## When Humans Become Migrants

Study of the European Court of Human Rights with an Inter-American Counterpoint

MARIE-BÉNÉDICTE DEMBOUR



## Contents—Summary

List Tab	listic note of Tables ole of Cases of Abbreviations	xxi xxiii xxv xxxv
1.	Introduction	1
	I. FOUNDATIONS	
2.	The Alien in the Social Imagination of the Founding Texts	35
3.	Rejecting the Legacy of Empire: Postcolonial Dereliction (East African Asians Case)	62
4.	Dislocating Families: The Strasbourg Reversal (Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali)	96
5.	Not-so-Threatening Foreigners: Nationality as a Core Human Rights Issue (Advisory Opinion 4/84)	130
	II. CONSOLIDATION	
6.	Shattering Lives: The Normalisation of Deportation (After <i>Berrehab</i> )	161
7.	The Sleeping Beauty Awakens Late: An Absolute Prohibition with Many Buts (Around <i>Soering</i> )	196
8.	Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others (After Gaygusuz)	250
9.	The Voice of the Inter-American Court: Equality as <i>Jus Cogens</i> (Advisory Opinions 16/99 and 18/03)	282
.0.	Reparations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico)	313

## III. PROSPECTS

11. Migrants, Not Criminals: The Continual Elaboration of Strong Human Rights Norms in the Inter-American System (Vélez Loor)	359
12. Domestic Asylum Procedures Aside: Scrutinising Strasbourg's 'Scrutiny' (M.S.S.)	402
13. The Darkest Case Law: Condoning Rightlessness (Bonger et alia)	442
<ol> <li>On the Road to Substantive Equality: Due Process and Non-discrimination at San José (Nadege Dorzema and Pacheco Tineo)—by Lourdes Peroni</li> </ol>	482
15. Conclusion: The Way Forward	503
Index	513

## Contents

Sty	listic ne	nte	xxi
List	of Tak	ples	xxiii
Tak	ole of C	Cases	xxv
List	of Abl	previations	xxxv
List	0)		
		T. contact	
1.	Intro	duction	1
	I.	The Strasbourg Reversal or Putting the Migrant First	1
	II.	Human First: The <i>Pro-Homine</i> Bias of the Lever-American Court	6
	III.	The Contrasting Bias of the Two Courts	8
	IV.	Explaining the Contrast	9
		The figure of the state as guardian or villain	9
		The sociological make up of the two institutions	12
		The different outlooks of migration in Europe and Latin America	14
	V.	The Oranges and Apples of Human Rights Law	16
	VI.	One European Court or Several?	17
	VII.	Documenting the Strasbourg Undercurrents and	
		Neglected Mainstream	19
	VIII.	A Dissecting Method of Analysis	22
	IX.	The Book's Historical Structure, European Focus, and	
		Inter-American Counterpoint	23
	X.	The Scope of This Study	26
		The Strasbourg and San José Courts	26
		Immigration issues	27
		No intersectional analysis	28
	XI.	The Open Borders Intuition	29
	XII.	Migrants First, Who Next?	31
		I FOUNDATIONS	
		I. FOUNDATIONS	
2.	The A	Alien in the Social Imagination of the Founding Texts	35
	I.	The Drafting of the ECHR: A History of	
	1.	Political Compromises	37
	II.	The Citizen-Centred Focus of the Post-1945 Human	31
	11.	Rights Regime	41
	III.	Broadening the Personal Scope of the European Convention: An	71
	111.	Italian Initiative	42
	IV.	The Memory of the Internment of 'Enemy Aliens'	45
	V.		46
	V. VI.	The Appearance of the Alien Clause in European Debates	49
	VII.	A Largely Redundant Alien Clause Open to Reduction The Discriminatory Alien Clause Enters the European Convention	42
	V 11.	The Discriminatory Alien Clause Enters the European Convention Uncontested	50
		VALCOURAGE	,,,

