

Contents

FOREWORD	vii
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS	lv
TABLE OF CASES	lxi
TABLE OF LEGISLATIVE INSTRUMENTS	lxxvii

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW

1. PRELIMINARY REMARKS	1
2. NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW IN THE EUROPEAN UNION	2
3. STRUCTURE AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE BOOK	4
4. SOURCES OF NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW	7
4.1. INTERNATIONAL SOURCES OF NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW	8
4.2. NON-DISCRIMINATION AND THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE	9
4.3. THE EC DIRECTIVES ON NON-DISCRIMINATION	11
THE RACIAL EQUALITY DIRECTIVE	11
THE EMPLOYMENT EQUALITY DIRECTIVE	12
THE GENDER EMPLOYMENT DIRECTIVE	12
THE GENDER GOODS AND SERVICES DIRECTIVE	13
5. COMPARATIVE NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW	13
5.1. COMMON LAW COUNTRIES	14
5.2. CIVIL LAW COUNTRIES IN EUROPE	17
5.3. SPECIAL CASE: THE NETHERLANDS	21
5.4. NORDIC MEMBER STATES	22
5.5. SUMMARY OF COMPARISON AND RELEVANCE FOR REST OF THE BOOK	25
6. AIMS AND CONCEPTS OF NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW	25
6.1. (NON-)DISCRIMINATION OR EQUALITY?	26

CONTENTS

6.2.	FORM AND SUBSTANCE	26
6.3.	EQUALITY AND DISTRIBUTIVE AND CORRECTIVE JUSTICE	29
6.4.	INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS	30
6.5.	ENFORCING NON-DISCRIMINATION LAW	31

**CHAPTER ONE
DISCRIMINATION GROUNDS**

1.1.	INTRODUCTION	33
1.2.	“SUSPECT” GROUNDS OF DISCRIMINATION	35
	1.CoE.1. ECtHR, 13 December 2005, <i>Timishev v. Russia</i> . Freedom of movement of Chechens	37
	1.CoE.2. ECtHR, 21 February 1986, <i>James and Others v. The United Kingdom</i> . Different treatment of property owners	37
1.3.	THE GROUNDS OF DISCRIMINATION	39
1.3.1.	INTRODUCTION	39
1.3.2.	RACE; ETHNIC, RACIAL AND NATIONAL ORIGIN; BELONGING TO A NATIONAL OR ETHNIC MINORITY; SKIN COLOUR	41
1.3.2.A.	DEFINITIONS	41
	RACE	41
	1.AT.3. <i>Austrian Equal Treatment Act. Explanatory Notes</i>	43
	1.CoE.4. European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, <i>ECRI General Policy Recommendation No. 7 on national legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination</i>	44
	1.NL.5. <i>EC Implementation Act. Explanatory Memorandum</i>	45
	1.GB.6. <i>British Race Relations Act 1976</i>	45
	1.CoE.7. ECtHR, 13 December 2005, <i>Timishev v. Russia</i> . Freedom of movement of Chechens	46
	MEMBERSHIP OF AN ETHNIC OR RACIAL GROUP	47
	1.NL.8. Equal Treatment Commission. <i>Opinion 1998-57</i> . Asylum seekers are not members of a “racial group”	47
	1.UN.9. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. <i>General Recommendation No. 08: Identification with a particular racial or ethnic group</i>	48
	1.GB.10. House of Lords, <i>Mandla v. Dowell Lee</i> . Sikhs as an ethnic group	49
	TRAVELLERS AND GYPSIES	51
	1.IE.11. Equality Tribunal, <i>Connors v. Molly Heffernan’s Public House</i> . Nomadic life no requirement for establishment of traveller identity	51
	1.IE.12. Equality Tribunal, <i>O’Brien v. Killarney Ryan Hotel</i> . Irrelevance of subjective feeling of belonging to the “traveller community”	52
	1.GB.13. Court of Appeal, <i>Commission for Racial Equality v. Dutton</i> . Gypsies as an ethnic group	53

CONTENTS

1.NL.14. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1999-65</i> . Unequal treatment of caravan dwellers constitutes racial discrimination	55
MEMBERSHIP OF A (NATIONAL) MINORITY—NATIONAL ORIGIN	56
1.CoE.15. Council of Europe, <i>European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities</i>	56
1.PL.16. <i>Polish National and Ethnic Minorities and Regional Languages Act of 6 January 2005</i>	58
1.PL.17. Comments of the Polish Parliamentary Office to the Draft National Minorities Act	59
LANGUAGE	60
ETHNICITY AND RELIGION	60
1.3.2.B. SUSPECTNESS	61
1.CoE.18. ECtHR, 18 January 2001, <i>Chapman v. United Kingdom</i> . No strict test applied to discrimination against Gypsies	62
1.3.3. NATIONALITY	63
1.3.3.A. DEFINITION	63
DIFFERENT SITUATIONS	63
DEFINITION OF NATIONALITY	64
1.3.3.B. SUSPECTNESS	66
1.CoE.19. ECtHR, 16 September 1996, <i>Gaygusuz v. Austria</i> . “Very weighty reasons” test applied to nationality discrimination	66
1.CoE.20. ECtHR, 20 October 2005, <i>Niedzwiecki v. Germany</i> . No “very weighty reasons” test applied to nationality discrimination	67
1.EC.21. ECJ, 20 October 1993, Joined Cases C-92/92 and C-326/92, <i>Phil Collins v. Imtrat Handelsgesellschaft mbH and Patricia Im- und Export Verwaltungsgesellschaft mbH and Leif Emanuel Kraul v. EMI Electrola GmbH</i> . Importance of the prohibition of nationality discrimination	68
1.EC.22. ECJ, 11 July 2002, Case C-224/98, <i>M.N. D’Hoop v. Office national de l’emploi</i> . Importance of prohibition of nationality discrimination	69
1.3.4. GENDER, SEX AND RELATED GROUNDS	70
1.3.4.A. DEFINITION	70
GENDER AND SEX	70
SYMMETRICAL AND ASYMMETRICAL DEFINITIONS	71
1.ES.23. <i>Estonian Law on Gender Equality</i>	71
1.DE.24. <i>German Constitution</i>	71
1.UN.25. <i>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</i>	72
GENDER RELATED GROUNDS—PREGNANCY AND GENDER—SPECIFIC ILLNESS	73
1.EC.26. ECJ, 9 November 1990, Case C-177/88, <i>Dekker v. Stichting VJV</i> . Discrimination based on pregnancy constitutes sex discrimination	73

CONTENTS

1.EC.27. ECJ, 30 June 1998, Case C-394/96, <i>Mary Brown v. Rentokil</i> . Dismissal because of absence during pregnancy is sex discrimination	73
1.EC.28. ECJ, 8 November 1990, Case C-179/88, <i>Handels- og Kontorfunktionærernes Forbund i Danmark, acting on behalf of Birthe Vibeke Hertz v. Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening</i> . No sex discrimination in case of dismissal for pregnancy-related reasons	74
HOMOSEXUALITY AND GENDER	75
1.EC.29. ECJ, 17 February 1998, Case C-249/96, <i>Grant v. South-West Trains</i> . Sex discrimination or discrimination based on sexual orientation	76
GENDER/SEX, TRANSSEXUALITY AND INTERSEXUALITY/ HERMAPHRODITISM	76
1.EC.30. ECJ, 30 April 1998, Case C-13/94, <i>P. v. S. and Cornwall County Council</i> . Discrimination based on transsexuality constitutes sex discrimination	77
1.DE.31. Regional Court of Munich, Civil Division, 30 June 2003. Does hermaphroditism qualify as a separate gender?	78
1.3.4.B. SUSPECTNESS	79
1.EC.32. ECJ, 30 March 1993, Case C-328/91, <i>Secretary of State for Social Security v. Thomas and Others</i> . Strict scrutiny in gender discrimination cases	80
1.CoE.33. ECtHR, 25 May 1985, <i>Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v. the United Kingdom</i> . Very weighty reasons test applied to gender discrimination	80
1.EC.34. ECJ, 12 July 1984, Case 184/83, <i>Hofmann v. Barmer Ersatzkasse</i> . Less intensive review of social security issues	81
1.CoE.35. ECtHR, 27 March 1998, <i>Petrovic v. Austria</i> . No very weighty reasons required to justify gender discrimination	82
1.3.5. SEXUAL ORIENTATION	83
1.3.5.A. DEFINITION	83
SYMMETRICAL OR ASYMMETRICAL APPROACH	83
1.IE.36. <i>Irish Equal Status Act 2000</i>	83
1.GB.37. <i>Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2003</i>	83
SEXUAL ORIENTATION, SEXUAL PREFERENCE AND SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR	84
1.EC.38. <i>Explanatory Memorandum to the Employment Equality Directive</i>	84
1.NL.39. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2003-150</i> , “Sexual orientation” also covers sexual behaviour	85
OTHER FORMS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION, PREFERENCE OR BEHAVIOUR	86
1.NL.40. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1996-108</i> . Discrimination against transvestites is not sexual orientation discrimination	87
1.3.5.B. SUSPECTNESS	88
1.CoE.41. ECtHR, 21 December 1999, <i>Salgueiro da Silva Mouta v. Portugal</i> . Disadvantage solely based on sexual orientation is not acceptable	88
1.CoE.42. ECtHR, 9 January 2003, <i>L. and V. v. Austria</i> . Very weighty reasons test applied to sexual orientation discrimination	89
1.3.6. MARITAL AND FAMILY STATUS	91
1.3.6.A. DEFINITIONS	91

CONTENTS

MARITAL STATUS	91
1.EC.43. ECJ, 17 April 1986, Case 59/85, <i>State of Netherlands v. Ann Florence Reed</i> . No residence permit for unmarried partner	91
1.EC.44. ECJ, 13 May 2001, Joined cases C-122/99 P and C-125/99, <i>P, D. and Sweden v. Council</i> . Discrimination of same-sex partners with a registered partnership	93
FAMILY STATUS AND MARITAL STATUS	94
1.BG.45. <i>The Bulgarian Protection against Discrimination Act</i>	94
1.IE.46. Equality Tribunal, <i>Travers & Maunsell v. The Ball Alley House</i> . Definition of family status	95
1.3.6.B. SUSPECTNESS	96
1.CoE.47. ECtHR, 4 June 2002, <i>Wessels-Bergervoet v. The Netherlands</i> . Very weighty reasons test applied to discrimination based on sex and marital status	96
1.3.7. BIRTH, PARENTAGE AND DESCENT	97
1.CoE.48. ECtHR, 13 June 1979, <i>Marckx v. Belgium</i> . Illegitimate birth as a suspect ground for discrimination	98
1.CoE.49. ECtHR, 28 October 1987, <i>Inze v. Austria</i> . Very weighty reasons test applied to discrimination based on illegitimate birth	99
1.CoE.50. ECtHR, 8 July 2003, <i>Sahin v. Germany</i> . Discrimination against parents of illegitimate children	100
1.CoE.51. ECtHR, 13 July 2004, <i>Pla and Puncernau v. Andorra</i> . Discrimination against adopted children	101
1.3.8. RELIGION AND BELIEF; POLITICAL OR PERSONAL CONVICTION	102
1.3.8.A. DEFINITION	102
INTRODUCTION	102
1.GB.52. <i>Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003</i>	103
1.BG.53. <i>Bulgarian Protection against Discrimination Act</i>	103
1.MT.54. <i>Constitution of Malta</i>	103
1.UN.55. <i>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</i>	104
1.UN.56. <i>Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination based on Religion and Belief</i>	104
1.CoE.57. <i>European Convention of Human Rights</i>	104
1.EC.58. <i>Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union</i>	104
1.CoE.59. Human Rights Committee, <i>General Comment No. 22: The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion</i>	105
RELIGION—RECOGNITION AND SECTS	105
1.DK.60. N.E. Hansen, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Denmark</i>	106
1.IT.61. A. Simoni, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Italy</i>	107
HOW TO PROVE THE EXISTENCE OF RELIGION?	108
1.CoE.62. ECtHR, 13 April 2006, <i>Kosteski v. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i> . Proof of adherence to a religion	109
THE FREEDOM NOT TO HAVE A RELIGION	110

CONTENTS

1.CoE.63. ECtHR, 18 February 1999, <i>Buscarini et al. v. San Marino</i> . Freedom of conscience covers freedom not to have a religion	111
1.NL.64. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2003-114</i> . “Religion” encompasses “not having a religion”	112
MANIFESTATION OF RELIGION AND RELIGIOUS EXPRESSIONS	112
1.CoE.65. ECtHR, 25 May 1993, <i>Kokkinakis v. Greece</i> . Religious expression is protected by the freedom of religion	113
1.UN.66. Human Rights Committee, <i>General Comment No. 22</i> : <i>The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion</i>	113
1.NL.67. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1998-18</i> . Subjective approach to religious practice	114
1.CoE.68. EComHR, 16 May 1977, <i>Arrowsmith v. UK</i> . Objective approach to religious practice	116
1.CoE.69. ECtHR, 10 November 2005, <i>Leyla Sahin v. Turkey</i> . Headscarf as religious expression	116
BELIEF	117
1.CoE.70. ECtHR, 25 February 1982, <i>Campbell and Cosans v. UK</i> . Definition of “philosophical convictions” and “belief”	118
1.NL.71. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2005-28</i> . Definition of “belief” and “religion”	118
RELATION BETWEEN RELIGION AND BELIEF	120
1.DE.72. The German Federal Administrative Court, 27 March 1992. Religion or belief?	121
POLITICAL CONVICTION OR OPINION	121
1.CoE.73. EComHR, 16 May 1977, <i>Arrowsmith v. UK</i> . Objective approach to religious practice	122
1.NL.74. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1998-45</i> . “Political conviction” does not cover criminally punishable behaviour	123
1.3.8.B. SUSPECTNESS	124
1.CoE.75. ECtHR, 23 June 1993, <i>Hoffmann v. Austria</i> . Religion based discrimination is highly suspect	124
1.CoE.76. ECtHR, 16 December 2003, <i>Palau Martinez v. France</i> . Margin of appreciation in religious discrimination cases	125
1.3.9. DISABILITY AND (CHRONIC) ILLNESS	127
1.3.9.A. DEFINITION	127
1.EC.77. <i>Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union</i>	127
1.EC.78. <i>Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine</i>	128
1.FI.79. <i>Finnish Non-Discrimination Act</i>	128
1.NL.80. <i>Dutch Act on Equal Treatment on the Grounds of Disability or Chronic Illness</i>	128
HANDICAP OR DISABILITY?	129
1.UN.81. UN General Assembly, <i>Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities</i>	129
SYMMETRICAL OR ASYMMETRICAL APPROACH?	130

