

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	xvii
Chapter 1 General Introduction: The Need for a General Decision Model	
1 Judicial Assessment of Unequal Treatment	1
2 Problems Regarding the Judicial Assessment of the Principle of Equality	4
3 The Need for Well-reasoned Decisions on Unequal Treatment	5
4 The Desirability of Developing a Decision Model	7
Chapter 2 A Theoretical Model for Judicial Decision-making on the Principle of Equality	
1 Definition of Concepts	9
1.1 Equality, Comparability, Differentiation and Discrimination	9
1.1.1 The Aristotelian Equality Formula	9
1.1.2 Distinction, Unequal Treatment, Differentiation, Classification and Discrimination	11
1.2 Formal and Substantive Inequality; Direct and Indirect Inequality	12
1.2.1 Formal and Substantive Inequality	12
1.2.2 Direct and Indirect Inequality—Relationship of these Concepts to Formal and Substantive Inequality	13
1.2.3 Other Concepts	14
2 Scope of Application of the Decision Model	16
2.1 Introduction	16
2.2 Open and Closed Models	16
2.3 Situations where a Complaint can be Made about Unequal Treatment	18
2.3.1 Situations of Unequal Treatment	18
2.3.2 Consequences for the Assessment Methods	21
2.4 Manifestations of Unequal Treatment: Formal or Substantive, Direct or Indirect, Intentional or Unintentional	22
2.5 Ground of Distinction	25
2.6 Applicability in Horizontal Relationships	26
3 Contents of the Assessment Model	28
3.1 General Remarks	28
3.1.1 Introduction	28

3.1.2	Phases of the Assessment	28
3.1.3	Design of the Justification or Assessment Model	30
3.1.4	Preferential Treatment	32
3.2	The Requirement of a Legitimate Aim	32
3.2.1	Introduction: The Need to Assess the Legitimacy of the Aims Pursued	32
3.2.2	Uncovering the Aim of a Difference in Treatment	35
3.2.3	The Simultaneous Search for Different Goals (Plurality of Objectives)	39
3.2.4	Substantive Assessment of the Justifiability of the Aims Pursued	42
3.3	Assessment of the Relationship Between Goal and Means	46
3.3.1	Introduction	46
3.3.2	Over- and Underinclusiveness, or the Assessment of the Degree of Fit	46
3.3.3	Suitability	49
3.3.4	Subsidiarity	51
3.3.5	Proportionality in the Strict Sense (Narrow Proportionality)	53
4	The Test of Comparability and the First Phase of Assessment	57
4.1	Content of the Comparability Test	57
4.2	Determining Comparability	58
4.2.1	Introduction	58
4.2.2	The Need to Establish a Standard of Comparison	59
4.2.3	Substantive Assessment of the Standard of Comparison	63
4.2.4	The Justification Model and the Comparability Test: Over- and Underinclusiveness	65
4.3	The Second Phase of the Assessment: Desirability of the Choice of the Justification Model	66
4.3.1	Introduction	66
4.3.2	The Desirability of the Choice of the Justification Model	69
4.3.3	Conclusion: No Comparability Test	72
4.4	The Evidential Function of the Comparability Test; Alternative Tests	72
4.4.1	Assessment in the First Phase; Apportionment of the Burden of Proof	72
4.4.2	First Alternative: Test of Intent or Motive	74
4.4.3	Second Alternative: the 'but for' Criterion	75
4.4.4	Third Alternative: Test of Disadvantage	76
4.4.5	Conclusion	79