	٠			
X	ľ	v	•	

-		
1 01	nta	nto
(,01	LLE	LLS

V	III. The Entry of Special Migrant Rights in the		IX. Sexual Discrimination under Scrutiny, but without	
	Universal Declaration	52	Producing Rights	11
I		53	X. The Court Shares the States' Fear of Immigration	11
X	. Migrant Rights are Expanded in the (Latin)		XI. A Well-Established Principle of International Law	11
	American Convention	56		11
X	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	57		11
	II. The Significance of Article 16 ECHR Today	59	The Strasbourg Reversal	11
	III. Conclusion	60	XIII. Who are the Successful Applicants? The Exceptional Tuquabo-Tekle	
Λ	III. Conclusion	00	v. the Netherlands	11
2 D	ejecting the Legacy of Empire: Postcolonial Dereliction		XIV. Family Reunification: Why not a Right under the European	
		62	Convention?	12
(1	East African Asians Case)	62	XV. Back to ABC: Biao v. Denmark	12
I.	The Colonial Clause: At the Heart of the	-	XVI. Definite Losers: The Family Patterns Prevalent	
	European Convention	66	The state of the s	12
II				12
	of the Colonies	71	X v II. Conclusion	12
II			5. Not-so-Threatening Foreigners: Nationality as a Core Human	
-11	of the Convention	74		10
17		79		13
I.		19	I. A Slow Start for the Int American Court of	
V		00	Human Rights	13
	Immigrants Act 1968	82		13
V				13
	Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1968	83		14
V	II. The European Commission: A Racially Motivated and thus	-		17
	Degrading Piece of Legislation	86		1 /
V	III. One Commissioner's View: The British Government was Entitled to			14
	Pass the Legislation	88	VI. Underdeveloped Strasbourg Case Law: The Case of the	7%
IJ		89		14
X		0)	VII. The Prominence of Nationality Issues in Inter-American	
Λ		02	Case Law	14
77	Immigration Controls	92	VIII. Who are the Judges?	14
X				15.
	of Human Rights Law	93		
X	II. Conclusion	93		
	14		II. CONSOLIDATION	
í. D	islocating Families: The Strasbourg Reversal (Abdulaziz, Cabales	- 1		
ar	nd Balkandali)	96	6. Shattering Lives: The Normalisation of Deportation	
		99	(After Berrehab)	16
I.		99		
II		00	I. The First Thirty Years: The Commission Declares Expulsion Cases Inadmissible	11
	Settlement v. H.S.'s Inadmissibility	99		16
II		1		17
	The Migrants' Response	102	1 0	172
II	7. The Government's Reply: The State's Right of Exclusion	105		174
V.	From a Blank Slate to No Right to Choose One's Country		V. The Expulsion of Foreign Criminals: An Issue which Attracts	
	of Residence	106	Diametrically Opposed Positions	178
V	the same control program on the same of th		VI. The Absence of a Principled Approach by the Court	
*(0)	in the 1960s and 1970s	107		179
V	II. Three Test Cases	109		18
	III. No Right to Family Reunion: ABC sets the Tone for Strasbourg	107	VIII. Taking a Stance against Expulsion: A Series of Legal Tools which	10.
٧		111		187
	Migrant Case Law	111		
				190
			X. Conclusion	193

