports cited by the Court as ECHR.

Whether reported or not, all judgments and decisions of the Court can be freely accessed on http://www.echr.coe.int/echr by searching the Court's HUDOC database.

```
A and Others v. Secretary of State for the Home Department [2004] UKHL 56, [2005] 3 All ER 169, [2004] EWCA Civ 1123, [2004] All ER (D) 62 page 64, 111
```

A v. United Kingdom (Application 25599/94) 23 September 1998, RJD 1998-VI, (1999) 27 EHRR 611 185

A ν. United Kingdom (Application 35373/97) 17 December 2002, ECHR 2002-X, (2002) 36 EHRR 917 93–5, 110, 229

Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali *v.* United Kingdom (Applications 9473/81 and 9474/81) 28 May 1985, Series A, No 94, (1985) 7 EHRR 471 135, 151, 192–3, 194, 222

Ahmed v. Austria (Application 25964/94) 17 December 1996, RJD 1996-VI 2195, (1997) 24 EHRR 278 108

Airey v. Ireland (Application 6289/73) 9 October 1979, Series A, No 32, (1979–1980) 2 EHRR 305 27, 215–18, 230

Aksoy v. Turkey (Application 21987/93) 26 November 1996, RJD 1996-VI, (1997) 23 EHHR 553 49–53, 58, 65

Anguelova v. Bulgaria (Application 38361/97) 13 June 2002, ECHR 2002-IV, (2004) 38 EHRR 31 134–5, 150



Table of cases

xxi

```
Aydin v. Turkey (Application 23173/94) 25 September 1997, RJD 1997-VI, (1998)
                    202, 203, 204-5, 226, 227, 231
  25 EHRR 251
B v. France (Application 13343/87) 25 March 1992, Series A, No 232-C, (1993)
  16 EHRR 1
                 239, 240, 265
Baghli v. France (Application 34374/97) 30 novembre 1999, ECHR
Bankovic v. Belgium and Others (Application 52207/00), decision of
  12 December 2001
Benhebba v. France (Application 53441/99) 10 July 2003
                                                         54–5, 56, 58, 66
Borgers v. Belgium (Application 12005/86), 30 October 1991, Series A,
  No 214, (1993) 15 EHRR 92
                                 167-8, 184
Bowman v. United Kingdom (Application 24839/94) 19 February 1998, RJD 1998
                              65, 207, 208-9, 228, 229
  I-175, (1998) 26 EHRR 1
Brannigan and McBride v. United Kingdom (Application 14553/89 and 14554/
  89), 26 May 1993, Series A, No 258-B, (1994) 17 EHRR 539
                                                               48, 50-1,
Brogan and Others v. United Kingdom (Applications 11209/84, 11266/84,
  and 11365/85), 29 November 1988, Series A, No 145-B, (1989)
  11 EHRR 117
                   48, 64
Buckley v. United Kingdom (Application 20348/92), 25 September 1996,
  RJD 1996-IV 1271, (1997) 23 EHRR 101
                                            197-9, 210, 223
Bulut (Lamiye) v. Turkey (Application 18783/91) decision of 3 May 1993
                                                                        230
Burghartz v. Switzerland (Application 16213/90), 22 February 1994,
  Series A No 280-B, (1994) 18 EHHR 101
                                            193-4, 214, 215, 222
Campbell and Cosans v. United Kingdom (Applications 7511/76 and
  7743/76) 25 February 1982, Series A, No 48, (1982) 4 EHRR 293
                                                                    185, 186
Casado Coca v. Spain (Application 15450/89) 24 February 1994,
  Series A no 285-A, (1994) 18 EHRR 1
                                          117–18, 146
Casalta v. France (Application 58906/00) 12 October 2004
                                                           184
Chahal v. United Kingdom (Application 22414/93) 15 November 1996,
  RJD 1996-V 1831, (1997) 23 EHRR 413
                                            108
Chapman v. United Kingdom (Application 24882/94) 18 January 2001, ECHR
                                197, 199–201, 218, 223
  2001-I, (2001) 33 EHRR 18
Chassagnou and Others v. France (Applications 25088/94, 28331/95 and
  28443/95) 29 April 1999, ECHR 1999-III, (2000) 29 EHRR 615
                                                                  97-9, 111
Chesnay v. France (Application 56588/00) 12 October 2004
Connors v. United Kingdom (Application 66746/01) 27 May 2004, (2005)
  40 EHRR 9
Cossey v. United Kingdom (Application 10843/84) 27 September 1990, Series A,
```