5	The Intensity of the Assessment	79
5.1	Introduction: The Need for Differentiation in the Intensity of the Assessment	79
5.2	'Levels' of Intensity and their Significance for the Assessment	81
5.2.1	Gradations or 'Levels' of Intensity of the Assessment	81
5.2.2	Consequences of the Choice of a Particular Level of Intensity	82
5.3	Factors Determining the Level of Intensity	84
5.3.1	Introduction	84
5.3.2	Factors Determining the Level of Intensity	84
5.3.3	Balancing the Different Factors and Deciding on the Level of Intensity	98
6	Summary of the Theoretical Assessment Model	99
Chapter 3 Assessment Against Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights by the European Court of Human Rights		
1	General	103
1.1	The Accessory Nature of the Prohibition of Discrimination	103
1.1.1	The Way in which the Court has given Substance to the Accessory Character	103
1.1.2	Disadvantages of the Accessory Character	106
1.1.3	The Consequences of the Accessory Character for the Assessment Methods	108
1.1.4	Significance of the Twelfth Protocol	110
1.2	Content and Scope of the Prohibition of Discrimination	111
1.2.1	Grounds for Distinction; Requirement of Unequal Treatment on the Basis of a Personal Characteristic	111
1.2.2	Dealing with the Substance of Claims under Article 14	113
1.3	Direct and Indirect Unequal Treatment; Formal and Substantive Equality	113
1.3.1	Direct and Indirect Unequal Treatment	113
1.3.2	Formal and Substantive Equality	115
1.4	Only Assessment of Claims Directed against the Government	117
1.5	Case-based Assessment by the Court	118
2	The Assessment Model	121
2.1	Development and Content of the Assessment Model	121
2.2	Comparability as a First-phase Test	127

2.2.1	Assessment Standards when Judging Comparability	127
2.2.2	Omission of the Comparability Test in Specific Cases	129
2.2.3	The Test of Disadvantage as an Alternative for the Comparability Test	135
2.3	Assessment of the Presence of a Legitimate Aim	137
2.3.1	Determining the Aim of the Distinction	137
2.3.2	Justification of the Aims Pursued	140
2.4	Assessment of the Relationship between Goal and Means: Proportionality in the Broad Sense	144
2.4.1	Content and Application of the Goal-means Test and Article 14	144
2.4.2	Application of the Goal-means Test with Respect to Substantive Provisions of the Convention	149
2.5	Suitability	152
2.5.1	The Suitability Test with Respect to Substantive Convention Provisions	152
2.5.2	The Suitability Test with Respect to Article 14	153
2.6	Subsidiarity and Necessity	154
2.6.1	Subsidiarity and Necessity with Respect to Substantive Convention Provisions	154
2.6.2	Subsidiarity and Necessity when Assessing against Article 14	157
2.7	Proportionality in the Strict Sense	160
2.8	A Missing Criterion: Assessment of Over- and Underinclusiveness	162
2.9	Conclusion	164
3	Intensity of the Assessment and the Margin of Appreciation	165
3.1	Introduction	165
3.1.1	Content of the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine	165
3.1.2	Basis for Accepting the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine	166
3.1.3	Significance of the Margin of Appreciation for the Intensity of the Assessment	169
3.2	Factors Determining the Scope of the Margin of Appreciation	170
3.2.1	Introduction	170
3.2.2	The “Common Ground” Factor: the Existence of a European Consensus	171
3.2.3	The “Better Placed” Argument	180
3.2.4	The Character and the Weight of the Aims Pursued	182
3.2.5	Context of the Measure in Question	185

3.2.6	The Importance of the Affected Right: Fundamental Interests and Core Rights	187
3.2.7	Nature of the Interference	192
3.2.8	Balancing the Intensity-determining Factors	194
3.3	Intensity of the Assessment and Article 14: The “Very Weighty Reasons” Doctrine	199
3.3.1	Translating the Margin of Appreciation Doctrine into a Very Weighty Reasons Doctrine	199
3.3.2	Criterion for the Applicability of the Very Weighty Reasons Doctrine: Ground of Distinction	201
3.3.3	Conclusion	207
4	Conclusions	209
4.1	Conclusions Relating to the Assessment Methods	209
4.1.1	Introduction	209
4.1.2	Assessment in the First Phase: the Comparability Test	210
4.1.3	The Second Phase of the Assessment: Application of the Justification Model	215
4.2	Conclusions Relating to the Intensity of the Assessment	218
4.2.1	Method of the Court, Levels of Intensity and Influence on the Assessment Methods	218
4.2.2	Factors that Determine the Intensity of the Assessment	220
Chapter 4 Assessment by the European Court of Justice against the Principle of Equality		
1	General	223
1.1	Content and Background of the Principle of Equality in Community Law	223
1.1.1	The EC Treaty and the Principle of Equality	223
1.1.2	Background and Meaning of the Principle of Equality in European Law	224
1.2	Direct and Indirect Distinctions; Formal and Substantive Inequality	227
1.2.1	Direct and Indirect Distinctions	227
1.2.2	Formal and Substantive Inequality	230
1.3	Horizontal and Vertical Relations	232
1.4	Nature of the Procedure in which the Equality Principle Plays a Role	235
1.5	Structure of this Chapter	236
2	The Assessment Models	238
2.1	General Description of the Assessment Models	238
2.1.1	The Assessment Model with Distinctions Based on Gender	238

