

European Non-Discrimination Law

A Comparison of EU Law and the ECHR in the Field of
Non-Discrimination and Freedom of Religion in Public Employment
with an Emphasis on the Islamic Headscarf Issue

SCHOOL OF HUMAN RIGHTS RESEARCH SERIES, Volume 59.

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

European Non-Discrimination Law

A Comparison of EU Law and the ECHR in the Field of
Non-Discrimination and Freedom of Religion in Public Employment
with an Emphasis on the Islamic Headscarf Issue

Sarah Haverkort-Speekenbrink



Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd
Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road
Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 393 753 | mail@intersentia.co.uk

Sarah Haverkort-Speekenbrink
European Non-Discrimination Law
A Comparison of EU Law and the ECHR in the Field of Non-Discrimination and Freedom
of Religion in Public Employment with an Emphasis on the Islamic Headscarf Issue

ISBN 978-1-78068-126-9
D/2012/7849/110
NUR 828

© Cover image: [iStockphoto.com/caracterdesign](https://www.istockphoto.com/caracterdesign)

Typesetting: G.J. Wiarda Institute for Legal Research, Utrecht University

© 2012 Intersentia
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing is sculpting with words. I have always enjoyed the process of writing. This enjoyment has been the common thread throughout my law studies and work. This research gave me the opportunity to combine my studies, working experience and personal interest. I am happy to express my appreciation and gratitude to the following persons.

I could not have carried out this research without my supervisor Professor Titia Loenen. Her involvement was invaluable to this research. I am thankful for her support and confidence. I much appreciated her insightfulness and working method. I am also much indebted to Dr. Susanne Burri. Her comments on this book were very helpful and supportive. Furthermore, my appreciation is extended to the members of the reading committee, Professor Eva Brems, Dr. Antoine Buyse, Professor Janneke Gerards, Professor Linda Senden and Professor Christa Tobler for reading my dissertation and providing their commentaries thereon.

This research was carried out at Utrecht University's Netherlands Institute of Human Rights (SIM). It has been an excellent and inspiring environment to engage in research and write the book. I want to thank the Director of SIM, Professor Jenny Goldschmidt, for her support and involvement. I am further indebted to my other SIM colleagues, especially my fellow PhD candidates Ramona Biholar, Diana Contreras Garduno, Marie-Elske van Gispén, Masha Fedorova, Katherine Fortin, Jayshree Mangubhai, Brianne McGonigle Leyh, Hana van Ooijen, René Rouwette and Marthe Lot Vermeulen. It was not always an easy task to access materials from Ethiopia and the support of the SIM Librarians Saskia Bal and Maaïke Hogenkamp made this easier. I am grateful for the assistance of Hanneke van Denderen, Esther Heldenbergh and Marcella Kiel. I am also grateful to Peter Morris for the English editing, Henk Zonneveld for his help with Refworks and Klaartje Hoeberechts for the layout. I am thankful for the support during my move to Ethiopia provided by Kathelijin Korver.

I benefited a great deal from the experience I gained at the Council of State and the EU Agency of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This experience contributed to my ambition to carry out this research and write this book.

In the summer of 2011 I moved to Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The transition was enormous. The benefit of electricity and the internet for my computer was no longer an assumption. It was felt as a gift when there was "light", as Ethiopians call it. The difficulties required me to be flexible and resulted in unexpected solutions. Who would have known that I could attach a car battery to my laptop so that I could work

Acknowledgements

a few more hours? I want to thank the consultancy firm Fair & Sustainable Ethiopia, in particular Paul Weijers, for hosting me in their office. The working environment accommodated the lonely feeling of writing this book in Ethiopia. I have been blessed with a cheerful group of friends in Ethiopia.

I am grateful that I have such good friends, in particular Maartje Hensen, Imke Hoefnagels, Samantha van Os, Nicole Ganzevles-Verwiel, Allard Ganzevles, Frodo van Oostveen, Hanke Verspaget, Tanja Oele-Essers, Wim Oele, Lukas van den Heuvel, Christie Veldhuizen and Sjoerd Gallmann. I want to devote special consideration to my late friend Marieke van den Heuvel-Wessels, who taught me to enjoy life every day. Her strength, humour and perseverance have been an enormous inspiration to me.

I am deeply indebted to my parents Maarten and Joke Speekenbrink for always being there for me. I am thankful for my brother Thomas Speekenbrink and Anne-Marie Broekhuisen. Further, I want to thank Bertus and Berna Haverkort, Annegien and Wouter Dessing, Teun Haverkort and Yvon Muller for their support.

Finally, I want to express my gratefulness, respect and acknowledgement to my husband Harm Haverkort. I thank him for his unconditional love and support. I could not have written this dissertation without his continuous patience, encouragement and positivity. This book is dedicated to Harm and our beautiful son Teun.