CONTENTS

SOCIAL CONSTRUCT OR MEDICAL IMPAIRMENT?	131
1.UK.82. <i>Disability Discrimination Act 2005</i>	131
1.UN.83. World Health Organisation, <i>Towards a Common Language for Functioning, Disability and Health</i>	133
1.EC.84. ECJ, 11 July 2006, <i>Sonia Chacón Navas v. Euresst Colectividades SA</i> . Definition of disability and illness	136
PERMANENT OR LONG-TERM PHYSICAL OR MENTAL IMPAIRMENT	138
1.DE.85. German Federal Constitutional Court, 8 October 1997. Disability as a long-term physical, mental or psychological function	138
1.NL.86. <i>The Dutch Second Memorandum of Reply with respect to the Act on Equal Treatment on the Grounds of Disability or Chronic Illness of 2003</i>	139
LIMITATION TO PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL OR PROFESSIONAL LIFE	140
1.BE.87. <i>Executive Regulation adopted on 30 January 2004 by the Flemish Government to implement certain provisions of the Decree of 8 May 2002</i>	140
1.CY.88. <i>Cypriot Law concerning Persons with Disabilities</i>	141
1.FR.89. <i>French Act 2005-102 on the Equality of Rights and Opportunities, the Participation and Citizenship of Disabled Persons</i>	141
1.LT.90. <i>Lithuanian Law on the Social Integration of the Disabled</i>	141
1.PT.91. <i>Portuguese Law 38/2004</i>	141
FUTURE DISABILITY	142
1.DE.92. <i>SGB IX, Social Law Code, Book IX</i>	142
1.SE.93. <i>Swedish Disability Discrimination Act 1999</i>	143
CHRONIC ILLNESS, SICKNESS AND HEALTH	143
1.HU.94. <i>Hungarian Act CXXV. of 2003 on equal treatment and on fostering equal opportunities</i>	143
1.PT.95. <i>Portuguese Labour Code</i>	144
1.NL.96. <i>Dutch Explanatory Memorandum to the Act on Equal Treatment on the Grounds of Disability or Chronic Illness of 2003</i>	144
1.IE.97. Equality Tribunal, <i>Fernandez v. Cable & Wireless</i> . Illness as disability	144
1.IE.98. Equality Tribunal, <i>A Civil Servant v. The Office of Civil Service and Local Appointments Commissioners</i> . Asthma and irritable bowel syndrome as disability	145
1.3.9.B. SUSPECTNESS	147
1.3.10. AGE	148
1.3.10.A. DEFINITION	148
1.IE.99. <i>Irish Equal Status Act 2000, as amended by Equality Act 2004</i>	149
1.3.10.B. SUSPECTNESS	149
1.IE.100. Supreme Court, 15 May 1997, Case 118/1997, <i>In the Matter of Article 26 and in the Matter of the Employment Equality Bill 1996</i> . Limited scope of age discrimination prohibitions	151
1.EC.101. ECJ, 22 November 2005, <i>Werner Mangold v. Rüdiger Helm</i> . Strict test of proportionality in age-discrimination cases	151
1.3.11. PART TIME AND FIXED-TERM WORK	152
1.3.11.A. DEFINITION	152

CONTENTS

1.EC.102. <i>Council Directive 97/81/EC of 15 December 1997 concerning the Framework Agreement on part-time work concluded by UNICE, CEEP and ETUC – Annex (Framework Agreement on Part-Time Work)</i>	153
1.EC.103. <i>Council Directive 1999/70/EC of 28 June 1999 concerning the framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded by ETUC, UNICE and CEEP – Annex (Framework Agreement on Fixed-Term Work)</i>	153
PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME WORK	154
1.UN.104. <i>ILO Convention No. 175: Part-Time Work Convention</i>	154
1.IE.105. <i>Irish Protection of Employees (Part-time Work) Act 2001</i>	156
1.GB.106. <i>The Part-Time Workers (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000</i>	157
1.FR.107. <i>French Labour Code</i>	159
1.NL.108. <i>Dutch Act on Equal Treatment based on Working Hours</i>	159
FIXED-TERM CONTRACTS	159
1.NL.109. <i>Dutch Act on Equal Treatment based on Temporary and Permanent Contracts</i>	161
1.PL.110. <i>Polish Labour Code</i>	161
1.NL.111. <i>Dutch Explanatory Memorandum to the Act on Equal Treatment based on Temporary and Permanent Contracts</i>	161
1.3.11.B. SUSPECTNESS	161
1.4. DISCRIMINATION ON GROUNDS OF ASSUMED CHARACTERISTICS AND DISCRIMINATION BY ASSOCIATION	163
1.4.1. DISCRIMINATION ON GROUNDS OF ASSUMED CHARACTERISTICS	163
1.CoE.112. ECtHR, 13 December 2005, <i>Timishev v. Russia</i> . Freedom of movement of Chechens	163
1.AT.113. <i>Explanatory Notes to the Austrian Equal Treatment Act</i>	164
1.HU.114. <i>Hungarian Act CXXV. of 2003 on equal treatment and on fostering equal opportunities</i>	164
1.IE.115. <i>Irish Equal Status Act 2000, as amended by the Equality Act 2004</i>	165
1.GB.116. House of Lords, 24 March 1983, <i>Mandla v. Dowell Lee</i> . Sikhs as an ethnic group	165
1.NL.117. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-67</i> . Discrimination based on assumed disability	166
1.NL.118. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2002-84</i> . Ascribed political conviction	168
1.4.2. DISCRIMINATION BY ASSOCIATION	169
1.IE.119. Equality Tribunal, 27 January 2004, <i>Six Complainants v. A Public House, Dublin</i> . Discrimination by association	169
1.5. MULTIPLE DISCRIMINATION	170
1.5.1. INTRODUCTION	170
1.5.2. PROBLEMS OF MULTIPLE DISCRIMINATION	172
DIFFERENCES IN PERSONAL AND MATERIAL SCOPE	172

CONTENTS

DIFFERENCES IN EXEMPTIONS	173
ESTABLISHING (INDIRECT) DISCRIMINATION: WHO IS THE COMPARATOR?	173
1.5.3. PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS TO CASES OF MULTIPLE DISCRIMINATION	174
1.UN.120. <i>Fourth World Congress on Women, Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action</i>	174
1.UN.121. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, <i>General Recommendation No. 25 : Gender related dimensions of racial discrimination</i>	175
1.CoE.122. ECtHR, 28 November 1984, <i>Rasmussen v. Denmark</i> . Intersectional discrimination under the ECHR	176
1.IE.123. Equality Tribunal, 18 December 2001, <i>Maughan v. The Glimmer Man</i> . Cumulative discrimination	178
1.NL.124. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1998-48</i> . Intersectional discrimination against a Jewish employee	179
1.6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	180

CHAPTER TWO DIRECT DISCRIMINATION

2.1. INTRODUCTION	185
2.2. RECOGNISING DIRECT DISCRIMINATION	187
2.2.1. DISCRIMINATION AND THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE	187
2.CoE.1. ECtHR, 23 July 1968, <i>Case 'relating to certain aspects of the laws on the use of languages in education in Belgium' v. Belgium</i> . The concept of discrimination under article 14	188
2.CoE.2. ECtHR, 6 April 2000, <i>Thlimmenos v. Greece</i> . Failure to treat differently persons in different situations	189
2.2.2. DISCRIMINATION AND THE EUROPEAN UNION	191
2.2.3. GENERAL CONCEPTS OF DIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN NATIONAL LAW	194
2.BE.3. O. De Schutter, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Belgium</i>	194
2.FI.4. T. Makkonen, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Finland</i> .	195
2.FI.5. T. Makkonen, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Finland</i>	197
2.2.3.A. UK	197
2.2.3.B. FRANCE	200
2.2.3.C. THE NETHERLANDS	201
2.NL.6. M. Gijzen, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Netherlands</i>	201

CONTENTS

2.2.3.D. GERMANY	203
2.DE.7. <i>Workplace Constitution Act (Betriebsverfassungsgesetz)</i>	203
2.3. ESTABLISHING DIRECT DISCRIMINATION	204
2.3.1. CAUSATION AND COMPARATORS	205
2.EC.8. ECJ, 30 April 1996, Case C-13/94, <i>P v. S and Cornwall County Council</i> . Sex discrimination and transsexuals	207
2.FR.9. Court of Cassation, 14 June 2000, <i>CFDT Inter-Co v. Fort</i> . Role for comparators in identifying cause of treatment	209
2.3.1.A. CHOOSING THE APPROPRIATE COMPARATOR	210
2.EC.10. ECJ, 27 April 2006, Case C-423/04, <i>Richards v. Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> . Sex discrimination and transsexuals	211
2.EC.11. ECJ, 17 February 1998, Case C-249/96, <i>Grant v. South-West Trains</i> . Sex discrimination and sexual orientation	213
2.3.1.B. DIRECT DISCRIMINATION WITHOUT A COMPARATOR	215
2.EC.12. ECJ, 8 November 1990, Case C-177/88, <i>Dekker v. VJV Centrum</i> . Comparators and pregnancy discrimination	216
2.EC.13. ECJ, 7 December 2000, Case C-79/99, <i>Schnorbus v. Land Hessen</i> . More favourable treatment of persons having completed military service	217
2.3.1.C. HYPOTHETICAL COMPARATORS	218
2.NIR.14. House of Lords, 27 February 2003, <i>Shamoon v. Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary</i> . Hypothetical comparators	219
2.IE.15. Equality Tribunal, 7 May 2003, <i>O'Brien v. Iarnród Eireann</i> . Hypothetical comparators	221
2.3.1.D. EQUAL PAY COMPARATORS	223
2.EC.16. ECJ, 13 January 2004, Case C-256/01, <i>Allonby v. Accrington & Rossendale College</i> . Comparators in equal pay	223
2.3.1.E. COMPARATORS IN AGE DISCRIMINATION	224
2.IE.17. Equality Tribunal, 24 September 2001, <i>Perry v. The Garda Commissioner</i> . Hypothetical comparators and age discrimination	225
2.3.2. INTENT, MOTIVE AND STEREOTYPING	226
2.3.2.A. MOTIVE	227
2.BE.18. Labour Court of Ghent, 24 January 1985, <i>MVT v. G</i> . Third party pressure and direct discrimination	228
2.3.2.B. STEREOTYPING	229
2.GB.19. House of Lords, 9 December 2004, <i>R (European Roma Rights Centre) v. Immigration Officer at Prague Airport and another</i> . Stereotyping and direct racial discrimination	230
2.ES.20. Spanish Constitutional Court, 14 December 1992, <i>Rodriguez Valencia</i> . Stereotyping and direct sex discrimination	232
2.3.3. LESS FAVOURABLE TREATMENT	233
2.NIR.21. House of Lords, 27 February 2003, <i>Shamoon v. Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary</i> . The meaning of detriment	234

CONTENTS

2.DE.22. Federal Labour Court, 12 November 1998. Detriment and rejected job applicants	235
2.4. PROVING DIRECT DISCRIMINATION	237
2.FR.23. Court of Cassation, Criminal Division, 25 November 1997, Case 96-85670, <i>Potier</i> . No explanation other than direct discrimination	238
2.4.1. SHIFTING THE BURDEN OF PROOF	239
2.4.1.A. EUROPEAN UNION	239
2.EC.24. ECJ, 17 October 1989, Case 109/88, <i>Handels- og Kontorfunktion Wrennes Forbund I Danmark v. Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening acting on behalf of Danfoss</i> . Equal pay and the burden of proof	240
2.EC.25. Directive 97/80/EC of 15 December 1997 on the burden of proof in cases of discrimination based on sex	241
2.4.1.B. NATIONAL LAW AND THE BURDEN OF PROOF	242
UNITED KINGDOM	242
2.GB.26. Court of Appeal, 18 February 2005, <i>Igen Ltd (Formerly Leeds Careers Guidance) and Others v. Wong; Chamberlin and Another v. Emokpae; Webster v. Brunel University</i> . Guidance on the application of the burden of proof	243
FRANCE	245
THE NETHERLANDS	246
2.NL.27. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2003-41</i> . Racial discrimination and the burden of proof	246
2.NL.28. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-67</i> . Disability discrimination and the burden of proof	247
2.IT.29. A. Simoni, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Italy</i>	248
2.4.1.C. COUNCIL OF EUROPE	249
2.CoE.30. ECtHR, Grand Chamber, 6 July 2005, <i>Nachova and others v. Bulgaria</i> . Article 14 ECHR and the burden of proof	249
2.CoE.31. ECtHR, 13 December 2005, <i>Timishev v. Russia</i> . Article 14 and the burden of proof	251
2.4.2. TRIGGERING A SHIFT IN THE BURDEN OF PROOF	253
2.4.2.A. STATISTICS	253
2.GB.32. Court of Appeal, 21 May 2004, <i>Rihal v. London Borough of Ealing</i> . Statistics and evidence of direct racial discrimination	254
2.4.2.B. SITUATION TESTING	255
2.HU.33. Kisvárdai Town Court, 28 November 2000. Racial discrimination in entry to disco	255
2.5. SEGREGATION	257
2.5.1. INTERNATIONAL, EUROPEAN AND NATIONAL LEGAL INSTRUMENTS	259

