

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	v
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	xv
Chapter 1: The Racial Equality Directive and Minority Protection: An Exploration	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.2. QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS	5
1.3. METHODOLOGY	6
1.3.1. Theoretical framework	7
1.3.2. Case study: comparative research	8
1.4. BELGIUM, ESTONIA, HUNGARY AND THE NETHERLANDS: A BRIEF INTRODUCTION	11
1.4.1. Belgium	11
1.4.2. Estonia	13
1.4.3. Hungary	16
1.4.4. The Netherlands	19
Chapter 2: Personal Scope	21
PART ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	21
2.1. INTRODUCTION	21
2.2. ADDRESSEES OF ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION	22
2.2.1. 'All persons'	22
2.2.2. 'As regards both the public and private sectors, including public bodies'	25
2.2.2.1. Applicability of the RED in the case of incorrect or untimely implementation	25
2.2.2.2. Differentiation between public and private actors	26
2.2.2.2.1. <i>Fundamental rights and freedoms of private actors</i>	27
2.2.2.2.2. <i>Margin of appreciation for public actors</i>	28
2.2.2.2.3. <i>Further-reaching duties for public actors</i>	29
2.3. BENEFICIARIES OF ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION	30

2.3.1. Conceptualisation of 'racial' and 'ethnic' origin	30
2.3.1.1. Race and ethnicity as social constructs	30
2.3.1.2. Proxies for racism recognised in international human rights law	32
2.3.1.3. Interpretation of 'racial' and 'ethnic' origin of Article 2(1) RED	33
2.3.1.4. Alternatives in the case of an inflexible approach	34
2.3.2. Interaction of grounds of discrimination	36
2.3.2.1. Direct v. indirect discrimination	37
2.3.2.2. Intersectional discrimination	38
2.3.2.3. Conflicts of grounds	41
2.3.3. The nationality exception of Article 3(2) RED	42
2.3.4. Types of victims	45
2.3.4.1. Legal persons as victims	45
2.3.4.2. Discrimination by association and by assumption	46
PART TWO: CASE STUDY	47
2.4. ADDRESSEES OF ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION	47
2.4.1. 'All persons'	47
2.4.1.1. Applicability to principally and non-principally envisaged actors	47
2.4.1.2. Alternatives available for direct liability of non-principally envisaged actors	50
2.4.2. 'As regards both the public and private sectors, including public bodies'	52
2.4.2.1. Applicability of the RED in the case of incorrect or untimely implementation	52
2.4.2.2. Differentiation between public and private actors	54
2.4.2.2.1. <i>Fundamental rights and freedoms of private actors</i>	54
2.4.2.2.2. <i>Margin of appreciation for public actors</i>	56
2.4.2.2.3. <i>Differentiated application of duties</i>	57
2.5. BENEFICIARIES OF ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION	59
2.5.1. Conceptualisation of 'racial' and 'ethnic' origin	59
2.5.2. Interaction of grounds of discrimination	64
2.5.2.1. Direct v. indirect discrimination	64
2.5.2.2. Intersectional discrimination	66
2.5.2.3. Conflicts of grounds	68
2.5.3. The nationality exception of Article 3(2)	70
2.5.4. Types of victims	74
2.5.4.1. Legal persons as victims	74
2.5.4.2. Discrimination by assumption or by association	75
2.6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	76
Chapter 3: Material Scope	81
PART ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	82
3.1. INTRODUCTION	82
3.2. FACTORS THAT POTENTIALLY QUALIFY THE MATERIAL SCOPE OF THE RED	83
3.2.1. Division of competences between Member States and the EU	83
3.2.2. Fundamental rights and freedoms	87
3.3. THE MATERIAL SCOPE AS REGULATED BY THE RED	88