Contents

xv

			٠	
37	4	T	•	

_			
n-		242	40
( ()	nti	771	1.5

I. Who Remembers KCL? The European Commission's Unpromising Case law Sering: The Court Finally Steps In 202   III. Sering: The Court Finally Steps In 202   III. Cree Variet Final Sect. The Court need not Believe 207   III. Cree Variet Secd. The Court need not Believe 207   III. Cree Variet Secd. The Court Normally accepts the Facts as 207   III. Cree Variet Secd. The Court Normally accepts the Facts as 213   IV. Cree Variet Secd. The Court Normally accepts the Facts as 214   IV. Cree Variet Secd. The Court Normally accepts the Facts as 215   IV. Cree Variet Secd. The Court Normally accepts the Facts as 216   IV. Cree Variet Secd. The Court Normally accepts the Facts as 217   IV. Cree Variet Secd. The Court Seamins the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Court Examines the Article 3   Complaint Ex Variet Secd. The Court Examines the Court E	7.		eping Beauty Awakens Late: An Absolute Prohibition any Buts (Around <i>Soering</i> )	196		VI	II. What a Revolutionary Post- <i>Gaygusuz</i> Case Law would have Looked Like	264
Case Law 199  II. Sorring: The Court Finally Steps In 202  X. Discrimination Sturson From Mater to K.A.B. and Zhou, or When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of the Keed In Court Reguests of Seed in the Strasboom of Court Face away from their Parents of When Children are Taken Away from their Parents of the Strasboom of Court Away from their Parents of the Strasboom of Court Away from their Parents of When Courts Denomary of Retreat 27.  XIV. Craw Wara! Your Away from their Parents of Strasboom Potentially Objectionable Distinction: Ponnomary of Retreat 27.  XIV. Craw Wara! Your Away from their Parents of Distinction: Ponnomary of Retreat 27.  XIV. Craw Wara! Your Away from their Parents of Strasboom Potentially Objectionable Distinction: Ponnomary of Retreat 27.  XIV. Craw Wara! Your Your Your Waray From Maintenant 27.  XIV. Craw Wara! Your Your Waray From Maintenant 27.  XIV. Craw Wara! Your Your Waray From Maintenant 27.  XIV. The Craw Wara! Regretable Minimisation Strategy: Zebed and Pannomaryon! Retreat 28.  XIV. Waray Waray Your Your Your Your Your Your Your Your		400		170		IX	When Discrimination is not Discussed: Timishev and Other Non-	
Whe Children are Taken Away from their Parents   207				199				265
II. Char brian Plas Seed. In Court Reed in Report Reports of the Whole Story: Conflicting Tendencies IV. A Seed is not the Whole Story: Conflicting Tendencies IV. A Seed is not the Whole Story: Conflicting Tendencies IV. A Seed is not the Whole Story: Conflicting Tendencies IV. Crae Varia' Second Seed. The Court Normally accepts the Facts as Part Second Seed. The Court Normally accepts the Facts as Part Second Seed. The Court Standard Part Seed. The Co				202		X.		267
No. A Seed is not the Whole Story: Conflicting Tendencies in the Strasbourg Case Law  V. Cone Yourd's Second Seed: The Court Normally accepts the Facts as Presented by the Respondent State  V. Cone Yourd's Tended Seed: The Court's Long Reticence at Serutinising National Determination Procedures  VII. Crue Yourd's Tended Seed: The Court's Long Reticence at Serutinising National Determination Procedures  VIII. Crue Yourd's First Seed: The Court Examines the Article 3  Complaint Ex Nunc  VIII. Crue Yourd's First Registration Procedures  VIII. Crue Yourd's First Registrations Article Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding.  X. Crue Yourd's Confirmations Article 5 shigh Iltreshold, Non-Violation of Article 8 and Inadmissibility of Any Article 6 Complaint  X. Back to the Commission and enter Kache and Varplomejew: When is Inhuman Tuburan?  XII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Sorving, not Vileurajab?  XIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination  XIV. The Court's Regettable Minimisation Strategy: Zetbek and Panamarapay it a Back The Strategy: Zetbek and Panamarapay i		III.				371	The second secon	20/
V. Cruz Visits Second Seed: The Court Normally accepts the Facts as Presented by the Respondent State VI. Cruz Visits Second Seed: The Court Stong Reticence at VI. Cruz Visits Seed: The Court Stong Reticence at VIII. Cruz Visits Fourth Seed: The Court Examines the Article 3 Complaint Ex Num. VIII. Cruz Visits Fourth Seed: The Court Examines the Article 3 VIII. Cruz Visits Flith (but now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Cruz Visits Flith (but now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Cruz Visits Flith (but now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Cruz Visits Flith (but now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Cruz Visits Protection VIII. Cruz Visits Protection VIII. An Article 3 Protection VIII. Visits of State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Visits of State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Visits of State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Visits of State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Visits of State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. The Inter-American Court: Equality as Jus Cogens (Advisory Opinions 16/99 and 18/03)  28. Sack to the Commission and enter Konlon and Varfolomejee: When is Inhuman Tinhuman? VIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case of Soering, not Visits of State of Stay Deportation of Visits of State of Visits of Visit		T3.7		207		XI		270
Second Seed: The Court Normally accepts the Facts as Presented by the Respondent State   213   134   135		1 V.		211		ΧI		2,0