CONTENTS

2.HU.34. A. Kádár and L. Farkas, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Hungary</i>	260
2.5.2. CASE-LAW ON SEGREGATION	261
2.EC.35. ECJ, 10 March 2003, Case C-196/02, <i>Nikoloudi v. Organismos Tilepikinonion Ellados AE (OTE)</i> . Sex-specific category of workers	261
2.GB.36. Employment Appeals Tribunal, 14 November 1979, <i>Pel Ltd v. Modgill and others</i> . Racial segregation in employment	263
2.HU.37. Nyiregyháza Town Court, 1 December 1998, <i>Anonymous Plaintiffs v. Local Government of Tiszavasvári Town</i> . Roma segregation in education	264
2.RO.38. National Council for Combating Discrimination, 23 June 2003, <i>Decision No. 218 on Petition No. 1704/12.05.2003 from the Roma Centre for Social Intervention and Research (Romani CRISS) in relation to Cehei School</i> . Roma segregation in education	267
2.RO.39. National Council for Combating Discrimination, 25 May 2004, <i>Decision No. 160 on Petition No. 1174/11.05.2004</i> . Roma segregation in education	267
2.6. JUSTIFICATIONS AND EXCEPTIONS	269
2.6.1. INTRODUCTION	269
2.6.2. JUSTIFICATION OF DIRECT DISCRIMINATION	271
2.6.2.A. COUNCIL OF EUROPE	272
2.6.2.B. EUROPEAN UNION	273
2.6.2.C. NATIONAL JURISDICTIONS	274
2.6.3. EXCEPTIONS APPLYING TO SEVERAL DISCRIMINATION GROUNDS	275
2.6.3.A. GENUINE OCCUPATIONAL REQUIREMENTS	276
2.NL.40. <i>Dutch Decree of 19 May 1989 concerning the establishment of a governmental decree regarding occupational activities for which sex can be determinant</i>	277
2.GB.41. House of Lords, 26 April 2004, <i>R (Amicus-MSF and others) v. Secretary of State for Trade and Industry and Christian Action Research Education and others</i> . Sexual orientation requirements and organised religions	280
2.NL.42. M. Gijzen, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Netherlands</i>	281
2.EC.43. ECJ, 15 May 1986, Case 222/84, <i>Johnson v. Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC)</i> . GOR exception and sex discrimination in policing	283
2.GB.44. Court of Appeal, 4 April 1990, <i>Lambeth London Borough Council v. Commission for Racial Equality (CRE)</i> . Ethnicity requirements and GOR exceptions	286
2.DE.45. Federal Labour Court, 12 November 1998. Sex as a genuine occupational requirement	287
2.NL.46. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1997-51</i> . Advert for Moroccan male youth officer	288
2.6.3.B. RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS	289
2.EC.47. ECJ, 8 November 1983, Case 165/82, <i>Commission v. UK</i> . Privacy and the right to non-discrimination	290

CONTENTS

2.IE.48. High Court, 10 June 2005, <i>The Equality Authority v. Portmarnock Golf Club and others</i> . Sex discrimination in membership of a golf club	293
2.6.3.C. PUBLIC SECURITY ISSUES	294
2.EC.49. ECJ, 11 March 2003, Case C-186/01, <i>Dory v. Germany</i> . National service and sex discrimination	295
2.6.3.D. HEALTH AND SAFETY	297
2.NL.50. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-67</i> . Disability discrimination and the burden of proof	299
2.UK.51. Court of Appeal, 11 April 2001, <i>Jones v. Post Office</i> . Disability discrimination and health and safety	300
2.6.3.E. PROVISION OF FINANCIAL SERVICES	301
2.EC.52. D. Schiek, <i>Freedom of contract and a non-discrimination principle – irreconcilable antonyms?</i>	304
2.6.4. EXCEPTIONS APPLYING TO SPECIFIC GROUNDS OF DISCRIMINATION	304
2.6.4.A. SEX	305
2.EC.53. ECJ, 12 July 1984, Case 184/83, <i>Hofmann v. Barmer Ersatzkasse</i> . Sex discrimination and paid maternity leave	305
2.6.4.B. RELIGION	306
2.NL.54. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2003-112</i> . Restrictions on wearing religious symbols	310
2.NL.55. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1998-38</i> . Religious ethos exception and sexual orientation	311
2.6.4.C. AGE	313
2.EC.56. ECJ, 22 November 2005, Case C-144/04, <i>Mangold v. Helm</i> . Age discrimination in employment contracts	314
2.NL.57. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-118</i> . Justification for age discrimination	316
2.LV.58. G. Feldhune, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Latvia</i>	320
2.7. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	321

CHAPTER THREE INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION

3.1. INTRODUCTION	323
3.2. RATIONALES AND CONCEPTIONS OF INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION LAW	324
3.2.1. RATIONALES	324
3.2.1.A. PREVENTING CIRCUMVENTION OF PROHIBITION	325

CONTENTS

3.2.1.B. SOCIAL ENGINEERING	327
3.2.2. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES	328
3.2.2.A. FORM AND SUBSTANCE	328
3.ES.1. Spanish Constitutional Court, 1 July 1991, Case 145/91, <i>Pilar Rodriguez de la Fuente and 138 others v. City of Madrid</i> . Discrimination by assigning employees to different employment categories per gender	328
3.2.2.B. DISTRIBUTIVE AND CORRECTIVE JUSTICE	330
3.2.2.C. GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS	330
3.2.2.D. CONCEPTUAL HYBRIDISM OF INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION LAW	332
3.2.3. LIMITS OF INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION LAW	332
3.SE.2. K. Lundstrøm, <i>Indirect Sex Discrimination in the European Court of Justice's Vision</i>	333
3.3. ORIGINS OF INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION LAW	333
3.3.1. INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW	334
3.3.1.A. EARLIER EMANATIONS OF THE CONCEPT	334
3.UN.3. Permanent International Court of Justice, 10 September 1923, <i>Poland</i> . Whether evacuation order violates the Treaty on protection for Polish minorities	334
3.3.1.B. MODERN INTERNATIONAL LAW AND INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION— UNITED NATIONS	336
GENERAL HUMAN RIGHTS PACTS	336
3.UN.4. <i>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (UN)</i>	336
3.UN.5. UN Human Rights Committee, 8 August 2003, Communication No.998/2001, <i>Althammer v. Austria</i> . Indirect discrimination against pensioners	337
SPECIFIC UN NON-DISCRIMINATION CONVENTIONS	338
3.UN.6. <i>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination</i>	338
3.UN.7. <i>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</i>	339
3.UN.8. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, 5 August 2003, Communication No. 31/2003, <i>L.R. et.al (represented by European Roma Rights Centre) v. Slovakia</i> . Indirect ethnic discrimination – City Council withdrawing funding programme favouring Roma families in response to a racist motion by majority citizens	340
3.UN.9. <i>General Recommendation No. 25, on Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, on temporary special measures</i>	341
3.3.1.C. EUROPEAN HUMAN RIGHTS LAW AND INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION	341
3.CoE.10. ECtHR, 6 January 2005, <i>Hoogendijk v. The Netherlands</i> . Whether submitting a claim for a social benefit to a means test constitutes sex discrimination	343

CONTENTS

3.CoE.11. ECtHR, 7 February 2006, <i>D.H. and others v. Czech Republic</i> . Whether article 14 includes prohibition to indirectly discriminate	344
3.CoE.12. European Committee on Social Rights, 10 March 2004, <i>International Association Autism – Europe (IAAE) v. France</i> . Whether denying autistic children adequate schooling (including access to mainstream schools) amounts to (<i>inter alia</i>) discrimination	346
3.3.1.D. SUMMARY ON INTERNATIONAL LAW	347
3.3.2. ORIGINS OF MODERN INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION LAW: US, UK AND IRISH LAW	348
3.US.13. U.S. Supreme Court, Co 401 U.S. 424 (1971), <i>Griggs et al. v. Duke Power Co.</i> Requiring high score in tests and high school diploma as indirect racial discrimination	348
3.3.3. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN EUROPEAN COMMUNITY LAW—DEVELOPING THE DEFINITION	352
3.3.3.A. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN INTERNAL MARKET LAW AND IN EQUALITY LAW	352
3.3.3.B. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN EQUALITY LAW: CASE-LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DEFINITIONS	353
ESTABLISHING THE CONCEPT BY CASE-LAW	353
3.EC.14. ECJ, 12 February 1974, Case 152/73, <i>Sotgiu v. Deutsche Post</i> . Whether disadvantage on grounds of permanent residence outside Germany amounts to discrimination on grounds of nationality	353
3.EC.15. ECJ, 31 March 1981, Case 96/80, <i>Jenkins v. Kingsgate (Clothing Productions) Ltd.</i> Whether lower hourly rates for part time work constitute sex discrimination	354
3.EC.16. ECJ, 13 May 1986, Case 170/84, <i>Bilka – Kaufhaus GmbH v. Karin Weber von Hartz</i> . Whether requiring full time work to be included in occupational pension scheme is indirect discrimination	356
CODIFYING THE DEFINITION	357
3.EC.17. <i>Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin (Racial Equality Directive)</i>	358
3.EC.18. <i>Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation (Employment Equality Directive)</i>	358
3.EC.19. <i>Directive 76/207/EEC of 9 February 1976 on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion, and working conditions, amended by Directive 2002/73/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 September 2002 (Gender Employment Directive)</i>	359
3.4. PROBLEMS OF COMPARISON	359
3.4.1. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN FRENCH LAW	360
3.FR.20. Court of Cassation, 10 January 1995, <i>Baggio</i> . Rule of Sunday rest as indirect sex discrimination	361

CONTENTS

3.FR.21. Court of Cassation, 27 June 1995, <i>Mme Marrie et Sauty</i> . Rule of Sunday rest as indirect sex discrimination	362
3.FR.22. Court of Cassation, 9 April 1996., <i>Soufflet v. CPAM</i> . Discrimination against part time workers and (indirect) sex discrimination	363
3.FR.23. Court of Cassation, 28 March 1995, <i>CNAV v. Thibault</i> . Performance evaluation and pregnancy discrimination	364
3.FR.24. Ph. Martin, <i>Droit social et discriminations sexuelles: à propos des discriminations générées par la loi</i> .	365
3.FR.25. Court of Appeal Rennes, 5 February 2002, <i>S.A. Cogifer v. Ferre, Gruel, Robert et Tarib</i> . Reduction in working time and indirect discrimination	365
3.4.2. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN SCANDINAVIAN LAW	367
3.FI.26. K. Ahtela, <i>The Revised Provisions on Sex Discrimination in European Community Law: A Critical Assessment</i>	367
3.4.3. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN GERMAN LAW	369
3.DE.27. Federal Constitutional Court – 1st Senate, 2nd chamber, 28 September 1992, 1 BvR 496/87. Whether the Federal Labour Court’s judgment following the ECJ judgment in <i>Bilka</i> violates constitutionally protected rights	369
3.4.4. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN BRITISH AND IRISH LAW	371
3.4.5. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN DUTCH LAW	371
3.4.6. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN OTHER MEMBER STATES	371
3.5. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION—SPECIFIC ELEMENTS	372
3.5.1. ESTABLISHING DETRIMENTAL EFFECT	372
3.5.1.A. TO WHAT IS THE DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ATTRIBUTED?	373
SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT OR CONDITION	373
3.GB.28. Court of Appeal, 1 February 1983, <i>Perera v. The Civil Service Commission and The Department of Customs and Excise</i> . Whether referring to three criteria is sufficient to establish a “specific requirement”	373
3.IE.29. Equality Tribunal, 27 February 2003, <i>Bukola Ogunlade and Sola Oyefeso v. Michael Guiney Limited Cork</i> . Indirect racial discrimination by denying access to persons on their identification as past troublemakers	375
3.EC.30. ECJ, 27 October 1993, C-127/92, <i>Enderby v. French Health Authority</i> . Indirect wage discrimination by applying different collective agreements to predominantly female and male groups of employees respectively	376
3.GB.31. Court of Appeal, 23 March 2001, <i>Allonby v. Accrington and Rossendale College</i> . Whether “downgrading” part time lecturers to self employed service providers constitutes indirect discrimination	377
3.GB.32. Race Relations Act as amended by The Race Relations Act 1976 (Amendment) Regulations 2003 Statutory Instrument 2003 No. 1626	379
A WIDER APPROACH (A COLLECTIVE APPROACH)	380
3.FI.33. Finnish Supreme Court, 14 June 2004, Case 59/2004, <i>Employees v. Town of Kajaani</i> . Indirect discrimination, laying off a significant number of staff	380