241, 265

No 184, (1991) 13 EHRR 622



#### xxii Table of cases

Costello-Roberts v. United Kingdom (Application 13134/87) 23 February 1993, Series A, No 247-C, (1995) 19 EHRR 112 185, 186 CR v. United Kingdom, 22 November 1995 225 Cyprus v. Turkey (Application 25781/94) 10 May 2001, ECHR 2001-IV, (2002) 35 EHRR 30 D v. Ireland (Application 26499/02) 228 Dahlab v. Switzerland (Application 42393/98) decision of 15 February 212, 213, 230 De Becker v. Belgium (Application 214/56) 27 March 1962, Series A, No 4, (1962) 1 EHRR 43 104 Delcourt v. Belgium (Application 2689/65) 17 January 1970, Series A, No 11, (1979–80) 1 EHRR 355 167, 168, 184 Demir and Others v. Turkey (Applications 21380/93, 21381/93, 21383/93) 23 September 1998, ECHR 1998-VI, (2001) 33 EHRR 43 Dudgeon v. United Kingdom (Application 7525/76) 22 October 1981, Series A, No 45, (1983) 5 EHRR 573 71-2, 75-6, 77, 104 East African Asians v. United Kingdom (Applications 4403/70–4419/70, 4422/70, 4434/70, 4443/70, 4476/70–4478/70, 4486/70, 4501/70 and 4526/70–4530/70) 14 December 1973, (1981) 3 EHRR 76 150 Enhorn v. Sweden (Application 56529/00) 25 January 2005, (2005) 41 EHRR 30 Eriksson and Goldschmidt v. Sweden (Application 14573/89) decision of 9 November 1989 Ezzouhdi v. France (Application 41760/99) 13 February 2001 55, 66 Gisèle Taïeb dite Halimi v. France (Application 50614/99) decision of 214, 215, 230 20 March 2001 Goodwin (Christine) v. United Kingdom (Application 28957/95) 11 July 2002, ECHR 2002-VI, (2002) 35 EHRR 18 241, 265 Greece v. United Kingdom, (Application 175/56), report of 26 September 1958 41-4, 47, 62, 65, 184 (First Cyprus case) Greece v. United Kingdom (Application 299/57), report of 8 July 1959 (Second Cyprus case) 44-5, 62, 63 Gregory v. United Kingdom (Application 22299/93) 25 February 1997, RJD 1997-I 296, (1997) 25 EHRR 577 132, 150 H v. Norway (Application 17004/90) decision of 19 May 1992 Handyside v. United Kingdom (Application 5493/72) 7 December 1976,