Presented by the Respondent State VI. Crue Varia' Third Seed: The Court's Long Reticence at VI. Crue Varia' Third Seed: The Court's Long Reticence at Complaint Es Minal Determination Procedures VIII. Crue Varia' Fourth Seed: The Court Examines the Article 3 Complaint Es Minal VIII. Crue Varia' Fifth (but now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. Crue Varia' Fifth (but now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding VIII. An Article 3 And Individual Information Strategy: Zeibek and Article 3 Protection An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Vibraright? An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of May VIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of May VIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of May VIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of May VIII. The Court's Reluctance to Proteced to Verdicts of Violation VIII. The Court's Reluctance to Proteced to Verdicts of Violation Available Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of May VIII. The Court's Reluctance to Proteced to Verdicts of Violation Available Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of May VIII. The Court's Reluctance to Proteced to Verdicts of Violation VIII. The Court's Reluctance to Proteced to Verdicts of Violation VIII. The Court's Reluctance to Proteced to Verdicts of Violation VIII. The Court's Rejectable Minimisation Strategy: Zeibk and Pagnonaryori Cable National States About Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of May VIII. The Court's Rejectable Minimisation Strategy: Zeibk and May VIII. The Court's Rejectable Minimisation Strategy: Zeibk and May VIII. The Court's Rejectable Minimisation Strategy: Zeibk and May VIII. The Court's Rejectable Minimisation Strategy: Zeibk and May VIII. The Court's Rejectable Minimisation Strategy: Zeibk and May VIII. The Cou		V		211		71.		271
VII. Cruz Varas' Third Seed: The Court's Long Reticence at Secretarinising National Determination Procedures 217  VIII. Cruz Varas' Fourth Seed: The Court Examines the Article 3 Complaint Ex Nune 219  VIII. Cruz Varas' Firth (But now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding 221  IX. Cruz Varas' Firth (But now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding 221  XV. The Court's Regretable Minimisation Strategy: Zethek and Pomomaryou's Retreat 27, Vol. Conclusion 228  XVII. Conclusion 229  XVII. Conclusion 320  XVII. Conclusion 321  XVII. Conclusion 328  XII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering and Vulvaright's Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection 323  XIII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering and Vulvaright's Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Ill. The Inter-American Court Asserts is Jurisdiction to Deliver Advisory Opinion No. 16  228  XIII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering and Vulvaright's Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Ill. The Inter-American Court Declares Consular Information a Human Right: LaGrand, Averna and the Unknown Kimmel 229  XIV. Other Courts Deny Consular Information is a Human Right: LaGrand, Averna and the Unknown Kimmel 229  XIV. Glass Half Pull? From Chabalto Stadul v. Italy, National Security does not Chapten the Village of Civil Seas Half Pull? From Chabalto Stadul v. Italy, National Security does not Chapten the Probabilition of a Return to Totrue 241  XIV. From Pomomaryou's Betterat 277  XVI. Conclusion 229  XVII. Glass Half Pull? From Chabalto Stadul v. Italy, National Security does not Chapten the Probabilition of a Return to Totrue 241  XIV. The Court's Regretable Minimisation Strategy: Zetchek and Decision Strategy: Zetchek and Decision Strategy: Zetchek and Decision Strategy: Zetchek and Decision Strategy: Zetchek and Chapten Available Relationship 257  III. The Inter-American Court		*•		213		XI		
Scrutinising National Determination Procedures  VII. Crue Varie Vorley Seed: The Court Examines the Article 3 Complaint Ex Name  VIII. Crue Varies Fifth (but now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stray Deportation are not Binding  IX. Crue Varies Confirmations: Article 3s High Ihreshold, Non-Vlolation of Article 3a and Inadmissibility of Any Article 6 Complaint  X. Back to the Commission and enter Kozlov and Varfolomejer. When is Inhuman Inhuman?  XI. Vilnouright Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection  XII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Vilnouright  XII. An Alternative Pro-Nigrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Ingination  XV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The Court's Reductance to Proceed to Verdices of Violation  XV. Glass Half Full? From Chabalto Stadu v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture  XVII. The Missing Case Law  XVII. The Missing Case Law  XVII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Anticip		VI.						272
Complaint Ex Nume   Complaint   Complaint Ex Nume   Complaint   Complaint   Complaint   Complaint Ex Nume   Complaint				217				275
VIII. Grie Variat's Fifth (but now Dead) Seed: Strasbourg Requests for the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding IX. Cruz Variat's Confirmations Article 3s High Threshold, Non-Violation of Article 8 and Inadmissibility of Any Article 6 Complain XI. Back to the Commission and enter Kozlov and Varfolomejer. When is Inhuman Inhuman? XI. Wiburajdah: Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection XII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Viburajdah: Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection XII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination XIV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3' The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom XVI. Glass Half Empty? Sissanathan XVII. Glass Half Empty? Sissanathan XVII. Glass Half Empty? Sissanathan XVII. The Missing Case Law XVIII. The Missing Case Law XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 XVIII. Inter-American Court Orders Provisions 30 XVIII. Inter-American Court Orders Provisional XVIII. Inter-American Court Orders Provisio		VII.				X		270
the State to Stay Deportation are not Binding IX. Cruz Varair Confirmations: Article 3s High Threshold, Non-Violation of Article 8 and Inadmissibility of Any Article 6 Complaint X. Back to the Commission and enter Kozlov and Varfolomejev: When is Inhuman Tinhuman? XI. Viluarajah: Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Qualify for An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Vilvarajah: XIII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of my Imagination XIV. In Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation XIV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom AVII. Glass Half Full From Chahal to Saada v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture XIV. Conclusion XIV. Conclusion XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. Conclusion XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. Conclusion XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings XIV. The State and the Individual Interests: Differ				219		1/1		