CONTENTS

3.DE.34. Federal Labour Court, 8 February 2003, <i>A Claimant v. Freie Hanse Stadt Hamburg</i> . Indirect discrimination: denying full time employment to pre-school teachers	381
3.FR.35. Court of Cassation, 9 June 1998, <i>Société Bureau moderne informatique et négoce interprofessionnel v. Mme Gaborit</i> . Whether dismissal from a position usually occupied by women is indirect discrimination	382
3.NL.36. Supreme Court, 10 December 1982, <i>Van Binderen v. Kaya</i> . Whether a housing association is guilty of indirect ethnic discrimination when granting a disproportionately low percentage of their tenancies to foreign workers	383
WHAT IS THE PRECISE FACTOR FROM WHICH DETRIMENTAL EFFECT FLOWS IN EQUAL PAY CASES?	384
<i>Special quality of equal pay cases and relevance of indirect discrimination</i>	385
<i>ECJ case-law</i>	387
3.EC.37. ECJ, 1 July 1986, Case 237/85, <i>Rummler v. Dato Druck</i> . Indirect discrimination: work requiring less muscle power in lower wage group	387
3.EC.38. ECJ, 17 October 1989, C-109/88, <i>Handels- og Kontorfunktionærernes Forbund I Danmark v. Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening, acting on behalf of Danfoss</i> . Whether a gender pay gap resulting from a system of bonuses establishes detrimental effect	389
3.EC.39. ECJ, 31 May 1995, C-400/93, <i>Specialarbejderforbundet i Danmark v. Dansk Industri, formerly Industriens Arbejdsgivere, acting for Royal Copenhagen A/S</i> . Whether statistical differences in pay between three groups of workers are sufficient to establish detrimental effect of a pay system	391
<i>National case-law</i>	393
3.DE.40. Federal Labour Court, 23 September 1992, 4 AZR 30/92. Whether categorising most men in a higher wage group than most women amounts to indirect discrimination	393
3.ES.41. Spanish Constitutional Court, 28 February 1994, Case 58/1994, <i>Works council de Antonio Puig S.A. on behalf of 140 workers v. Antonio Puig S.A.</i> Wage categories and (indirect) sex discrimination	394
3.ES.42. Spanish Constitutional Court, 16 October 1995, Case 147/1995, <i>E.S.K. – C.U.I.S. representing 25 workers v. Gomaytex S.A.</i> Whether granting lower remuneration to staff in departments predominantly staffed by women amounts to indirect pay discrimination	395
CONCLUSIONS AND PRESENT DEFINITION IN EC LAW	397
3.5.1.B. HOW IS DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ESTABLISHED?	397
STATISTICAL AND OTHER APPROACHES—THE POLICY DEBATE	397
DISPARATE IMPACT ESTABLISHED BY STATISTICS	399
<i>Overview</i>	399
3.DE.43. Federal Labour Court, 23 September 1992, 4 AZR 30/92. Whether categorising most men in a higher wage group than most women amounts to indirect discrimination	400
<i>Choosing the pool of comparators</i>	401

CONTENTS

3.EC.44. ECJ, 30 November 1993, C-189/91, <i>Kirsammer-Hack v. Sidal</i> . Whether exempting establishments with less than 5 employees from statutory employment protection is indirect sex discrimination, if employees working less than 10 hours a week do not count towards the minimum	401
3.EC.45. ECJ, 31 May 1995, C-400/93, <i>Specialarbejderforbundet i Danmark v. Dansk Industri, formerly Industriens Arbejdsgivere, acting for Royal Copenhagen AIS</i> . Whether statistical differences in pay between three groups of workers are sufficient to establish detrimental effect of a pay system	403
3.DE.46. Federal Constitutional Court, 27 November 1997, 1 BUL 12/91. Whether excluding part time employees working less than 18 hours a week from an additional pension scheme constitutes indirect sex discrimination	404
3.GB.47. Court of Appeal, 21 December 1992, <i>Jones v. University of Manchester</i> . Whether a requirement for a university graduate career adviser to be aged 27-35 indirectly discriminated against women	405
<i>Establishing disparate impact (which numbers are to be compared exactly?)</i>	407
3.EC.48. ECJ, 9 September 1999, C-281/97, <i>Krüger v. Kreiskrankenhaus Eberswalde</i> . Whether denying a year end bonus to part time employees working less than 10 hours a week constitutes indirect gender discrimination	407
3.EC.49. ECJ, 23 October 2003, C-4/02, C-5/02, <i>Hilde Schönheit v. Stadt Frankfurt a.M. and Sylvia Becker v. Land Hessen</i> . Whether degressively reducing a public servant's pension for years worked part time constitutes indirect sex discrimination	408
3.GB.50. House of Lords, 22 July 1999, <i>Barry v. Midland Bank Plc</i> . Whether paying less severance grant to those who have worked part time constitutes indirect sex discrimination	410
3.GB.51. Court of Appeal, 21 May 1998, <i>London Underground Ltd v. Edwards</i> . Whether changing a train operator's rostering scheme is indirect discrimination	411
3.NL.52. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1997-4</i> . Indirect sex discrimination by disregarding seniority of former stand-by stewardesses who proceed to regular employment	412
3.DE.53. Federal Labour Court, 20 August 2002, 9 AZR 750/00. Whether excluding from the right to reduce working time upon reaching the age of 60 such employees as can claim a pension is indirect discrimination	413
<i>Degree of adversity ("considerably higher")</i>	414
3.EC.54. ECJ, 9 February 1999, C-167/97, <i>Regina v. Secretary of State for Employment, ex parte Nicole Seymour-Smith and Laura Perez</i> . Two year qualification period for employment protection as indirect sex discrimination	414
3.GB.55. House of Lords, 17 February 2000, <i>R v. Secretary of State for Employment, ex parte Seymour-Smith and another</i> . Two year qualification period for employment protection as indirect sex discrimination	416
3.NL.56. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1998-66</i> . Indirect sex discrimination by composing a redundancy list in accordance with seniority	418
<i>Special causation requirements</i>	419
3.GB.57. Employment Appeal Tribunal, 15 July 1977, <i>Price v. Civil Service Commission</i> . Indirect sex discrimination by maximum age-limit in relation to civil service	419

CONTENTS

3.DE.58. Federal Labour Court, 2 December 1992, 4 AZR 52/92. Whether excluding part time employees from regular promotions constitutes indirect sex discrimination	421
<i>Agreement on disparate impact</i>	422
3.SE.59. Labour Court, 21 September 2005, <i>Equal Opportunity Ombudsman (JämO) v. Teknikarbetsgivarna and VOLVO Car Co.</i> Whether requiring a height between 163 and 195 cm indirectly discriminates against women	422
QUALITATIVE ARGUMENTS TO ESTABLISH DETRIMENTAL EFFECT	423
<i>The new formula in the recent directives and its background</i>	423
3.EC.60. ECJ, 23 May 1996, C-237/94, <i>O'Flynn v. Adjudication Officer.</i> Whether requirement of a burial to be within a country indirectly discriminates against nationals from other Member States	423
<i>Factors where detrimental effect has been assumed prior to implementation of younger directives</i>	425
3.EC.61. ECJ, 17 October 1989, C-109/88, <i>Handels- og Kontorfunktionærernes Forbund I Danmark v. Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening, acting on behalf of Danfoss.</i> Whether a gender pay gap resulting from a system of bonuses establishes detrimental effect.	425
3.NL.62. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1996-56.</i> Whether an occupational doctor may be denied working time reduction for study purposes on the grounds that she works part time	426
3.ES.63. Spanish Constitutional Court, 28 February 1994, Case 58/1994, <i>Works council de Antonio Puig S.A. on behalf of 140 workers v. Antonio Puig S.A.</i> Wage categories and (indirect) sex discrimination	427
3.IE.64. Equality Tribunal, 6 February 2004, <i>Martin McDonagh v. Navan Hire Limited.</i> Whether not hiring a sanding machine to customers without a permanent address is indirect racial discrimination	428
3.NL.65. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1996-109.</i> Indirect religious discrimination by referring to headscarf	429
3.NL.66. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-112.</i> Indirect discrimination on grounds of religion by refusing to serve persons wearing head-coverings	429
<i>Assessing detrimental effect without statistical evidence following the younger directives</i>	430
3.NL.67. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-143.</i> Whether requiring an employee for telephone marketing to speak Dutch without a foreign accent constitutes indirect racial discrimination	431
3.SE.68. Labour Court, 4 December 2002, <i>Ombudsman ethnic discrimination (DO) v. Tjänstföretagens Arbetsgivarförbund and GfK Sv. Aktiebolag.</i> Whether requiring a telephone interviewer to speak Swedish without a foreign accent amounts to indirect discrimination on grounds of race	431
3.BE.69. Court of Appeal Antwerpen, 14 June 2005, <i>9 appellants v. Provincial Administration of Limburg.</i> Prohibiting wearing any headcovers as indirect discrimination on grounds of religion	433
3.DK.70. L. Roseberry, Tørklædediskrimination på arbejdsmarkedet	434
ASSESSMENT	435
3.5.2. OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION	435

CONTENTS

3.5.2.A. A “JUSTIFICATION PROPER” OR AN ELEMENT OF CAUSATION?	436
OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION AS “JUSTIFICATION PROPER”	436
3.EC.71. ECJ, 17 October 1989, C-109/88, <i>Handels- og Kontorfunktionærernes Forbund I Danmark v. Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening, acting on behalf of Danfoss</i>	436
3.NL.72. <i>Dutch Equal Treatment Act</i>	438
3.NL.73. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1997-4</i> . Indirect sex discrimination by disregarding seniority of former stand-by stewardesses who proceed to regular employment	438
“OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION” AS CAUSAL LINK TEST—AN INTEGRATED APPROACH	439
3.GB.74. Court of Appeal, 23 March 2001, <i>Allonby v. Accrington and Rossendale College</i> . Whether “downgrading” part time lecturers to self employed service providers constitutes indirect discrimination	440
ASSESSMENT	442
3.5.2.B. STANDARDS OF SCRUTINY	443
COMMUNITY LAW AND ECJ CASE-LAW	443
<i>Strict standard of scrutiny in relation to employers (sex equality law)</i>	443
<i>A loose standard in relation to Member States</i>	444
3.EC.75. ECJ, 9 February 1999, C-167/97, <i>Regina v. Secretary of State for Employment, ex parte Nicole Seymour-Smith and Laura Perez</i> . Two year qualification period for employment protection as indirect sex discrimination	444
3.EC.76. ECJ, 26 September 2000, C-322/98, <i>Kachelmann v. Bankhaus Lampe</i> . Indirect sex discrimination by reducing the pool of comparable employees for part time employees to other part time employees in cases of dismissal for economic reasons	445
NATIONAL CASE-LAW	447
3.GB.77. House of Lords, 17 February 2000, <i>R v. Secretary of State for Employment, ex parte Seymour-Smith and another</i> . Two year qualification period for employment protection as indirect sex discrimination	448
3.NL.78. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1996-56</i> . Whether an occupational doctor may be denied working time reduction for study purposes on the grounds that she works part time	449
3.SE.79. Labour Court, 21 September 2005, <i>Equal Opportunity Ombudsman (JämO) v. Teknikarbetsgivarna and VOLVO Car Co</i> . Whether requiring a height between 163 and 195 cm indirectly discriminates against women	450
3.5.2.C. OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION—PRACTICAL EXAMPLES AND APPLICATION AT NATIONAL LEVEL	452
ECONOMIC ARGUMENTS AS OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION	452
<i>EC law</i>	452
3.EC.80. ECJ, 6 April 2000, C-226/98, <i>Birgitte Jørgensen v. Foreningen af Speciallæger (FS) and Sygesikringens Forhandlingsudvalg (SF)</i> . Whether forcible	