Sarah Haverkort-Speekenbrink
Addis Ababa, August 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
List of Abbreviations	xvii

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 The Islamic Headscarf Controversy in Europe	3
1.2 European Supervision	5
1.3 Objective, Research Question and Delimitation	7
1.4 Methodology	14
1.5 A Legal Case Study: The Islamic Headscarf Case	17
1.5.1 The Purpose for using a Legal Case Study	17
1.5.2 The Islamic Headscarf Case	19
1.6 The European Regimes and their Terminology	20
1.6.1 The EU, the ECJ and the Preliminary Ruling Procedure	20
1.6.2 The CoE, the ECtHR and the Complaint Procedure	23
1.7 Structure and Sub-Questions	24

PART I EU NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW

Chapter 2 The EU Protection against Discrimination on Grounds of Sex, Race and Religion

2.1 Introduction	29
2.2 The Position of Non-Discrimination Law: European Social Policy	30
2.3 The Road to Directives 2006/54, 2000/43 and 2000/78	33
2.3.1 The Development of Protection against Sex Discrimination	33
2.3.2 The Development of Protection against Race Discrimination	35
2.3.3 The Development of Protection against Religious Discrimination	38
2.4 Some Features of Directives 2006/54, 2000/43 and 2000/78	39
2.4.1 A Specific Type of EU Legislation: Directives	39

2.4.2	The Concepts of Discrimination: Direct and Indirect Discrimination	39
2.4.2.1	Direct Discrimination	40
2.4.2.2	Indirect Discrimination	42
2.4.3	The Scope of Application of the Directives	44
2.4.3.1	Personal Scope of Application	44
2.4.3.2	Material Scope of Application	45
2.5	Conclusion	46

Chapter 3 The ECJ's Assessment of Sex, Race and Religious Discrimination in Public Employment

3.1	Introduction	49
3.2	The ECJ's Assessment Model: Direct or Indirect Discrimination?	50
3.2.1	The Importance of the Point of Departure	50
3.2.2	The ECJ's Approach	51
3.3	Different Treatment in Cases of Direct Discrimination	53
3.4	Different Treatment in Cases of Indirect Discrimination	55
3.4.1	The Disparate Impact Test of Directives 2006/54, 2000/43 and 2000/78	57
3.4.2	A Statistical or Quantitative Approach	60
3.4.2.1	The Issue of Data	60
3.4.2.2	The Selection of the Pool of Comparators	61
3.4.2.3	Determining Disparate Impact: Reading the Relevant Statistics	63
3.4.3	A Non-Statistical or Qualitative Approach	65
3.5	Justification for Direct Discrimination	67
3.5.1	The Genuine Occupational Requirement (GOR) Exception	68
3.5.2	The Exception of Article 2(5): Necessary in a Democratic Society	70
3.6	Justification for Indirect Discrimination	72
3.6.1	The Legitimate Aim Test	73
3.6.2	The Proportionality Test	75
3.7	The Intensity of the ECJ's Assessment of Proportionality	77
3.8	The Principle of Subsidiarity	80
3.9	Factors that Influence the Intensity of the ECJ's Assessment	82
3.9.1	The Formulation of the Preliminary Question	82
3.9.2	The Field of Law or the Policy Field and the Aim of the Measure	83
3.9.3	Consensus in the EU Member States	85
3.9.4	The Non-Discrimination Ground	85
3.10	Conclusion	85

Chapter 4 The ECJ and the Islamic Headscarf Case

4.1	Introduction	89
4.2	The Possible Legal Approaches of the ECJ: Religion, Sex and/or Race	90
4.3	The Question of Direct or Indirect Discrimination	94
4.4	Is there Different Treatment on Grounds of Religion?	96
4.4.1	Indirect Discrimination: the Disparate Impact Test	96
4.4.2	Direct Discrimination: the Comparability Test	99
4.5	Is there Different Treatment on Grounds of Sex?	100
4.6	Is there Different Treatment on Grounds of Race?	101
4.7	Justifying the Ban on Conspicuous Symbols in Public Employment	102
4.7.1	The Aims of the Ban on Conspicuous Symbols in the Public Workplace	102
4.7.2	The Proportionality Question	104
4.7.2.1	The ECJ's Strictness of Review in the Islamic Headscarf Case	106
4.7.2.2	Appropriateness	111
4.7.2.3	Necessity	113
4.7.2.4	Proportionality <i>Stricto Sensu</i>	114
4.7.3	Is the Ban on Conspicuous Symbols Necessary in a Democratic Society?	115
4.8	Conclusion	116

PART II THE RIGHTS TO NON-DISCRIMINATION AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION IN THE ECHR AND THE ECtHR'S ASSESSMENT