3.3.1. Employment (Article 3(1) (a)-(d))	88
3.3.1.1. Access to employment	89
3.3.1.2. Vocational guidance and training	90
3.3.1.3. Work conditions	91
3.3.1.4. Membership of professional organisations	92
3.3.2. Social protection, social security and healthcare	92
3.3.3. Social advantages	95
3.3.4. Education	97
3.3.5. Goods and services	98
3.4. THE EXCEPTION OF IMMIGRATION, VISA AND ASYLUM POLICIES (ARTICLE 3(2) RED)	102
PART TWO: CASE STUDY	103
3.5. FACTORS THAT COULD POTENTIALLY QUALIFY THE MATERIAL SCOPE OF THE RED	103
3.5.1. Division of competences between Member States and the EU	103
3.5.2. Fundamental rights and freedoms	105
3.6. THE MATERIAL SCOPE AS REGULATED BY THE RED	107
3.6.1. Employment (Article 3(1) (a)-(d))	107
3.6.1.1. Provisions implementing Article 3(1) (a)-(d)	107
3.6.1.2. Access to employment	110
3.6.1.3. Vocational guidance and training	113
3.6.1.4. Work conditions	114
3.6.1.5. Membership of professional organisations	115
3.6.2. Social protection, social security and healthcare	116
3.6.3. Social advantages	119
3.6.4. Education	121
3.6.5. Goods and services	123
3.7. THE EXCEPTION OF IMMIGRATION, VISA AND ASYLUM (IVA) POLICIES	129
3.8. ADDITIONAL DOMAINS COVERED BY NATIONAL ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LAW	130
3.9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	131
Chapter 4: Direct discrimination	135
PART ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	135
4.1. INTRODUCTION	135
4.2. PROPER DELINEATION OF DIRECT DISCRIMINATION V. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION	136
4.2.1. Delineation of direct v. indirect discrimination from a theoretical perspective	136
4.2.2. Delineation of direct v. indirect discrimination in the jurisprudence of the ECJ on equal treatment between men and women	139
4.2.3. Delineation of direct v. indirect discrimination as regards racial and ethnic origin	143
4.3. DEFINITION OF DIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN THE RED	146

4.3.1. 'One person'	146
4.3.2. 'Is treated less favourably'	148
4.3.3. 'On grounds of racial or ethnic origin' (causal aspect of direct discrimination)	150
4.3.4. 'Than another is, has been or would be treated in a comparable situation' (comparative aspect of direct discrimination)	151
4.4. JUSTIFICATION POSSIBILITIES FOR PRIMA FACIE CASES OF DIRECT DISCRIMINATION	155
4.4.1. Open v. closed system of justification	155
4.4.2. Genuine and determining occupational requirement (GDOR)	157
4.4.2.1. Introduction	157
4.4.2.2. Genuine and determining	158
4.4.2.3. Legitimate aim	158
4.4.2.4. Suitability	159
4.4.2.5. Necessity	160
4.5. DIRECT DISCRIMINATION AND POSITIVE DUTIES	160
PART TWO: CASE STUDY	161
4.6. DEFINITION OF DIRECT DISCRIMINATION	161
4.6.1. Situation prior to the RED and the changes brought about by implementation	161
4.6.2. 'One person'	165
4.6.3. 'Is treated less favourably'	166
4.6.4. 'On grounds of racial or ethnic origin' (causal aspect of direct discrimination)	170
4.6.4.1. Delineation of direct v. indirect discrimination	170
4.6.4.2. Establishment of the causal link	175
4.6.4.3. Intent required?	177
4.6.4.4. Racial or ethnic origin as one of the reasons	177
4.6.5. 'Than another person is, has been or would be treated in a comparable situation'	179
4.6.5.1. Function of the comparative element	179
4.6.5.2. Hypothetical comparator	181
4.7. JUSTIFICATION POSSIBILITIES FOR A PRIMA FACIE CASE OF DIRECT DISCRIMINATION	182
4.7.1. Closed v. open system of justification	182
4.7.2. Genuine and determining occupational requirement (GDOR)	187
4.8. DIRECT DISCRIMINATION AND POSITIVE DUTIES	192
4.9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	195
Chapter 5: Indirect discrimination	201
PART ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	201
5.1. INTRODUCTION	201
5.2. DEFINITION OF INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION IN THE RED	202
5.2.1. 'An apparently neutral provision, criterion or practice'	204