1X.   Crue Varas' Confirmations Article 3s High Threshold, Non-Violation of Article 8 and Inadmissibility of Any Article 6 Complaint   X.   Back to the Commission and enter Kazlav and Varfolomejev. When is Inhuman Thhuman?   224   11.   Inhuman Thhuman?   224   24.		VIII.		221		X١	71. Conclusion	200
Non-Violation of Article 8 and Inadmissibility of Any Article 6 Complaint X. Back to the Commission and enter Kozlov and Variolomejev: When is Inhuman 'Inhuman'? XI. Vilvarajah': Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Vilvarajah': An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination XII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination XIV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom XVI. Glass Half Full From Chahal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture XIXI. The Missing Case Law XIXI. Conclusion  8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others (After Gaygusus)  8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others of Liberalism Office Gaygusus V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant VI. Relning in Gaygusus: These Cases Reaffirm Closure  (Advisory Opinions 16/99 and 18/03)  224 II. He Inter-American Court Declares Consular Information a Human Right: Laft Hunter-American Court Declares Consular Information a Human Right: Laft Hunter-American Court Declares Consular Information a Human Right: Laft Hunter-American Court Opinion No. 16 V. Equality as Jus Cogens: Advisory Opinion No. 18 on the Rights of Undocumented Migrants VII. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation VII. The State and the Unknown Kimmel VIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 The judicial interpretation of human rights provisions Original Provisional and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 The judicial interpretation of human rights provisions VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings VIII. The Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 The judicial interpretatio		IV		221	9.	Th	e Voice of the Inter-American Court: Equality as Jus Cogens	
X. Back to the Commission and enter Kozlow and Varfolomejev: When is Inhuman inhuman?  XI. Vilvarajab: Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection  An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Vilvarajab: Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection  XII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Vilvarajab: Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Marticle 3 Protection  XIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination  XIV. If a Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation  XV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3' The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom  XVI. Glass Half Full? From Chabal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does no Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture  XVII. Glass Half Empty? Sivanathan  XVII. He Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Missing Case Case of D. v. the Universal Market Case of Mission Case of Missing Case of D. v. the Universal Mission Case of M		IX.		-				282
X. Back to the Commission and enter Kozlov and Varfolomejev: When is Inhuman?  XI. Wilvarajah Randomly Indiced Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection  XII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Vilvarajah?  XIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination  XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation  XV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom  XVI. Glass Half Full? From Chabal to Standi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture  XVII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Inter-American Court Declares Consular Information a Human Right:  LaGrand, Averaa and the Unknown Kimmel  290.  V. Equality as Jus Cogens: Advisory Opinion No. 18 on the Rights of Undocumented Migrants  VIII. The Court's Deny Consular Information is a Human Right:  LaGrand, Averaa and the Unknown Kimmel  291.  V. Equality as Jus Cogens: Advisory Opinion No. 18 on the Rights of Undocumented Migrants  VIII. The Concurring Opinions  VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  302.  VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  303.  XVIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  304.  VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  305.  XVIII. The Inter-American Court Position is a Human Right:  LaGrand, Averaa and the Unknown Kimmel  294.  VIII. The Concurring Opinions  VIII. The Concurring Opinions  VIII. The Concurring Opinions  305.  VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  306.  VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  308.  VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  309.  VIII. The District of Viven And European Restraint: Four Key Indicators  300.  VIII. The District of Viven And European Restraint: Four Key Indicators  301.  VIII. The District Device of National Recurring Opini				222		ì	• •	284
is Inhuman 'Inhuman'?  XI. Vilvarajah: Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection  XII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Vilvarajah: An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination  XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation  XV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom  One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom  XVII. Glass Half Full Prom Chabatu to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture  XVII. Class Half Empty? Sivanathan  XVII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Stare and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  The intended general or particular reach of the ruling  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Stare and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings  The intended general or particular reach of the ruling  XVIII. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks  Or False Alarm?  XIII. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz  III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship  IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant  Z58  VIII. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yan and Bosico  329  V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Intere-Reterded Violations  320  XIII. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yan and Bosico' Merits: Multiple Intere-Readed Violations  321  V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Intere-Related Violations  322  V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Intere-Related Violations  323  III. Hence Charles and the Unknown Kimmel  III. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yan and Bosico'  XIII. The Intere-American Court Volcans Provisional of the Heart of The William Related Violations  XIII. Th		Χ.		LLL 9			A STATE OF THE STA	201