CONTENTS

reclassification of medical practices to part time following decrease of turnover indirectly discriminates against women	453
3.EC.81. ECJ, 23 October 2003, C-4/02, C-5/02, <i>Hilde Schönheit v. Stadt Frankfurt a.M. and Sylvia Becker v. Land Hessen</i> . Whether degressively reducing a public servant's pension for years worked part time constitutes indirect sex discrimination	455
<i>National law</i>	456
3.FI.82. Finnish Supreme Court, 14 June 2004, Case 59/2004, <i>Employees v. Town of Kajaani</i> . Indirect discrimination, laying off a significant number of staff	457
3.DE.83. Federal Labour Court, 26 January 2005, 4 AZR 509/03. Whether reducing wages in a predominantly female sector in order to avoid outsourcing amounts to indirect sex discrimination	459
OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION IRRESPECTIVE OF "GROUNDS", TRULY NEUTRAL JUSTIFICATIONS	460
3.BE.84. Court of Appeal Antwerpen, 14 June 2005, 9 appellants v. <i>Provincial Administration of Limburg</i> . Prohibiting wearing any headcovers as indirect discrimination on grounds of religion	460
3.NL.85. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1996-109</i> . Indirect religious discrimination by referring to headscarf	462
3.NL.86. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-112</i> . Indirect discrimination on grounds of religion by refusing to serve persons wearing head-coverings	462
<i>Neutral justifications in relation to ethnic origin – language requirements</i>	463
3.NL.87. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-143</i> . Whether requiring an employee for telephone marketing to speak Dutch without a foreign accent constitutes indirect racial discrimination	463
3.SE.88. Labour Court, 4 December 2002, <i>Ombudsman ethnic discrimination (DO) v. Tjänstföretagens Arbetsgivarförbund and GfK Sv. Aktiebolag</i> . Whether requiring a telephone interviewer to speak Swedish without a foreign accent amounts to indirect discrimination on grounds of race	463
<i>Neutral justification in relation to different grounds with contradictory results</i>	464
3.DE.89. Federal Labour Court, 9AZR 750/00. Whether excluding from the right to reduce working time upon reaching the age of 60 such employees as can claim a pension is indirect discrimination	465
3.DE.90. Federal Labour Court (BAG), 9 AZR 122/03. Whether denying part time work on grounds of age to a disabled person entitled to a pension is indirect discrimination	466
3.5.2.D. COMPARABILITY OF SITUATIONS AS A NEW AND SPECIAL HURDLE	468
3.EC.91. ECJ, 8 June 2004, C-220/02, <i>Österreichischer Gewerkschaftsbund, Gewerkschaft der Privatangestellten v. Wirtschaftskammer Österreich</i>	468
3.EC.92. ECJ, 12 October 2004, 313/02, <i>Wippel v. Peek and Cloppenburg</i> . Legislation providing for minimum and maximum working time – exception for part time	469
3.5.2.E. ASSESSMENT	471
3.6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	472
3.6.1. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION LAW BETWEEN LEGAL TRANSPLANT AND IUS COMMUNE	472

3.6.2. CONSOLIDATION OF THE CONCEPT IN NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY LAW	473
3.6.2.A. ESTABLISHING DISADVANTAGE—STATISTICAL AND NON-STATISTICAL APPROACHES	473
3.6.2.B. OBJECTIVE JUSTIFICATION	474
3.6.3. CHALLENGES	475

**CHAPTER FOUR
HARASSMENT**

4.1. INTRODUCTION	477
4.EC.1. <i>Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin and Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation</i>	479
4.EC.2. <i>Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin and Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation</i>	479
4.EC.3. <i>Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (recast)</i>	480
4.EC.4. <i>Commission Recommendation of 27 November 1991 on the protection of the dignity of women and men at work (92/131/EEC)</i>	481
4.EC.5. <i>Commission Recommendation of 27 November 1991 on the protection of the dignity of women and men at work (92/131/EEC)</i>	482
4.EC.6. <i>Commission of the European Communities, Sexual harassment in the Workplace in the European Union</i>	483
4.2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT	484
4.2.1. THE LEGAL RECOGNITION OF RACIAL AND “SEXUAL HARASSMENT” IN THE US	485
4.US.7. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, 454 F.2d 234 (1971), <i>Rogers v. EEOC</i> . Whether racial harassment is actionable race discrimination	486
4.US.8. District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeal, 561 F.2d 983 (1977), <i>Barnes v. Costle</i> . Quid pro quo sexual harassment as actionable sex discrimination	488
4.US.9. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, <i>Guidelines on Sexual Harassment</i>	490
4.US.10. Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, 682 F.2d 897 C.A.Fla (1982), <i>Henson v. City of Dundee</i> . “Hostile environment” harassment as actionable sex discrimination	491
4.US.11. US Supreme Court, 477 US 57 (1986), <i>Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson</i> . “Hostile environment” harassment as actionable sex discrimination	493
4.US.12. US Supreme Court, 523 U.S. 75 (1998), <i>Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Servs., Inc.</i> Same-sex sexual harassment as sex discrimination	496

CONTENTS

4.US.13. Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, 231 F.3d 1080 (2000), <i>Spearman v. Ford Motor Co.</i> Harassment based on sexual orientation not sex discrimination	498
4.2.2. THE RECOGNITION OF HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LAW	500
4.UN.14. Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, <i>General Recommendation No. 19: Violence against women</i>	501
4.UN.15. Committee on the Elimination of Race Discrimination, CERD/C/62/D/26/2002 (2002), <i>Hagan v. Australia</i> . Exposure to racially offensive material amounts to discrimination	502
4.INT.16. H. Hoel, K. Sparks & C.L. Cooper, <i>The Cost Of Violence/Stress At Work and The Benefits of a Violence/Stress-Free Working Environment</i>	504
4. INT.17. V. Di Martino, H. Hoel and C.L. Cooper, <i>Preventing violence and harassment in the workplace</i>	505
4.GB.18. <i>Guidance on Bullying, UNISON, 1996</i>	506
4.INT.19. V. Di Martino, H. Hoel and C.L. Cooper, <i>Preventing violence and harassment in the workplace</i>	507
4.INT.20. J. Aeberhard-Hodges, <i>Sexual harassment in employment: Recent judicial and arbitral trends</i>	508
4.3. THE REGULATION OF HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE EU AND ITS MEMBER STATES PRIOR TO 2000	509
4.EC.21. Commission of the European Communities, <i>Sexual harassment in the Workplace in the European Union</i>	509
4.3.1. HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE EU	512
4.EC.22. Commission of the European Communities, <i>Sexual harassment in the Workplace in the European Union</i>	512
4.EC.23. European Commission's Advisory Committee on Safety, Hygiene and Health Protection, <i>Opinion on Violence at the workplace</i>	515
4.EC.24. Commission of the European Communities, Communication from the Commission: <i>Adapting To Change In Work And Society: A New Community Strategy On Health And Safety At Work</i>	517
4.3.2. HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE EU MEMBER STATES	517
4.EC.25. <i>Sexual Harassment in Post-Communist Countries</i>	517
4.3.3. ADDRESSING HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT OUTSIDE THE FRAMEWORK OF DISCRIMINATION LAW	519
4.3.3.A. PENAL PROVISIONS	519
4.PT.26. <i>Portuguese Penal Code</i>	519
4.3.3.B. CIVIL PROVISIONS	520
4.IT.27. A. Simoni, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Italy</i>	520
4.PT.28. <i>Portuguese Civil Code</i>	521
4.3.3.C. HEALTH AND SAFETY PROVISIONS	521
4.3.3.D. GENERAL LABOUR LAW PROVISIONS	522

4.EC.29. Commission of the European Communities, <i>Sexual harassment in the Workplace in the European Union</i>	523
4.3.4. HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF DISCRIMINATION LAW	523
4.GB.30. <i>Sex Discrimination Act 1975</i>	524
4.GB.31. Court of Session: First Division, 14 January 1986, <i>Strathclyde Regional Council v. Porcelli</i> . Sexual harassment can amount to sex discrimination	524
4.GB.32. Employment Appeal Tribunal, 4 May 1994, <i>Stewart v. Cleveland Guest (Engineering) Ltd</i> . “Pin ups” did not discriminate against women	526
4.GB.33. Employment Appeal Tribunal, 27 July 2004, <i>Brumfitt v. Ministry of Defence</i> . Sexual abuse did not discriminate against women	527
4.GB.34. House of Lords, 31 July 2001, <i>Pearce v. Governing Body of Mayfield School</i> . Homophobic harassment is not sex discrimination	529
4.3.5. EXPRESS REGULATION OF SEXUAL AND OTHER HARASSMENT	530
4.DK.35. High Court for Eastern Denmark, 31 October 2001. Sexually explicit insults not sex discrimination	531
4.IE.36. <i>Irish Employment Equality Acts 1998 to 2004</i>	532
4.IE.37. Equality Tribunal, <i>A complainant v. A company</i> . Only a fooling girl	532
4.FR.38. <i>French Penal Code</i>	533
4.DE.39. <i>German Law for the protection of the persons employed from sexual annoyance on the job of 24 June 1994</i>	534
4.BE.40. <i>Belgian Federal Act of 11 June 2002 on violence, mobbing and sexual harassment at work</i>	535
4.SE.41. <i>The Swedish Equal Opportunities Act 1991 (as amended in 1998)</i>	535
4.BE.42. <i>Belgian Federal Act of 11 June 2002 on violence, mobbing and sexual harassment at work</i>	536
4.3.6. ENFORCING PROHIBITIONS ON HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT: PROBLEMS OF VICARIOUS AND DIRECT LIABILITY	536
4.IE.43. High Court, <i>BC v. a Health Board</i> . Sexual assault not “within the course of employment”	537
4.GB.44. <i>Race Relations Act 1975</i>	537
4.GB.45. Court of Appeal, <i>Jones v. Tower Boot Co Ltd</i> . Whether employer is liable for abusive conduct of fellow employees	538
4.IE.46. Labour Court, AEE/02/6 Determination No.029, 9 October 2002. Employers’ liability for harassment	538
4.NL.47. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1997-122</i> . Employer’s liability for harassment	540
4.NL.48. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1997-82</i> . Liability for harassment by third party	542
4.GB.49. House of Lords, 31 July 2001, <i>Pearce v. Governing Body of Mayfield School</i> . Liability for harassment by third parties	543
4.SE.50. <i>The Swedish Equal Opportunities Act 1991 (as amended in 1998)</i>	544
4.EC.51. <i>General Report On Developments In EU Gender Equality Law of the Commission’s Network of legal experts in the fields of employment, social affairs and equality between men and women (June 2004 – May 2005)</i>	545
4.SE.52. <i>The Swedish Equal Opportunities Act 1991 (as amended in 1998)</i>	545

CONTENTS

4.INT.53. V. Di Martino, H. Hoel and C. L. Cooper, <i>Preventing violence and harassment in the workplace</i>	545
4.4. REGULATION OF HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT AFTER IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECTIVES 2004/43/EC, 2000/78/EC AND 2002/73/EC	547
4.4.1. DEFINITIONS OF “HARASSMENT” AND “SEXUAL HARASSMENT”	547
4.FR.54. <i>French Labour Code</i>	548
4.BE.55. <i>Belgian Act to combat discrimination of 25 February 2003</i>	549
4.NL.56. <i>The Dutch General Equal Treatment Act</i>	549
4.NL.57. M. Gijzen, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Netherlands</i>	550
4.IE.58. <i>Irish Employment Equality Acts 1998 to 2004</i>	551
4.GB.59. <i>Race Relations Act 1976</i>	552
4.GB.60. <i>Sex Discrimination Act 1975</i>	552
4.4.2. “HARASSMENT” AND “DISCRIMINATION”	553
4.UK.61. <i>Disability Discrimination Act 1995</i>	554
4.4.3. LIABILITY FOR HARASSMENT	554
4.DK.62. <i>The Danish Labour Market Discrimination Act</i>	555
4.DK.63. N.E. Hansen, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Denmark</i>	555
4.NL.64. M. Gijzen, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Netherlands</i>	556
4.IE.65. <i>Irish Employment Equality Acts 1998 to 2004</i>	558
4.EC.66. <i>Directives 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC</i>	559
4.5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	559

CHAPTER FIVE INSTRUCTIONS TO DISCRIMINATE AND VICTIMISATION

5.1. INSTRUCTIONS TO DISCRIMINATE	561
5.1.1. DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL LAW	561
5.1.1.A. INCITEMENT TO DISCRIMINATE	561
5.UN.1. <i>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</i>	562
5.UN.2. Human Rights Committee, General Comment No.11: <i>Prohibition of propaganda for war and inciting national, racial or religious hatred</i>	562
5.UN.3. <i>Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination</i>	563
5.UN.4. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, <i>General Recommendation 15, Measures to eradicate incitement to or acts of discrimination</i>	564
5.EC.5. The Council of the European Union, <i>Joint Action of 15 July 1996 adopted by the Council on the basis of Article K.3 of the Treaty on European Union, concerning action to combat racism and xenophobia</i>	565

CONTENTS

5.EC.6. European Commission, <i>Staff Working Paper, Legal reasoning for not referring to the concept of “public incitement to discrimination” in the Commission’s proposal for a Council Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia</i>	566
5.EC.7. Council of the European Union, <i>Proposal for a Council Framework Decision on Combating Racism and Xenophobia</i>	567
5.1.1.B. INSTRUCTIONS TO DISCRIMINATE	568
5.EC.8. Council Directive 2000/43 of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin	568
5.1.2. NATIONAL LAW	569
5.1.2.A. INSTRUCTIONS TO DISCRIMINATE AS PART OF INCITEMENT TO DISCRIMINATE	569
5.LT.9. <i>Lithuanian Penal Code</i>	569
5.LU.10. Council of State, Opinion of 7 December 2004	569
5.BE.11. <i>Belgian Act of 30 July 1981 on the punishment of certain acts motivated by racism or xenophobia</i>	570
5.BE.12. <i>Belgian Penal Code</i>	570
5.BE.13. Criminal Court, 27 March 1995, <i>Openbaar Ministerie, Hamid B, Stephan A, George S, Azeen M, Singh R, CGKR v. Martine M, Mario G, Marc D</i> . An instruction by a bar manager to his employees not to serve foreigners in order to incite them to leave the place	571
5.BE.14. Criminal Court, 24 December 2002, <i>Openbaar Ministerie, Saida K, Hatem H, Mohmed H, Abdelgaafar H v. AVH, police Commissioner; 2. (...); 3.KDB, politie-inspecteur</i> . Violation of article 1.2 and 4 of the “Act of 30 July 1981 on punishment of certain acts motivated by racism or xenophobia”	572
5.1.2.B. PENAL CODE PROVISIONS ON ACCOMPLICES	573
5.FR.15. <i>French Penal Code</i>	573
5.FR.16. <i>French Penal Code</i>	574
5.FR.17. <i>French law on press freedom of 29 July 1881</i>	575
5.FI.18. <i>Preparatory Works to the Finnish Non-Discrimination Act, HE 44/2003 [Government Proposal 44/2003], extract concerning section 6</i>	576
5.1.2.C. INSTRUCTIONS TO DISCRIMINATE AS A FORM OF DISCRIMINATION	577
5.GB.19. <i>Race Relations Act 1976</i>	578
5.GB.20. Employment Appeal Tribunal, 15 November 1982, <i>B.L Cars Ltd and another (appellants) v. Brown and others (respondents)</i> . Instructions to discriminate can also amount to a detriment in a claim for direct discrimination	578
5.GB.21. Employment Appeal Tribunal, 23 October 1983, <i>Showboat Entertainment Centre Ltd v. Owens</i> . An employee, who is dismissed for failing to follow instructions to discriminate against customers	579
5.DE.22. Labour Court, 3rd Chamber, 10 December 2003. An instruction not to employ Turks if there are sufficient applicants of other backgrounds is not unlawful	580
5.1.2.D. BEYOND INSTRUCTIONS TO DISCRIMINATE	583
5.GB.23. <i>Sex Discrimination Act 1975</i>	584
5.GB.24. <i>Race Relations Act 1976</i>	584
5.GB.25. Employment Appeal Tribunal, 17 December 1982, <i>The Commission for Racial Equality v. The Imperial Society of Teachers of Dancing</i> . Meaning of inducing or	