5.2.1.1. Formal differences in treatment and material differences in treatment	204
5.2.1.2. Broad interpretation of 'provision, criterion or practice'	205
5.2.1.3. No single identifiable cause required	206
5.2.1.4. The 'single source' requirement	208
5.2.2. 'Would put at a particular disadvantage persons of a racial or ethnic origin'	210
5.2.2.1. Causal link required?	211
5.2.2.2. Establishing the particular disadvantage	212
5.2.2.2.1. <i>Means of proof</i>	212
5.2.2.2.2. <i>The meaning of 'disadvantage'</i>	213
5.2.2.2.3. <i>The meaning of 'particular'</i>	215
5.2.2.2.4. <i>The 'persons' controversy</i>	217
5.2.3. Compared to other persons (comparative aspect of indirect discrimination)	218
5.2.3.1. Establishing the pool of comparators	218
5.2.3.2. Making the appropriate comparison within the pool of comparators	221
5.2.4. 'Unless that provision, criterion or practice is objectively justified by a legitimate aim and the means of that aim are appropriate and necessary' (justification aspect of indirect discrimination)	222
5.2.4.1. Justification or causation?	223
5.2.4.2. 'Objectively justified by a legitimate aim'	223
5.2.4.3. Appropriateness	226
5.2.4.4. Necessity	227
5.3. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION AND POSITIVE DUTIES	229
PART TWO: CASE STUDY	233
5.4. DEFINITION OF INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION	233
5.4.1. Situation prior to the RED and the changes brought about by implementation	233
5.4.2. 'An apparently neutral provision, criterion or practice'	236
5.4.2.1. Formal differences in treatment and material differences in treatment	236
5.4.2.2. Broad interpretation of 'provision, criterion or practice'	237
5.4.2.3. Single source doctrine	238
5.4.3. Would put at a particular disadvantage persons of a racial or ethnic origin	239
5.4.3.1. Formulation of the 'particular disadvantage' element	239
5.4.3.2. Causal link required?	240
5.4.3.3. Establishing the particular disadvantage	241
5.4.3.3.1. <i>Means of proof</i>	241
5.4.3.3.2. <i>Establishment of the particular disadvantage</i>	243
5.4.3.3.3. <i>The 'would put' aspect of indirect discrimination</i>	246
5.4.4. Compared to other persons (comparative aspect of indirect discrimination)	247
5.4.4.1. Reference to the comparison and use of comparability	247

5.4.4.2. Delineation of the pool of comparators and application of the comparison	248
5.4.5. 'Unless that provision, criterion or practice is objectively justified by a legitimate aim and the means of that aim are appropriate and necessary' (justification aspect of indirect discrimination)	250
5.4.5.1. Formulation of the objective justification test	250
5.4.5.2. 'Objectively justified by a legitimate aim'	251
5.4.5.3. Appropriateness	252
5.4.5.4. Necessity	252
5.4.5.5. Need for consistency and transparency: a bad example drawn from the Belgian framework	254
5.4.5.6. The Hungarian approach	254
5.5. INDIRECT DISCRIMINATION AND POSITIVE DUTIES	256
5.6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	257
Chapter 6: Harassment and the Instruction to Discriminate	263
PART ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	263
6.1. INTRODUCTION	263
6.2. HARASSMENT	264
6.2.1. Margin of discretion for Member States	265
6.2.2. Definition of racial harassment	267
6.2.2.1. 'An unwanted conduct'	267
6.2.2.2. 'Related to racial or ethnic origin'	269
6.2.2.3. 'With the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person and of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment'	270
6.2.2.3.1. <i>'Of violating the dignity of a person'</i>	272
6.2.2.3.2. <i>'And of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment'</i>	274
6.2.2.3.3. <i>Need for transparency and consistency</i>	275
6.2.3. The duty of care implied by Article 2(3) RED	275
6.3. INSTRUCTION TO DISCRIMINATE	278
PART TWO: CASE STUDY	279
6.4. HARASSMENT	279
6.4.1. Situation prior to the RED and the changes brought about by implementation	279
6.4.2. The definition of harassment	283
6.4.2.1. 'An unwanted conduct'	283
6.4.2.2. 'Related to racial or ethnic origin'	286
6.4.2.3. 'With the purpose or effect'	287
6.4.2.4. 'Of violating the dignity of a person and of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment'	288
6.4.3. The duty of care implied by Article 2(3)	290
6.5. INSTRUCTION TO DISCRIMINATE	294
6.6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	297