Chapter 5 The Rights to Non-Discrimination and Freedom of Religion in the ECHR

5.1	Introduction	121
5.2	The Open-Ended Structure of Article 14 ECHR	122
5.3	The Open-Ended List of Non-Discrimination Grounds	123
5.4	The Scope of Application of Article 14 ECHR	125
5.4.1	The Accessory Character of Article 14 ECHR	126
5.4.2	Protection against Discrimination in the Field of Public Employment	128
5.5	Protocol no. 12: A General Non-Discrimination Clause	131
5.6	The Right to Freedom of Religion in the ECHR	135
5.6.1	Forum Internum and Forum Externum	136
5.6.2	The Demonstration of Interference	137

5.6.3	Justifications for Limiting Religious Manifestations	138
5.6.3.1	Prescribed by Law	139
5.6.3.2	A Legitimate Aim	140
5.6.3.3	Necessary in a Democratic Society	140
5.7	Conclusion	142

Chapter 6 The ECtHR's Assessment of Sex, Race and Religious Discrimination

6.1	Introduction	143
6.2	The General Assessment Model	144
6.3	The Development of the Concepts of Discrimination	145
6.4	The Test to Establish a Difference in Treatment	147
6.4.1	Direct Discrimination: A Comparability Test	147
6.4.2	Indirect Discrimination: A Disparate Impact Test	151
6.5	The Test to Establish an Objective and Reasonable Justification	154
6.5.1	The Assessment of the Legitimate Aim(s)	155
6.5.2	The Assessment of Proportionality	157
6.6	The Intensity of the ECtHR's Assessment of Proportionality	160
6.7	The Role of the Doctrine of the Margin of Appreciation	162
6.8	The Isolation of Factors that Influence the Intensity of the Assessment	166
6.8.1	The Ground of Distinction: Suspect and Non-Suspect Categories	167
6.8.2	The Absence or Presence of a European Consensus	171
6.8.3	Active or Passive Discrimination	173
6.8.4	The Field where the Difference in Treatment took place	173
6.8.5	The Weight of the Affected Right	174
6.9	Conclusion	174

Chapter 7 The ECtHR and the Islamic Headscarf Case

7.1	Introduction	177
7.2	The Islamic Headscarf Case and the Right to Freedom of Religion	178
7.2.1	Interference in Religious Manifestations	178
7.2.2	The Limitation Clause	179
7.2.2.1	The Legitimacy of the Aims of the Ban on Wearing Conspicuous Symbols	179
7.2.2.2	The Interest of Wearing an Islamic Headscarf v. the Need in a Democratic Society	180
7.3	The Islamic Headscarf Case and the Right not to be Discriminated Against	184
7.3.1	A Difference in Treatment	185

7.3.2	The Objective Justification Test	187
7.3.2.1	The Intensity of the ECtHR's Assessment in the Islamic Headscarf Case	188
7.3.2.2	Proportionality	189
7.4	Conclusion	189

PART III A COMPARISON OF TWO EUROPEAN REGIMES AND THEIR LEGAL APPROACH TO DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

Chapter 8 A Comparison of European Non-Discrimination Law

8.1	Introduction	193
8.2	Similarities and Differences in Structure	194
8.2.1	Detailed Framework v. General Framework	194
8.2.2	Non-Discrimination Grounds: Closed List v. Open-Ended List	195
8.2.3	Specific Exceptions v. the Objective Justification Clause	196
8.3	The Concepts of Discrimination	197
8.3.1	The Concepts of Direct and Indirect Discrimination	197
8.3.2	The Point of Departure of the Courts: Direct or Indirect Discrimination?	198
8.3.2.1	Direct Discrimination (EU) v. (Direct) Discrimination (ECHR)	199
8.3.2.2	Indirect Discrimination (EU) v. Indirect Discrimination (ECHR)	200
8.3.2.3	Indirect Discrimination (EU) v. (Direct) Discrimination (ECHR)	201
8.4	Comparing Test I: Demonstrating a Difference in Treatment	203
8.4.1	Cases of Direct Discrimination	203
8.4.1.1	The Comparison of the Comparability Tests	203
8.4.1.2	A Different Test applied by the ECtHR: the Test of Disadvantage	208
8.4.2	Cases of Indirect Discrimination	210
8.4.2.1	The Disparate Impact Tests Compared	210
8.4.2.2	The Issue of Proof	211
8.4.3	Cases of Indirect Discrimination (EU) and Cases of Direct Discrimination (ECHR)	217
8.4.3.1	The Disparate Impact Test v. the Comparability Test	217
8.5	Comparing Test II: Demonstrating Justification	219
8.5.1	Cases of Direct Discrimination	219