162, 163, 182, 184

Series A, No 24, (1979–1980) 1 EHRR 737

27, 37, 41, 61, 159–61,



Table of cases xxiii

```
HLR v. France (Application 24573/94) 29 April 1997, RJD 1997-III, (1998)
  26 EHRR 29
Hoffmann v. Germany, (Application 34045/96) 11 October 2001
                                                                 223
I v. United Kingdom, (Application 25680/94) 11 July 2002
Ipek v. Turkey (Application 25760/94) 17 February 2004, ECHR
  2004-II
              142-3, 154
Ireland v. United Kingdom (Application 5310/71) 18 January 1978, Series A,
  No 25, (1979–1980) 2 EHRR 25
                                     48, 51, 57, 64, 75, 105, 108, 110
Isayeva, Yusupova and Bazayeva v. Russia (Applications 57947/00, 57948/00
  and 57949/00) 24 February 2005
                                      148
Isayeva v. Russia (Application 57950/00) 24 February 2005
                                                            148
Jabari v. Turkey (Application 40035/98) 11 July 2000, ECHR 2000-VIII
James and Others v. United Kingdom (Application 8793/79) 21 February 1986,
  Series A, No 98, (1986) 8 EHRR 123
                                       71, 72–3, 104
Janowski v. Poland (Application 25716/94) 21 January 1999, ECHR 1999-I,
  (2000) 29 EHRR 705
                           117, 118, 120, 146
Jersild v. Denmark (Application 15890/8) 23 September 1994, Series A,
  No 298, (1995) 19 EHRR 1
                                100-2, 112, 137, 152
Johnston and Others v. Ireland (Application 9697/82) 18 December 1986,
  Series A, No 112, (1987) 9 EHRR 203
                                         168–70, 183
Karaduman v. Turkey (Application 16278/90) decision of 3 May
           212-13, 230
Khashiyev and Akayeva v. Russia (Applications 57942/00 and 57945/00)
  24 February 2005
                       148
Lafaysse v. France (Application 63059/00) 12 October 2004
Lawless v. Ireland (No 3) (Application 323/57) 1 July 1961, Series A, No 3,
  (1979-1980) 1 EHRR 15
                              47, 49, 64
Loizidou v. Turkey (Application 15318/89) 18 December 1996, RJD
  1996-VI 2216, (1997) 23 EHRR 513
Maaouia v. France (Application 39652/98) 5 October 2000,
  ECHR 2000-X, (2001) 33 EHRR 42
                                        131-2, 149
McCann and Others v. United Kingdom (Application 18984/91)
  27 September 1995, Series A, No 324, (1996) 21 EHRR 97
Manickavasagam Suresh v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)
  and Attorney General of Canada, 11 January 2002, Supreme Court of
  Canada
Marckx v. Belgium (Application 6833/74) 13 June 1979, Series A, No 31,
  (1970–1980) 2 EHRR 330 27, 79–80, 107
```



#### xxiv Table of cases

Messochoritis v. Greece (Application 41867/98) 12 April 2001 138, 153

Mokrani v. France (Application 52206/99) 15 July 2003, (2005)
40 EHRR 5 55

Moldovan and Others (No 2) v. Romania, 12 July 2005 151

Müller and Others v. Switzerland (Application 10737/84) 24 May 1988,
Series A, No 133, (1991) 13 EHRR 212 146

Nachova and Others v. Bulgaria (Applications 43577/98 and 43579/98)
26 February 2004, (2004) 39 EHRR 37 133–4, 135–7, 143, 150

Naumouv v. Albania (Application 10513/03) decision of 4 January 2005

Nuray Sen v. Turkey (Application 41478/98) 17 June 2003 65

Odièvre  $\nu$ . France (Application 42326/98) 13 February 2003, ECHR 2003-III, (2004) 38 EHRR 43 106, 110, 207, 209–10, 228 Open Door Counselling and Dublin Well Woman  $\nu$ . Ireland (Applications

Open Door Counselling and Dublin Well Woman v. Ireland (Applications 14234/88 and 14253/88) 29 October 1992, Series A, No 246, (1993) 15 EHRR 244 206, 207–8, 210, 228, 229

Otto Preminger Institut *v.* Austria (Application 13470/87) 20 September 1994, Series A, No 295-A, (1995) 19 EHRR 34 110, 146

Petrovic v. Austria (Application 20458/92) 27 March 1998, RJD 1998-II 67, (2001) 33 EHRR 14 222

Phull *v.* France (Application 35753/03) decision of 11 January 2005 230 Pretty *v.* United Kingdom (Application 2346/02) 29 April 2002, ECHR 2002-III, (2002) 35 EHRR 1 81–5, 107

Rasmussen v. Denmark (Application 8777/79) 28 November 1984, Series A, No 87, (1985) 7 EHRR 371 223

Rees v. United Kingdom (Application 9532/81) 17 October 1986, Series A, No 106, (1987) 9 EHRR 56 240, 241, 265

Remli v. France (Application 16839/90) 23 April 1996, RJD 1996-II 8, (1996) 22 EHRR 253 150

Roetjheim v. Germany (Application 31177/96) decision of 23 October 1997 265

Sahin (Leyla) v. Turkey (Application 44774/98) 29 June 2004, (2005) 4 EHRR 8 230

Sahin v. Germany (Application 30943/96) 11 October 2001, ECHR 2003-VII, (2003) 36 EHRR 43 223