2.1.2	The Assessment Model for Distinctions in the Field of the Common Agricultural Policy	240
2.1.3	The Assessment Model in the Case of Distinctions Based on Nationality	245
2.2	The First Phase of Assessment: Comparability and Disadvantage	247
2.2.1	Comparability and Disadvantage with Unequal Treatment Based on Gender	247
2.2.2	Comparability and Disadvantage in the Field of Agriculture	253
2.2.3	Comparability and Disadvantage with Unequal Treatment Based on Nationality	260
2.2.4	Applications of the Comparability Test with Article 90 EC	268
2.3	Assessment of the Goal	270
2.3.1	Assessment of the Goal with Unequal Treatment Based on Gender	270
2.3.2	Assessment of the Goal with Unequal Treatment in the Field of Agriculture	277
2.3.3	Assessment of the Goal with Unequal Treatment Based on Nationality	280
2.3.4	Assessment of the Goal with Article 90 EC	283
2.3.5	Conclusions	286
2.4	Assessment of Suitability, Subsidiarity and Proportionality	287
2.4.1	Assessment of Suitability, Subsidiarity and Proportionality with Unequal Treatment Based on Gender	287
2.4.2	Assessment of Suitability, Necessity and Proportionality with Unequal Treatment in the Field of Agriculture	290
2.4.3	Assessment of Suitability, Subsidiarity and Proportionality with Unequal Treatment Based on Nationality	300
2.5	Missing Element in the Assessment by the ECJ: Assessment of the Degree of Fit	305
3	Intensity of the Assessment	307
3.1	General	307
3.2	Intensity of the Assessment with Unequal Treatment Based on Gender	308
3.2.1	Introduction	308
3.2.2	Factors that Determine the Intensity of the Assessment	309
3.2.3	Conclusion	309
3.3	Intensity of the Assessment with Unequal Treatment in the Field of Agriculture	320

3.3.1	Introduction	320
3.3.2	Factors that Determine the Intensity of the Assessment	321
3.3.3	Conclusion	329
3.4	Intensity of the Assessment with Unequal Treatment Based on Nationality	330
3.4.1	Nature and Weight of the Prohibition of Unequal Treatment Based on Nationality	330
3.4.2	Factors which Result in Reduced Intensity of the Assessment	333
3.4.3	Conclusion	340
4	Conclusions	342
4.1	Conclusions Relating to the Assessment Method	342
4.1.1	Consequences of the Background of the Prohibition of Unequal Treatment	342
4.1.2	Horizontal and Vertical Relations: Consequences for the Assessment Methods	345
4.1.3	Assessment in the First Phase: Comparability and Disadvantage	346
4.1.4	The Goal of the Distinction	352
4.1.5	Degree of Fit, Suitability, Necessity and Proportionality	355
4.2	Conclusions Relating to the Intensity of the Assessment	357
4.2.1	Gradations or Levels of Intensity	357
4.2.2	Factors that Play a Role in the Determination of the Intensity of the Assessment	359
Chapter 5 Assessment Against the Equal Protection Clause by the Supreme Court		
1	Introduction	365
1.1	Background and Scope of the Equal Protection Clause	365
1.1.1	Development and Significance of the Fourteenth Amendment	365
1.1.2	Extension of the Scope to Include Infringements of all Interests and Rights	367
1.1.3	Extension of the Scope from Race to Other Grounds of Distinction	369
1.1.4	Formal or Substantive equality; Direct and Indirect Distinctions	371
1.1.5	Applicability of the Equal Protection Clause in all Situations	374
1.2	Relationship Between the Federal System and the States	375
1.2.1	Consequences of the Federal System for the Supreme Court's Position	375