CONTENTS

attempting to induce a person to discriminate. Meaning of procuring or attempting to procure	585
5.NIR.26. <i>Fair Employment and Treatment (Northern Ireland) Order</i>	587
5.GB.27. <i>Equality Act 2006</i>	587
5.GB.28. <i>Equality Bill</i> , Standing Committee A, Hansard, 6 December 2005	588
Clause 54. Instructing or causing discrimination	588
5.IE.29. <i>Irish Employment Equality Act 1998</i>	589
5.IE.30. <i>Irish Equal Status Act 2000</i>	590
5.1.2.E. AIDING UNLAWFUL ACTS	590
5.HU.31. <i>Hungarian Act CXXV of 2003 on equal treatment and on fostering equal opportunities</i>	591
5.HU.32. <i>Hungarian Act XXII of 1992 on the Labour Code</i>	591
5.HU.33. <i>Hungarian Act XXII of 1992 on the legal status of civil servants</i>	591
5.HU.34. <i>Hungarian Act XLIII of 1996 on the service status of professional members of the armed services</i>	592
5.HU.35. <i>Hungarian Act IV of 1959 on the Civil Code</i>	592
5.GB.36. <i>Race Relations Act 1975</i>	593
5.NIR.37. <i>Fair Employment and Treatment (Northern Ireland) Order</i>	594
5.GB.38. House of Lords, 22 March 2001, <i>Hallam and another (applicants) v. Cheltenham Borough Council and others (Respondents)</i> . A degree of knowledge of the consequences of one's actions is needed to show that one has "knowingly aided" another to discriminate	595
5.GB.39. House of Lords, 22 March 2001, <i>Anyanwu and another (applicants) v. South bank University Students Union and South Bank University (respondents), Commission for Racial Equality (Interveners)</i> . Distinguishing aiding discrimination from inducing or procuring discrimination	597
5.1.3. COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW	601
5.2. VICTIMISATION	603
5.2.1. DEVELOPMENT OF EC LAW	603
5.EC.40. <i>Council Directive 76/207/EEC of 9 February 1976 on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion, and working conditions</i>	603
5.EC.41. <i>Council Directive 86/378/EEC of 24 July 1986 on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women in occupational social security schemes</i>	604
5.EC.42. <i>Council Directive 2000/43 of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin</i>	604
5.EC.43. <i>Council Directive 2000/78 of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation</i>	604
5.EC.44. <i>Council Directive of 9 February 1976 on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion and working conditions (76/207/EEC) as amended by Directive 2002/73</i>	604
5.EC.45. ECJ, 22 September 1998, C-185/1997, <i>Belinda Jane Coote v. Granada Hospitality Limited</i> . Victimisation covers the employer's actions in relation to the employee after the employment relationship has ended	606
5.EC.46. M. M. Sierra, <i>Towards Equal Treatment: Transposing the Directive – Analysis and Proposals</i>	608

CONTENTS

5.2.2. NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND CASE-LAW	608
5.IE.47. Equality Tribunal, <i>A claimant v. A department store</i> . Seriousness of victimisation	609
5.FI.48. <i>Finnish Non-Discrimination Act</i>	610
5.FI.49. <i>Finnish Act on Equality between Women and Men</i>	611
5.NL.50. <i>Dutch General Equal Treatment Act</i>	611
5.IE.51. <i>Irish Employment Equality Act 1998–2004</i>	612
5.IE.52. <i>Irish Equal Status Act 2000</i>	612
5.GB.53. Court of Appeal, 3 July 1997, <i>Waters v. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis</i> . Protection from victimisation requires claimant to reveal facts capable in law of amounting to an act of discrimination	614
5.GB.54. <i>Employment Equality (Religion and Belief) Regulations 2003</i>	616
5.DE.55. <i>German General Equal Treatment Act</i>	617
5.GB.56. House of Lords, 16 July 1999, <i>Swiggs and others v. Nagarajan</i> . Motivation of discrimination irrelevant to a victimisation claim	619
5.2.3. COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW	624
5.3. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	624
5.3.1. COMMONALITIES BETWEEN INSTRUCTION AND VICTIMISATION	624
5.3.2. MEMBER STATES' RESPONSES TOWARDS UNSOLVED ISSUES	625
5.3.3. POWER RELATIONS CAUSED BY DISCRIMINATION AND INSTRUCTIONS TO DISCRIMINATE	626

**CHAPTER SIX
REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION**

6.1. INTRODUCTION	629
6.EC.1. <i>Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation</i>	629
6.1.1. THE DUTY TO MAKE A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION—THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	631
6.1.2. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AND THE NON-DISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENT	632
6.1.3. GOALS OF THIS CHAPTER	633
6.2. THE MEANING OF THE TERM “REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION”	634
6.2.1. THE MEANING OF THE TERM “REASONABLE”	635
6.2.1.A. AN ACCOMMODATION THAT DOES NOT RESULT IN EXCESSIVE DIFFICULTIES FOR THE EMPLOYER	635
6.FI.2. <i>Finnish Non-Discrimination Act 21/2004</i>	635

CONTENTS

6.FI.3. <i>Extracts from the Preparatory Works to the Finnish Non-Discrimination Act</i>	636
6.IE.4. <i>Irish Equal Status Act 2000</i>	636
6.IE.5. <i>Irish Employment Equality Act 1998</i>	637
6.IE.6. Labour Court, 23 January 2000, <i>A Company (represented by the Irish Business and Employers' Confederation) v. A Worker (represented by Irish Municipal, Public and Civil Trade Union)</i> . Failure to do all that is reasonable to accommodate an employee – failure to reassign tasks and provide parking space	638
6.IE.7. Equality Tribunal, 4 February 2002, <i>An Employee (represented by IMPACT) v. A Local Authority</i> . Failure to do all that is reasonable to accommodate an employee – failure to follow expert advice	640
6.IE.8. Equality Tribunal, 1 August 2000, <i>Mr John Roche v. Alabaster Associates Limited t/a Madigans</i> . Refusal to allow access to a restaurant of a guide dog amounts to a failure to provide reasonable accommodation	642
6.BE.9. <i>Belgian Act of 25 February 2003 to Combat Discrimination and to Amend the Act of 15 February 1993 to Establish a Centre for Equal Opportunity and to Combat Racism</i>	645
6.BE.10. <i>Belgian Guide to...Reasonable Accommodations for Persons with a Disability at Work, March 2005</i>	645
6.DE.11. <i>German Social Law Code, Book Nine, Rehabilitation and Participation of disabled persons</i>	647
6.US.12. <i>Americans with Disabilities Act</i>	649
6.US.13. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), <i>Regulations on the ADA</i>	649
6.US.14. 7th Circuit 1995, 44 F.3d 538, <i>Vande Zande v. State of Wisconsin Department of Administration</i> . No failure to make a reasonable accommodation not allowing an employee to work full time at home and by not adapting kitchen	651
6.US.15. Supreme Court of the United States, 2002 535 U.S. 391, <i>US Airways, Inc. v. Barnett</i> . An accommodation which conflicts with a seniority rule will generally not be reasonable	653
6.2.1.B. AN ACCOMMODATION THAT IS EFFECTIVE	658
6.NL.16. <i>Dutch Act on Equal Treatment on the Grounds of Disability or Chronic Illness 2004</i>	658
6.NL.17. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-140</i> . Failure to provide accommodated exams at same price as ordinary exams amounted to discrimination	659
6.NL.18. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2005-18</i> . Requirement to react in adequate and timely manner to request for an accommodation	661
6.IE.19. <i>Irish Equality Act 2004</i>	662
6.FR.20. <i>French Labour Code</i>	664
A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION WITH REGARD TO RELIGIOUS PRACTICES	664
6.US.21. The US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	664
6.2.1.C. BOTH AN ACCOMMODATION WHICH DOES NOT RESULT IN EXCESSIVE DIFFICULTIES FOR THE EMPLOYER AND AN “EFFECTIVE ACCOMMODATION”	665
THE EMPLOYMENT EQUALITY DIRECTIVE	665

CONTENTS

6.EC.22. <i>Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation</i>	665
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS IN EU MEMBER STATES BASED ON ARTICLE 5 OF THE FRAMEWORK DIRECTIVE	666
6.LV.23. <i>Latvian Labour law, amended 7 May 2005</i>	666
6.BE.24. <i>Decree Flemish Community, 8 May 2002 concerning balanced participation in the labour market</i>	667
UNITED KINGDOM	667
6.UK.25. <i>The Disability Discrimination Act 1995, as amended</i>	667
6.2.1.D. COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW	669
6.2.2. THE MEANING OF THE TERM “ACCOMMODATION” AND THE KINDS OF ACCOMMODATIONS THAT ARE REQUIRED	670
6.2.2.A. GENERAL CLASSIFICATIONS OF ACCOMMODATION	671
EMPLOYMENT-RELATED ACCOMMODATIONS—“HARD” AND “SOFT” COSTS	671
6.US.26. <i>M. A. Stein, The Law and Economics of Disability Accommodations</i>	671
STAGE WITHIN THE EMPLOYMENT PROCESS	672
CHARACTERISTICS OF BENEFICIARIES	672
6.2.2.B. TERMINOLOGY	672
6.2.2.C. THE QUALITIES REQUIRED FOR ANY ACCOMMODATION	673
6.BE.27. <i>Belgian Guide to ... Reasonable Accommodations for Persons with a Disability at Work, March 2005</i>	673
6.IE.28. <i>Irish Employment Equality Act 1998-2004, Amended Section 16</i>	675
6.SK.29. <i>Slovakian Act No. 29/1984 Coll. on the system of primary and secondary schools (the School Act) as amended</i>	675
6.ES.30. <i>Spanish Law 51/2003 For Equal Opportunities and Against the Discrimination of Disabled Persons</i>	676
6.2.2.D. THE KINDS OF ACCOMMODATIONS WHICH ARE REQUIRED	677
STATUTORY PROVISIONS	677
<i>United Kingdom</i>	677
6.UK.31. <i>The Disability Discrimination Act 1995, as amended</i>	677
6.UK.32. <i>The Disability Discrimination Act 1995, as amended</i>	678
<i>Ireland</i>	679
6.IE.33. <i>Irish Equal Status Act 2000</i>	679
GUIDELINES ACCOMPANYING LEGISLATION	680
<i>United Kingdom</i>	680
6.GB.34. <i>Disability Discrimination Act 1995 – Code of Practice – Employment and Occupation</i>	680
<i>Belgium</i>	682

CONTENTS

6.BE.35. Belgian Guide to ... Reasonable Accommodations for Persons with a Disability at Work, March 2005	682
GUIDELINES RELATED TO ACCOMMODATING RELIGIOUS PRACTICES— US AND UK	683
6.US.36. <i>Code of Federal Regulations, Title 29, Volume 4, Part 1605, Guidelines on Discrimination because of Religion</i>	684
6.GB.37. <i>Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS), A Guide for Employers and Employees. Religion or Belief and the Workplace</i>	685
EXAMPLES FROM CASE-LAW—TRANSFER OF EMPLOYEE TO ANOTHER POSITION	687
6.NL.38. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-21</i> . Transfer to another position can be an effective accommodation	687
6.UK.39. House of Lords, Session 2003-04, <i>Archibald v. Fife</i> . Transfer to another position without requiring standard competitive interview can be a reasonable adjustment	689
6.IT.40. Court of Pistoia, Labour Section, 30 September 2005, <i>Laura Neri v. Ministry of Justice</i> . Failure to allow disabled employee to continue working near to a place of residence and to insist on transfer to another office can be a form of discrimination	692
6.2.2.E. CHOICE AS TO THE APPROPRIATE ACCOMMODATION	693
6.DE.41. State Labour Court of Lower Saxony, 1 July 2003, <i>Anonymous</i> . Right to reasonable accommodation/right to be employed in a way that allows a severely disabled employee to utilise and improve skills and knowledge to the full extent possible – variety of means of achieving this goal	694
6.2.2.F. COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW	696
6.3. ENTITLEMENT TO CLAIM A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AND OBLIGATIONS ON BOTH PARTIES	696
6.3.1. THE GENERIC CATEGORIES	697
6.3.1.A. PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	697
6.3.1.B. MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS MINORITIES AND INDIVIDUALS WISHING TO MANIFEST THEIR RELIGION	697
6.BG.42. <i>Bulgarian Protection against Discrimination Act (effective as of 1 January 2004)</i>	697
6.ES.43. L. Cachón, <i>Report on measures to combat discrimination: Directive 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. Country report Spain. Spanish Cooperation Agreements</i>	698
6.GB.44. Court of Appeal, 25 July 2005, <i>Copsey v. WBB Devon Clays Ltd.</i> Employers might be obliged to accommodate needs of religious employees in certain circumstances	700
6.3.1.C. OTHER GROUPS	701
6.FR.45. <i>French Labour Code</i>	701
6.3.2. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS—PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES	702