Sakik and Others v. Turkey (Applications 23878/94, 23879/94, 23880/94, 23881/94, 23882/94 and 23883/94) 26 November 1997, RJD 1997-VII 58, (1998) 26 EHRR 662 65



Table of cases x

XXV

Sander ν. United Kingdom (Application 34129/96) 9 May 2000, ECHR 2000-V, (2001) 31 EHRR 44 131, 132, 133, 137, 150

Selmouni v. France (Application 25803/94) 28 July 1999, ECHR 1999-V, (2000) 29 EHRR 403 57–8, 67, 75, 96, 105, 205, 227

Sheffield and Horsham v. United Kingdom (Applications 22985/93 and 23390/94) 30 July 1998, RJD 1998-V 2011, (1999) 27 EHRR 163 265

Soering v. United Kingdom (Application 14038/88) 7 July 1989, Series A, No 161, (1989) 11 EHRR 439 85–7, 107

Somjee v. United Kingdom (Application 42116/98) 15 October 2002, (2003) 36 EHRR 16 152

Sommerfeld *v.* Germany (Application 31871/96) 11 October 2001, ECHR 2003-VIII, (2004) 38 EHRR 35 223

Steel and Morris v. UK (Application 68416/01) 15 February 2005, (2005) 41 EHRR 22 149

Stubbings and Others v. United Kingdom (Application 22083/93) 22 October 1996, RJD 1996-IV, (1997) 23 EHRR 213 202, 205–6, 226

Sunday Times v. United Kingdom (No 1) (Application 6538/74) 26 April 1979, Series A, No 30, (1979–1980) 2 EHRR 245 119–20, 146

SW v. United Kingdom (Application 20166/92) 22 November 1995, Series A, No 355-B, (1996) 21 EHRR 363 202–3, 204, 225

T v. United Kingdom (Application 24724/94) 16 December 1999, ECHR 1999-IX, (2000) 30 EHRR 121 164–5, 183

Tokarczyk v. Poland (Application 51792/99) decision of 31 January 2002 207, 209, 228

Tyrer v. United Kingdom (Application 5856/72) 25 April 1978, Series A, No 26, (1979–1980) 2 EHRR 1 27, 110, 171–6, 185

Tysiac v. Poland (Application 5410/03) 228

Unabhängige Initiative Informationsvielfalt v. Austria (Application 28525/95) 26 February 2002, ECHR 2002-I, (2003) 37 EHRR 33 152

V v. United Kingdom (Application 24888/94) 16 November 1999, ECHR 1999-IX, (2000) 30 EHRR 121 183

Van Kück v. Germany (Application 35968/97) 12 June 2003, ECHR 2003-VII, (2003) 37 EHRR 51 241–2, 265

Van Oosterwijck v. Belgium (Application 7654/76), 6 November 1980, Series A, No 40, (1981) 3 EHRR 357 107, 265

Van Raalte v. Netherlands (Application 20060/92) 21 February 1997, RJD 1997-I, (1997) 24 EHRR 503 222

Vilvarajah and Others v. United Kingdom (Applications 13163/87, 13164/87 13165/87, 13447/87 and 13448/87) 30 September 1991, Series A, No 215, (1992) 14 EHRR 248 108



#### xxvi Table of cases

Wingrove v. United Kingdom (Application 17419/90) 25 November 1996, RJD 1996-V, (1997) 24 EHRR 1 146

- X, Y and Z v. United Kingdom (Application 21830/93) 22 April 1997, RJD 1997-II 619, (1997) 24 EHRR 143 241, 265
- X and Y v. Netherlands (Application 8978/80) 16 March 1985, Series A, No 91, (1986) 8 EHRR 235 108, 202, 203–4, 225
- Z v. Finland (Application 22009/93) 25 February 1997, RJD 1997-I, (1997) 25 EHRR 371 76–8, 86, 99–100, 105, 108



### List of tables

Table 1	How the four schools approach human rights	page 254
Table 2	The four schools' broad characteristics	255
Table 3	The relative position of the schools in the	
	human rights field	255
Table 4 (Appendix 2)	Voting pattern of judges	284

XXVII