1.2.2	Application of the Equal Protection Clause to the Federal Government	376
1.3	Horizontal Effect	379
1.3.1	The Fourteenth Amendment and the Necessity of State Action	379
1.3.2	Horizontal Effect: The Civil Rights Act 1964	381
1.4	Procedure of the Supreme Court	383
1.5	Assessment Methods of the Supreme Court and Structure of the Chapter	388
2	Assessment Methods	389
2.1	General Survey of the Tests Used by the Supreme Court	389
2.1.1	The Rational Basis Test	389
2.1.2	Rational Basis "with Bite"	393
2.1.3	The Strict Scrutiny Test	395
2.1.4	The Intermediate Scrutiny Test	398
2.2	First-phase Assessment: Comparability, Disadvantage and Intent	401
2.2.1	Comparability	401
2.2.2	Direct Unequal Treatment: The Existence of a Classification as a First-phase Test	407
2.2.3	Indirect Unequal Treatment: Effect and Intent as a First-phase Test	413
2.3	Assessment of the Presence of a Justified Aim	427
2.3.1	Manner of Establishing the Purpose	427
2.3.2	Plurality of Purposes	434
2.3.3	Assessment of the Legitimacy of the Purpose	437
2.4	Assessment of the Relationship Between Purpose and Means	448
2.4.1	Introduction	448
2.4.2	Assessment of the Degree of Fit	448
2.4.3	Assessment of Suitability	453
2.4.4	Assessment of Necessity and Subsidiarity	457
2.4.5	Assessment of Proportionality in the Strict Sense	460
3	Intensity of the Assessment	465
3.1	Introduction	465
3.2	Theoretical Underpinning of Differentiation in the Intensity of the Assessment	467
3.3	Factors Relating to the Difference in Treatment	470
3.3.1	Factors Relating to the Disadvantaged Group	470
3.3.2	Factors Relating to the Ground of Distinction	479
3.3.3	Balancing of Factors Relating to the Distinction as such	482

3.4	Impairment of Fundamental Rights as Justification for Strict Scrutiny	486
3.4.1	Recognition of Individual Fundamental Rights as Justification for Strict Scrutiny	486
3.4.2	Recognition of Political Rights as Justification for Strict Scrutiny	488
3.4.3	Changes in the Case Law: Constitutional Rights as Basis for Heightened Scrutiny	490
3.4.4	Seriousness of the Impairment	493
3.5	Other Factors Affecting the Level of Intensity	495
3.5.1	Introduction	495
3.5.2	Presence of Discretion, Nature of the Policy Field and the Better Placed Argument	496
3.5.3	Context of the Distinction	497
3.5.4	Relationship Between the States and the Federal Government; Subsidiarity Argument	499
3.5.5	Distinctions of an Unusual Character	501
4	Conclusions	502
4.1	Conclusions Relating to the Assessment Methods	502
4.1.1	Introduction	502
4.1.2	Assessment in the First Phase: Comparability, Disadvantage and Intent	502
4.1.3	Assessment of the Purpose	506
4.1.4	Assessment of the Relationship between Purpose and Means	508
4.2	Conclusions in Respect of the Level of Intensity	511
4.2.1	Levels of Intensity	511
4.2.2	Factors Determining the Level of Intensity	513
Chapter 6 Assessment Against the Principle of Equality in the Netherlands		
1	General	517
1.1	Equality Provisions in Dutch Law	517
1.1.1	Introduction	517
1.1.2	Article 1 of the Dutch Constitution	518
1.1.3	Equality Provisions in International Treaties	519
1.1.4	Equality Provisions in European Law	522
1.1.5	Equality Provisions in Dutch Legislation	523
1.1.6	The Principle of Equality as General Principle of Proper Administration	525
1.2	Situations in which Distinctions are Made	528
1.3	Direct and Indirect Distinctions; Formal and Substantive Inequality	529