CONTENTS

6.3.2.A. EMPLOYMENT	702
PERSON WITH DISABILITY MUST BE QUALIFIED FOR THE JOB/EMPLOYMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES	702
<i>Employment Equality Directive</i>	703
6.EC.46. ECJ, 11 July 2006, Case C-13/05, <i>Sonia Chacón Navas v. Eurest Colectividades</i> . Discrimination occurs where an individual with a disability is dismissed where they would be competent, capable and available to perform the essential functions of the post following the making of a reasonable accommodation	703
<i>Ireland</i>	705
6.IE.47. <i>Employment Equality Act 1998–2004</i>	705
6.IE.48. Labour Court, ED/00/8 Determination No. 013, 18 July 2001, <i>A Computer Component Company v. A Worker</i> . Employee with a disability not required to be able to carry out minor tasks related to function	706
<i>The Netherlands</i>	708
6.NL.49. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2004-59</i> . No obligation to make an accommodation where it is unclear that this would enable an individual to successfully complete exams	708
THE OBLIGATION ON THE PERSON WITH A DISABILITY TO INFORM THE EMPLOYER	710
<i>United Kingdom</i>	710
6.UK.50. Disability Discrimination Act 1995, as amended	710
<i>The Netherlands</i>	711
6.NL.51. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 2005-18</i> . Claimant is obliged to ensure employer or vocational trainer is aware of need for accommodation	711
<i>Latvia</i>	713
6.LV.52. Latvian Labour Law	713
THE OBLIGATION ON THE EMPLOYER TO CONSIDER AND IDENTIFY A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION	713
<i>United Kingdom</i>	713
6.UK.53. Employment Appeals Tribunal, 6 June 2001, <i>Casgrove v. Caesar & Howie</i> . Obligation to consider whether any reasonable adjustments is possible lies with employer	714
<i>Ireland</i>	716
6.IE.54. Labour Court, ED/02/59 Determination No. 037, 18 February 2003, <i>A Health and Fitness Club v. A Worker</i> . Employer is obliged to engage in a two stage enquiry process	716
6.3.2.B. SERVICES	718
IMPOSSIBLE OR UNREASONABLY DIFFICULT TO ACCESS SERVICES	718
<i>United Kingdom</i>	718
6.UK.55. B. J. Doyle, <i>Disability Discrimination, Law and Practice</i>	719

CONTENTS

6.UK.56. C. Gooding and C. Casserley, <i>Disability Discrimination Laws and Goods and Services</i>	719
A REACTIVE DUTY OWED TO INDIVIDUALS OR AN ANTICIPATORY DUTY OWED TO THE GROUP OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES?	720
<i>United Kingdom</i>	721
6.GB.57. <i>Code of Practice – Rights of access : services to public, public authority functions, private clubs and premises</i>	721
6.UK.58. C. Gooding and C. Casserley, <i>Disability Discrimination Laws and Goods and Services</i>	721
6.3.3. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS—RELIGION	722
6.3.3.A. AN INDIVIDUAL MAY NEED TO PROVE THAT THEY ARE OF A PARTICULAR FAITH	722
6.CoE.59. ECtHR, 13 April 2006, <i>Kosteski v. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i> . An individual who claims a right to take a public holiday to celebrate a Muslim holiday can be required to provide evidence that he is a Muslim	722
6.3.4. COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW	723
6.4. LIMITATIONS ON THE DUTY TO ACCOMMODATE	724
6.4.1. INTRODUCTION AND EXPLORATION OF THE ISSUES	724
6.EC.60. ECJ, 11 July 2006, Case C-13/05, <i>Sonia Chacón Navas v. Eurest Colectividades</i> . Discrimination occurs where an individual with a disability is dismissed where they would be competent, capable and available to perform the essential functions of the post following the making of a reasonable accommodation	726
6.EC.61. <i>Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation</i>	729
6.4.2. NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	730
6.4.2.A. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS	730
6.BG.62. <i>Bulgarian Protection Against Discrimination Act (effective as of 1 January 2004)</i>	730
6.BE.63. <i>Belgian Guide to...Reasonable Accommodations for Persons with a Disability at Work, March 2005</i>	731
6.4.2.B. IRELAND—FINANCIAL ISSUES AND THE IMPACT OF THE EMPLOYMENT EQUALITY DIRECTIVE	733
6.IE.64. Supreme Court, 15 May 1997, <i>In the matter of Article 26 of the Constitution and in the matter of the Employment Equality Bill, 1996</i> . Obligation to make an accommodation unless this amounted to undue hardship breached the right to carry on a business and earn a livelihood	734
6.IE.65. <i>Irish Employment Equality Act 1998</i>	736
6.4.2.C. NON-FINANCIAL ISSUES WHICH JUSTIFY A FAILURE TO MAKE ACCOMMODATION	737
6.SK.66. <i>Slovakian Act No. 365/2004 Coll. on Equal Treatment in Certain Areas and Protection against Discrimination, amending and supplementing certain other laws (Anti-discrimination Act) of 20 May 2004</i>	737

CONTENTS

6.AT.67. <i>Austrian Act on the Employment of People with Disabilities (effective as of 1 January 2006)</i>	738
6.4.3. COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW	739
6.5. FITTING THE DUTY TO ACCOMMODATE INTO THE NON-DISCRIMINATION FRAMEWORK	740
6.5.1. FAILURE TO MAKE A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AS A FORM OF DIRECT DISCRIMINATION	741
6.SE.68. <i>Swedish Prohibition of Discrimination in Working Life of People with Disability Act (1999:132)</i>	741
6.5.2. FAILURE TO MAKE A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AS A FORM OF INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION	742
6.SK.69. <i>Slovakian Act No. 365/2004 Coll. on Equal Treatment in Certain Areas and Protection against Discrimination, amending and supplementing certain other laws (Anti-discrimination Act)</i>	743
6.5.3. FAILURE TO MAKE A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AS A <i>SUI GENERIS</i> FORM OF DISCRIMINATION	744
6.5.4. FAILURE TO ELABORATE ON THE STATUS OF AN UNJUSTIFIED FAILURE TO MAKE A REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION	744
6.5.5. COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW	745
6.6. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AND POSITIVE ACTION	745
6.6.1. INTRODUCTION AND EXPLORATION OF THE ISSUES	745
6.6.2. A CLEAR SEPARATION OF REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION FROM POSITIVE ACTION	748
6.UK.70. House of Lords, Session 2003-04, <i>Archibald v. Fife Council</i> . Reasonable adjustments can involve an element of more favourable treatment where this is needed in order to achieve equality	748
6.UK.71. P. Hughes, <i>Disability Discrimination and the Duty to Make Reasonable Adjustments: Recent Developments</i>	750
6.6.3. AMBIGUITY OR CONFUSION	750
6.6.4. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AS AN EXCEPTION TO THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL TREATMENT	752
6.EE.72. <i>Law of Republic of Estonia on Employment Contracts</i>	752
6.6.5. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION LABELLED AS A FORM OF POSITIVE ACTION	753
6.PT.73. <i>Portuguese Labour Code</i>	753
6.6.6. COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW	753
6.7. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	754

CONTENTS

CHAPTER SEVEN POSITIVE ACTION

7.1. INTRODUCTION	757
7.2. THE DEFINITION OF POSITIVE ACTION	759
7.UN.1. <i>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</i>	760
7.CoE.2. <i>Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities</i>	761
7.3. A TYPOLOGY OF POSITIVE ACTION AND OTHER MEASURES	761
7.3.1. TYPOLOGY	762
7.3.2. MEASURES NOT (NECESSARILY) IMPLYING PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT	763
7.3.2.A. MONITORING	763
7.NL.3. <i>Dutch law on the Promotion of Labour Participation of Ethnic Minorities</i>	763
7.NIR.4. <i>Fair Employment and Treatment (Northern Ireland) Order 1998</i>	766
7.DE.5. <i>Hesse Women Equality Act in the public administration</i>	770
7.3.2.B. REDEFINING MERIT	771
7.DE.6. <i>Hesse Women Equality Act in the public administration</i>	772
7.3.2.C. OUTREACHING	772
7.DE.7. <i>Hesse Women Equality Act in the public administration</i>	773
7.GB.8. <i>The Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2003</i>	774
7.DE.9. <i>Hesse Women Equality Act in the public administration</i>	774
7.3.3. POSITIVE ACTION MEASURES IMPLYING PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT	775
7.3.3.A. PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT OF EQUALLY QUALIFIED MEMBERS OF THE UNDERREPRESENTED GROUP	775
7.DE.10. <i>Bremen Act on Equal Treatment for Men and Women in the Public Service</i>	775
7.DE.11. <i>German Law on Civil Servants of the Land</i>	776
7.3.3.B. STRICT QUOTAS	776
7.SE.12. <i>Swedish Equality Act 1991:433</i>	776
7.SE.13. <i>Swedish Regulation concerning certain professors' and research assistants' posts created with a view to promoting equality 1995:936</i>	777
7.DE.14. <i>Hesse Women Equality Act in the public administration</i>	778
7.NIR.15. <i>Police (Northern Ireland) Act 2000</i>	778
7.3.4. POSITIVE ACTION REQUIRING PREFERENCE—AIMS AND SCRUTINY	780
7.4. POSITIVE ACTION UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW	781
7.4.1. UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS	781
7.UN.16. <i>International Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination</i>	781

CONTENTS

7.UN.17. <i>International Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</i>	782
7.UN.18. CEDAW Committee, <i>General recommendation No. 23: Political and public life</i>	783
7.UN.19. Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, <i>General recommendation No. 25</i>	785
7.UN.20. Human Rights Committee, Communication n°198/1985, <i>Stalla Costa v. Uruguay</i> . Reinstatement in the Uruguayan public service of unfairly dismissed civil servants	787
7.UN.21. Human Rights Committee, Communication n°943/2000, <i>Guido Jacobs v. Belgium</i> . Compatibility with art. 25(c) and art. 26 CCPR of a quota in favour of under-represented sex in the Belgian public service	788
7.UN.22. UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, <i>General Comment No. 5: The rights of persons with disabilities</i>	790
7.4.2. COUNCIL OF EUROPE HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS	793
7.4.2.A. THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS	794
7.CoE.23. <i>European Convention on Human Rights, The Explanatory Report to Protocol 12</i>	795
7.4.2.B. THE EUROPEAN SOCIAL CHARTER	796
7.4.2.C. THE FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES	798
7.CoE.24. Advisory Committee of the Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities, <i>Opinion on Ireland, 22 May 2003</i>	800
7.5. POSITIVE ACTION UNDER EUROPEAN UNION LAW	801
7.5.1. COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 76/207/EEC AND THE <i>KALANKE</i> RULING (1995)	801
7.EC.25. <i>Council Directive 76/207/EEC of 9 February 1976 on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion, and working conditions</i>	801
7.EC.26. <i>Recommendation 84/635/EEC on the promotion of positive action for women</i>	802
7.EC.27. ECJ, 17 October 1995, C-450/93, <i>Eckhard Kalanke v. Freie Hansestadt Bremen</i> . Admissibility of an absolute preference in favour of the member of the under-represented sex (“flexible quota”) under the Gender Employment Directive	803
7.5.2. POST-KALANKE	806
7.5.2.A. CONSTITUTIONALISING POSITIVE ACTION BY CHANGING ARTICLE 141 EC (IGC AMSTERDAM)	806
7.EC.28. ECJ, 30 September 2004, Case C-319/03, <i>Serge Briheche v. Ministère de l’intérieur, de la sécurité intérieure et des libertés locales</i> . Compatibility with article 3(1) and article 2(4) of the Gender Equality Directive	807
7.5.2.B. THE <i>MARSCHALL</i> LINE OF CASE-LAW (1997–2002)	809
7.EC.29. ECJ, 11 November 1997, C-409/95, <i>Hellmuth Marschall v. Land Nordrhein-Westfalen</i> . Whether preferential rule with a “savings clause” is compatible with the gender employment directive	809