Chapter 7: Positive Action	301
PART ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	301
7.1. INTRODUCTION	301
7.2. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF POSITIVE ACTION: ENDS AND MEANS	302
7.2.1. Nature and aim of positive action	302
7.2.2. Types of positive action	304
7.2.2.1. First category: activities aimed at identifying and eradicating discriminatory practices	305
7.2.2.2. Second category: facially neutral policies that tend to favour persons belonging to disadvantaged groups, and that are aimed at increasing their participation	306
7.2.2.3. Third category: outreach programmes specifically aimed at particular groups, encouraging persons belonging to such groups to pursue certain socio-economic activities, or offering specific support, such as training	307
7.2.2.4. Fourth category: preferential treatment	308
7.2.2.5. Fifth category: redefinition of merit	308
7.2.3. Potential unwanted effects of positive action	308
7.2.4. Duties of positive action	310
7.3. LIMITS TO POSITIVE ACTION: ARTICLE 5 RED AND THE JURISPRUDENCE OF THE ECJ	312
7.3.1. Formulation of Article 5 RED as compared with other positive action provisions	313
7.3.2. Jurisprudence of the ECJ in gender equality law and its potential relevance for Article 5 RED	315
7.3.2.1. Overview of the positive action cases	315
7.3.2.2. Positive action as an exception to the principle of equal treatment	316
7.3.2.3. Central importance of the principle of proportionality	317
7.3.2.4. Legitimacy of the aim pursued by positive action	319
7.3.2.5. Appropriateness	323
7.3.2.6. Necessity (subsidiarity and proportionality <i>stricto sensu</i>)	324
PART TWO: CASE STUDY	326
7.4. INTRODUCTION	326
7.5. IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 5 RED IN THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS	327
7.6. LIMITS TO POSITIVE ACTION IN THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS	330
7.6.1. Positive action as an exception to the principle of equal treatment	330
7.6.2. Type of actor that is allowed to enact measures of positive action	332
7.6.3. Central importance of the principle of proportionality	333
7.6.3.1. Legitimacy of the aim pursued by positive action	334
7.6.3.2. Appropriateness	338
7.6.3.3. Necessity (subsidiarity and proportionality <i>stricto sensu</i>)	340
7.6.3.4. The Dutch ETC and potentially indirectly discriminatory measures of positive action	342

7.7. MEASURES OF POSITIVE ACTION TAKEN AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL ON BEHALF OF RACIAL OR ETHNIC MINORITIES	343
7.7.1. Duties of positive action	343
7.7.2. National positive action measures	345
7.8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	351
Chapter 8: Conclusion	357
8.1. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS: THE POTENTIAL OF THE RED FOR MINORITY PROTECTION	357
8.2. CASE STUDY SECTIONS: IMPLEMENTATION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL AND IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITY PROTECTION	362
Jurisprudence and Quasi-Jurisprudence	369
Selected General Bibliography	381