1.3.1	Formal and Substantive Inequality	529
1.3.2	Direct and Indirect Distinctions	531
1.4	Horizontal and Vertical Effect	534
1.5	Differences Between the Courts and Tribunals Competent to Assess Unequal Treatment; Structure of the Chapter	537
2	Assessment Methods	540
2.1	General Description of the Methods of the Various Courts Analysed	540
2.1.1	Assessment Methods of the Dutch Supreme Court—Civil and Criminal Divisions	540
2.1.2	Assessment of the Dutch Supreme Court—Tax Division	546
2.1.3	Assessment Methods of the Administrative Law Division	554
2.1.4	Assessment Methods of the Central Appeals Tribunal	556
2.1.5	Assessment Methods of the Equal Treatment Commission	561
2.2	Comparability and Disadvantage in Dutch Case Law	564
2.2.1	Introduction	564
2.2.2	The Comparability Test as First-phase Test	565
2.2.3	The Disadvantage Test as a First-phase Test	573
2.3	Assessment of the Aim	586
2.3.1	Introduction	586
2.3.2	Establishment of the Aim	587
2.3.3	Assessment of the Justifiability of the Aim	593
2.4	Assessment of the Relationship between Aim and Distinction	608
2.4.1	Degree of Fit (Over- and Underinclusiveness) and Assessment of the Proxy	608
2.4.2	Suitability	614
2.4.3	Necessity and Subsidiarity	616
2.4.4	Proportionality in the Strict Sense	622
3	Intensity of the Assessment	630
3.1	Variation in the Level of Intensity in the Netherlands	630
3.2	Factors that Determine the Level of Intensity	634
3.2.1	Introduction	634
3.2.2	Factors that Relate to the Division of Powers	634
3.2.3	Other Factors that may Affect the Level of Intensity	640
3.2.4	The Balancing of the Various Factors	646
4	Conclusions	647

4.1	Conclusions Relating to the Assessment Method	647
4.1.1	First-phase Assessment: Comparability and Disadvantage	647
4.1.2	Second-phase Assessment: the Justification Test	651
4.2	Conclusions Relating to the Level of Intensity	656
4.2.1	Variation in the Level of Intensity	656
4.2.2	Factors Determining the Level of Intensity	657
Chapter 7 Conclusion: Towards a General Assessment Model		
1	Introduction	659
2	First-phase Assessment: Disadvantage as a First-phase Test	662
2.1	Introduction	662
2.2	The Comparability Test as First-phase Test	663
2.3	The Test of Intent as First-phase Test	667
2.4	The Test of Disadvantage as First-phase Test	669
2.4.1	The Disadvantage Test as First-phase Test for the General Assessment Model	669
2.4.2	Structure of the Test of Disadvantage	670
3	Second-phase Assessment: the Justification Model	675
3.1	The Purpose Test	675
3.1.1	Introduction	675
3.1.2	Determination of the Purpose of the Distinction	676
3.1.3	Assessment of the Justifiability of the Purpose	679
3.2	Assessment of the Proxy Used and of the Degree of Fit	683
3.2.1	Introduction	683
3.2.2	Assessment of the Proxy	684
3.2.3	Assessment of the Degree of Fit	685
3.3	Suitability	687
3.4	Subsidiarity and Necessity	688
3.5	Proportionality	691
3.5.1	Abstract or Concrete Assessment?	691
3.5.2	Structure of the Proportionality Test; Determination of Interests	692
3.5.3	Weight of the Interests Involved	693
3.5.4	Assessment of the Balance of Interests	695
4	Level of Intensity	696
4.1	Introduction: Levels of Intensity	696
4.2	The Factors Determining the Level of Intensity	700
4.2.1	Group 1. Factors that Concern the Distinction as such	700
4.2.2	Group 2. Factors Relating to the Impairment of Interests	703

4.2.3	Group 3. Factors Relating to the Interest Pursued, the Policy Field and Position of the Opposite Party	707
5	Brief Summary of the Assessment Model	711
Appendices		
	Case Law	719
	Bibliography	743
	Index	761