8.5.2	Cases of Indirect Discrimination: the Objective Justification Tests Compared	222
8.5.3	The Comparison of the Proportionality Tests of the Courts	224
8.5.4	The Intensity of Assessment and the Variation of the Proportionality Tests	229
8.5.4.1	The Comparison of a Marginal Assessment	230
8.5.4.2	The Comparison of a Full Assessment	236
8.5.5	The Comparison of the Margins of Appreciation and Discretion	241
8.5.5.1	A Common Root: the Principle of Subsidiarity	242
8.5.5.2	Clarity and Consistency	243
8.5.5.3	The Practical Application in the Proportionality Test	245
8.5.5.4	A Tool to Balance Uniformity and Diversity	249
8.5.5.5	Supervisory Court v. Interpretative Court	251
8.5.5.6	The Courts' Objective of Self-Preservation	254
8.5.5.7	The Decisiveness of the Margins of Appreciation and Discretion	259
8.5.6	The Comparison of Triggering Factors	260
8.5.6.1	The European Consensus Argument	260
8.5.6.2	The Ground of Discrimination	262
8.5.6.3	The Field of Law or the Policy Field and the Better Placed Argument	268

Chapter 9 A Comparison of Non-Discrimination Law (EU) and the Right to Freedom of Religion (ECHR)

9.1	Introduction	271
9.2	Non-Discrimination (EU) and the Freedom of Religion (ECHR)	272
9.3	Test I: Differential Treatment on Grounds of Religion v. Interference in the Freedom of Religion	273
9.3.1	The Concept of Religion in the European Systems	274
9.3.2	Disadvantage v. Interference	276
9.3.3	The Element of Comparison	279
9.4	Test II: A Comparison of the Justifications for Differential Treatment and Interference	281
9.4.1	Article 2(5) of Directive 2000/78 v. Article 9(2) ECHR	282
9.4.1.1	Prescribed by Law	282
9.4.1.2	The List of Legitimate Aims	283
9.4.1.3	Necessary in a Democratic Society	284
9.4.2	The GOR Exception v. the Limitation Clause	286
9.4.3	The Objective Justification Clause of Indirect Discrimination v. the Limitation Clause of the Right to Freedom of Religion	287

Chapter 10 The Proof of the Pudding: The Islamic Headscarf Case

10.1 Introduction	289
10.2 A Comparison of the Possible Legal Bases	289
10.3 The Islamic Headscarf Case: Non-Discrimination (EU) v. Freedom of Religion (ECHR)	291
10.3.1 Deciding on the Framework: Direct or Indirect Discrimination	291
10.3.2 Different Treatment of Muslim Immigrant Women v. Interference with Religious Manifestation	292
10.3.3 Justifications for the Ban on Conspicuous Symbols in Public Employment	294
10.3.3.1 Comparing the Legitimate Aim Tests	294
10.3.3.2 The Islamic Headscarf Case and the Comparison of Proportionality	294
10.3.4 Special Exceptions to Religious Discrimination (EU) v. The Limitation Clause (ECHR)	297
10.4 The Islamic Headscarf Case: Non-Discrimination (EU) v. Non-Discrimination (ECHR)	297

CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 11 Conclusions: A Discrepancy Between the Courts?

11.1 Introduction	301
11.2 The Discrimination Approach of the EU and CoE	302
11.2.1 Structure and Consequences	302
11.2.2 Test I: Establishing a Difference in Treatment	303
11.2.3 Test II: Demonstrating a Justification	308
11.2.4 The Discrimination Approach of the EU and CoE in Charts	315
11.3 A Comparison of the Approach to Religious Discrimination	319
11.3.1 Test I: Different Treatment and Interference	319
11.3.2 Test II: Article 2(5) of Directive 2000/78 and the Limitation Clause of Article 9(2) ECHR	321
11.4 The Islamic Headscarf Issue: A Discrepancy between the Courts?	322
11.4.1 The Difference between the Legal Frameworks of the Courts in the Islamic Headscarf Case	322
11.4.2 The Difference in the Burden of Proof for the Applicants	323
11.4.3 The Difference in the Burden of Proof for the States	325
11.5 The Best of Both Worlds	326
11.6 The European Non-Discrimination Regimes: Same Same, but Different	329

Table of Contents

Samenvatting (Summary in Dutch)	331
Bibliography	347
Table of Cases	361
Index	369
Curriculum Vitae	375

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AG	Advocate General
CoE	Council of Europe
EC	European Community
EC Treaty	Treaty establishing the European Communities
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms
ECJ	Court of Justice (instance of the Court of Justice of the European Union)
EComHR	European Commission of Human Rights
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community (1951)
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EEC	European Economic Community (1957)
ETC	Equal Treatment Commission (the Netherlands)
EU	European Union
FRA	EU Agency for Fundamental Rights
GOR	Genuine Occupational Requirements
O.J.	Official Journal of the European Union
Prot.	Protocol
ToA	Treaty of Amsterdam (1997)
TEU	Treaty on European Union (revised by Treaty of Lisbon, 2007)
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (ex EEC and EC Treaty)
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
UN	United Nations