CONTENTS

7.EC.30. ECJ, 28 March 2000, C-158/97, <i>Badeck and others</i> . Compatibility with the gender employment directive of provisions imposing the adoption of advancement plans and other measures in favour of women	811
7.EC.31. ECJ, 6 July 2000, Case C-407/98, <i>Katarina Abrahamsson, Leif Anderson and Elisabet Fogelqvist</i> . Compatibility with the gender employment directive of a rule providing for the automatic recruitment of a sufficiently qualified member of the under-represented sex, unless this would give rise to a breach of the requirement of objectivity in making appointments	815
7.5.2.C. ADAPTING DIRECTIVE 76/207/EEC TO ARTICLE 141(4) EC	820
7.5.3. THE FUTURE OF POSITIVE ACTION UNDER EUROPEAN UNION LAW	821
7.EC.32. <i>Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation [Employment Equality Directive]</i>	821
7.6. POSITIVE ACTION BEFORE THE NATIONAL COURTS	826
7.6.1. THE ADMISSIBILITY OF POSITIVE ACTION MEASURES	826
7.BE.33. Court of Arbitration, 27 January 1994, Case 9/94, <i>A. Asztalos v. Office national des pensions</i> . Compatibility with the constitutional requirements of equality and non-discrimination of a difference of treatment on grounds of sex in the allocation of benefits to the elderly	827
7.FR.34. Constitutional Council, 16 March 2006, Decision n. 2006-533 DC. Compatibility with the constitution of the law on equality of wages between women and men	828
7.SK.35. Constitutional Court of the Slovak Republic, 18 October 2005. Compatibility of the positive action provision of the anti-discrimination act with the constitutional principles of the rule of law and of equality	830
7.NL.36. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1996-97</i> . Compatibility with national legislation implementing the gender employment directive of a scheme aimed at improving the representation of women in the police force	835
7.DE.37. Federal Labour Court, 21 January 2003, 9 AZR 307/02. Compatibility of “flexible quotas”, comprising a “savings clause”, with the German <i>Grundgesetz</i> and with European community law	838
7.NL.38. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Opinion 1999-32</i> . Compatibility with the general equal treatment act of preferential recruitment of applicants of immigrant origin	842
7.NIR.39. High Court of Justice in Northern Ireland, Queen’s Bench Division (Judicial Review), 23 July 2002. <i>In the Matter of an Application by Mark Parsons for judicial review</i> . Compatibility of the recruitment system of the police in northern Ireland with article 14 ECHR	847
7.6.2. THE POSITIVE OBLIGATION TO ADOPT A POSITIVE ACTION MEASURE	850
7.IR.40. Equality Tribunal, 29 August 2003, <i>Gillen v. Department of Health and Children (Represented by the Chief State Solicitor)</i> . The refusal to adopt a positive action policy (on the grounds of age) as a form of discrimination	850
7.6.3. PHASING OUT POSITIVE ACTION	851

CONTENTS

7.GB.41. House of Lords, 5 May 2005, <i>Regina v. Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Appellant) ex parte Hooper and others (FC) (Respondents)</i> ... Obligation to put an end to widow's benefits not recognised to widowers, in response to the gradual historic trend towards greater economic activity by women	852
7.7. POSITIVE ACTION POLICIES AND THE PROTECTION OF PRIVATE LIFE IN THE PROCESSING OF PERSONAL DATA	854
7.UN.42. Medis Projects (Measurement of Discriminations), <i>Comparative Study on the collection of data to measure the extent and impact of discrimination within the United States, Canada, Australia, Great-Britain and the Netherlands</i>	856
7.CoE.43. Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities, <i>Opinion on Germany, 1 March 2002</i>	857
7.EC.44. European Parliament, <i>European Parliament resolution on non-discrimination and equal opportunities for all – a framework strategy</i>	859
7.EC.45. Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data [Personal Data Directive]	860
7.NIR.46. C. McCrudden, <i>Consociationalism, Equality and Minorities in the Northern Ireland Bill of Rights Debate: The Role of the OCSE High Commissioner on National Minorities</i>	864
7.CoE.47. A.W. Heringa, G. Malinverni and J. Marko, <i>Comments by Council of Europe experts on certain aspects of a future Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland</i>	865
7.NIR.48. Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission, <i>Progressing a Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland: An Update</i>	866
7.8. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	867

CHAPTER EIGHT ENFORCEMENT BODIES

8.1. INTRODUCTION	871
8.1.1. WHY DO WE NEED EQUALITY BODIES?	871
8.1.2. THE BROAD RANGE OF EUROPEAN EQUALITY BODIES	872
8.2. SINGLE OR MULTIPLE EQUALITY BODIES?	875
8.EC.1. B.D. Jacobsen and E.O. Rosenberg Khawaja, <i>Legal Assistance to Individuals. Powers and Procedures of Effective and Strategic Individual Enforcement</i>	876
8.UK.2. C. McCrudden, <i>The contribution of the EU Fundamental Rights Agency to Combating Discrimination and Promoting Equality.</i>	877
8.3. OVERVIEW OF MODELS FOR INTERVENTION	880
8.3.1. OMBUDS	881
8.3.1.A. SWEDEN	881
8.SE.3. <i>The Swedish Disability Ombudsman Act of 9 June 1994</i>	882
8.3.1.B. OTHER COUNTRIES	883
8.3.1.C. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE	883

CONTENTS

8.3.2. COMMISSIONS	883
8.3.2.A. OVERVIEW	883
8.3.2.B. EXAMPLES OF DIVERSITY IN COMMISSIONERS	883
8.4. LEGAL NORMS FOR ENFORCEMENT BODIES	884
8.4.1. INTERNATIONAL NORMS	884
8.4.1.A. THE PARIS PRINCIPLES	884
8.UN.4. Office for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, <i>Principles relating to the status and functioning of national institutions for protection and promotion of human rights</i>	884
8.4.1.B. WIDER APPLICATION OF THE PARIS PRINCIPLES	886
8.4.1.C. ECRI RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EUROPEAN EQUALITY BODIES	887
8.4.2. REQUIREMENTS FOR EQUALITY BODIES UNDER EUROPEAN LAW	887
8.4.2.A. INTRODUCTION	887
8.EC.5. Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin	888
8.4.2.B. MINIMUM STANDARDS	888
8.EC.6. Council Directive 2002/73/EC of 23 September 2002 amending Council Directive 76/207/EEC on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion and working conditions	889
8.4.3. CRITICISMS OF EU REQUIREMENTS	890
8.4.3.A. GENERAL COMMENTS	890
8.4.3.B. THE RACIAL EQUALITY DIRECTIVE	890
8.EC.7. C. O’Cinneide, <i>The Race Equality Directive as a Basis for Strategic Enforcement</i>	890
8.5. FUNCTIONS	891
8.5.1. LEGAL CASEWORK	891
8.5.1.A. PROVISION OF LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS	891
8.EC.8. B. D. Jacobsen and E. O. Rosenberg Khawaja, <i>Strategic Enforcement: Powers and Competences of Equality Bodies</i>	894
8.EC.9. B. D. Jacobsen and E. O. Rosenberg Khawaja, <i>Legal Assistance to Individuals: Powers and Procedures of Effective and Strategic Individual Enforcement</i>	894
8.IE.10. N. Crowley, <i>Equality Authority, Annual Report 2004</i>	895
8.5.1.B. MEDIATION	897
8.EC.11. European Commission, <i>Specialized bodies to promote equality and/or combat discrimination. Final report</i>	898
8.EC.12. European Commission, <i>Specialized bodies to promote equality and/or combat discrimination. Final report</i>	899

CONTENTS

8.5.1.C. TAKING ACTION IN ITS OWN NAME	899
8.BE.13. <i>Belgian Act of February 15, 1993 pertaining to the foundation of a centre for equal opportunities and opposition to racism</i>	900
8.BE.14. <i>Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, Report: Fighting Racism in Belgium. Civil Actions brought in 2000</i>	900
8.IE.15. <i>Irish Employment Equality Acts 1998 to 2004</i>	901
8.GB.16. <i>House of Lords, 3 March 1994, R. v. Secretary of State for Employment ex parte Equal Opportunities Commission and another. Part time workers rights to claim redundancy payments</i>	902
8.5.1.D. INTERVENTIONS	903
8.GB.17. <i>Queen's Bench Division, 30 July 2004, Burke v. General Medical Council. Guidance on the withdrawal of artificial nutrition and hydration</i>	905
8.IE.18. <i>E. Barry, Interventions and Amicus Curiae Applications. Making Individual Enforcement More Effective</i>	906
8.IE.19. <i>E. Barry, Interventions and Amicus Curiae Applications. Making Individual Enforcement More Effective</i>	907
8.IE.20. <i>E. Barry, Interventions and Amicus Curiae Applications. Making Individual Enforcement More Effective</i>	907
8.BE.21. <i>Belgian Act of February 25, 2003 pertaining to the combat of discrimination and to the amendment of the Act of February 15, 1993 pertaining to the foundation of a centre for equal opportunities and opposition to racism</i>	908
8.FR.22. <i>French Act No. 2004-1486 dated 30th December 2004 concerning the creation of the high authority against discrimination and for equality</i>	909
8.FR.23. <i>French Act No. 2006-369 of 31 March 2006 on equality of opportunity</i>	909
8.5.1.E. SITUATION TESTING	909
8.EC.24. <i>I. Rorive, Situation tests in Europe: myths and realities</i>	910
8.HU.25. <i>Hungarian Government Decree 362/2004. (XII. 26.) Korm. on the Authority of Equal Treatment and the Detailed Rules of its Procedures</i>	911
8.FR.26. <i>French Act No. 2006-369 of 31 March 2006 on equality of opportunity</i>	912
8.EC.27. <i>O. de Schutter, Methods of Proof in the context of combating discrimination</i>	912
8.5.2. QUASI-JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS	914
8.UN.28. <i>Office for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Principles relating to the status and functioning of national institutions for protection and promotion of human rights</i>	915
8.5.2.A. THE NETHERLANDS	915
8.NL.29. <i>J. Goldschmidt, Implementation of Equality Law: a task for specialists or for human rights experts?</i>	916
8.EC.30. <i>European Commission, Specialized bodies to promote equality and/or combat discrimination. Final report</i>	917
8.NL.31. <i>Equal Treatment Commission. The Difference Made. Evaluation of the Equal Treatment Act and the Activities of the Equal Treatment Commission, 1999–2004</i>	917
8.NL.32. <i>Supreme Court, 13 November 1987, St. Bavo v. Gielen. Role of a commission decision in an equal pay case</i>	919
8.NL.33. <i>Equal Treatment Commission. The Difference Made. Evaluation of the Equal Treatment Act and the Activities of the Equal Treatment Commission, 1999–2004</i>	920
8.5.2.B. IRELAND	921

CONTENTS

8.5.3. INVESTIGATIONS AND INQUIRIES	922
8.EC.34. M. White, <i>Formal Investigations and Inquiries</i>	923
8.EC.35. M. White, <i>Formal Investigations and Inquiries</i>	924
8.GB.36. R. Karim, <i>A Legal Strategy to Combine and Coordinate Different Tools available</i>	925
8.NL.37. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Equality law and the work of the Dutch Equal Treatment Commission</i>	928
8.SE.38. The Office of the Ombudsman against Discrimination on Grounds of Sexual Orientation, <i>Report 2005</i>	928
8.5.4. RESEARCH AND REPORTS	929
8.EC.39. N. Reuter, T. Makkonen, O. Oosi, <i>Study on Data Collection to measure the extent and impact of discrimination in Europe</i>	930
8.5.5. MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOVERNMENT	930
8.NL.40. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Equality law and the work of the Equal Treatment Commission in the Netherlands</i>	931
8.5.6. PROMOTING GOOD EQUALITY/PRACTICE	932
8.NL.41. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Equality law and the work of the Equal Treatment Commission in the Netherlands</i>	932
8.NL.42. Equal Treatment Commission, <i>Equality law and the work of the Equal Treatment Commission in the Netherlands</i>	933
8.5.7. POSITIVE DUTIES TO PROMOTE EQUALITY	933
8.EC.43. L. Griffiths, <i>Positive Duties to Promote Equality</i>	934
8.6. PROTECTION OF INDEPENDENCE	936
INDEPENDENCE FROM GOVERNMENT	936
8.UN.44. Office for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, <i>Principles relating to the status and functioning of national institutions for protection and promotion of human rights</i>	937
8.EC.45. European Commission, <i>Specialized bodies to promote equality and/or combat discrimination</i>	938
8.SE.46. Swedish Report on coherent discrimination legislation	939
8.EC.47. European Commission, <i>Specialized bodies to promote equality and/or combat discrimination</i>	939
8.CoE.48. European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, <i>Third report on Italy</i>	940
8.6.1.A. UNITED KINGDOM	941
8.UK.49. UK Parliament, Joint Committee on Human Rights, <i>Commission for Equality and Human Rights: the Government's White Paper, 16th Report of Session 2003–2004</i>	941
8.UK.50. UK Parliament, Joint Committee on Human Rights, <i>4th Report of Session 2005–2006</i>	943
8.GB.51. <i>Equality Act 2006</i>	944
8.6.1.B. THE NETHERLANDS	944
8.NL.52. <i>Dutch Equal Treatment Act 1994</i>	945
8.6.1.C. FRANCE	946

CONTENTS

8.FR.53. <i>French Act No. 2004-1486 dated 30 December 2004 concerning the creation of the high authority against discrimination and for equality</i>	946
8.6.1.D. IRELAND	947
8.IE.54. <i>Irish Employment Equality Acts 1998 to 2004</i>	947
8.6.1.E. HUNGARY	949
8.HU.55. <i>Hungarian Government Decree 362/2004. (XII. 26.) Korm.on the Authority of Equal Treatment and the Detailed Rules of its Procedures</i>	950
8.6.2. INDEPENDENCE FROM OTHER SOURCES OF INFLUENCE	951
8.SE.56. <i>K. Linna, The role of specialised bodies and of trade unions</i>	951
8.7. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	952
Synopsis of the Content of the EU Anti-discrimination Legislation	955
INDEX	967