XI.   Vilvarajah: Randomly Inflicted Ill-Treatment does not Qualify for Article 3 Protection   228   Right   28:				224				285
XII. An Important Aside: Why the Leading Case of Soering, not Viluarajah?  XIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination  XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation  XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation  XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation  XIV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom  XIV. Glass Half Full? From Chahal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture  XIVII. Glass Half Empty? Sivanathan  XVIII. Glass Half Empty? Sivanathan  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz  In Feshort and Straightforward Gaygusuz  In Feshort and Straightforward Gaygusuz  In Feshort and Straightforward Gaygusuz  In Heartican Activism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism  V. Conclusion  XIV. Conclusion  XIV. The Concurring Opinions  XVIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30-The judicial interpretation of human rights provisions  30 The judicial interpretation of human rights provisions  30 The intended general or particular reach of the ruling  30 Civil society participation  XV. Conclusion  30 The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm?  X. Conclusion  31 Reparations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico)  XV. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settleend Migrant  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  259 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations  329 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations  320 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations  321 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations  322 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations  329 V. Yean and Bo		XI.				III		
XIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination 233 Undocumented Migrants 299.  XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 VI. The Concurring Opinions 300.  XV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom 238 VII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 309.  XVI. Glass Half Full? From Chahal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture 241 The intended general or particular reach of the ruling 300.  XVII. The Missing Case Law 246 Civil society participation 300.  XVII. The Missing Case Law 247 IX. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm? 300.  XIX. Conclusion 247 IX. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm? 300.  X. Conclusion 300.  8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others (After Gaygusuz) 255 II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz 255 III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship 257 II. Haitians in the Dominican Republic III. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000 311.  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant 259 IV. Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico 320.  V. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 261 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 320.			Article 3 Protection	228			O Company of the comp	288
XIII. An Alternative Pro-Migrant Case Law: The Leading Case of my Imagination 233 Undocumented Migrants 295 XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 XVI. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom 238 XVI. Glass Half Full? From Chahal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture 241 XVIII. The Missing Case Law 246 XVIII. The Missing Case Law 246 XVIII. The Missing Case Law 247 XIX. Conclusion 247 XIX. Conclusion 247 XIX. Conclusion 247 XIX. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm? 300 XX. Conclusion 310 XX. Conclusion 311 XX. Conclusion 312 XX. Conclusion 313 XX. Conclusion 314 XX. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm? 300 XX. Conclusion 315 XX. Conclusion 316 XX. Conclusion 317 XX. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm? 300 XX. Conclusion 316 XX. Conclusion 317 XX. Conclusion 318 XX. Conclusion 318 XX. Conclusion 319 XX. Conclusion 310 XX. Con		XII.				IV		
Imagination 233 Undocumented Migrants 290 XIV. The Court's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 VI. The Courting Opinions 300 XV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom 238 VIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 300 XVI. Glass Half Full? From Chahal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture 241 The normative basis of the courts' reasoning 300 XVIII. The Missing Case Law 246 Civil society participation 300 XVIII. The Missing Case Law 246 Civil society participation 300 XIX. Conclusion 247 IX. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm? 300 XIX. Conclusion 250 I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz 255 II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz 255 III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship 257 I. Haitians in the Dominican Republic 310 III. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism 258 V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant 259 VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 261 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 322 VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 234 VIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 300 VIII. The Concurring Opinions 300 VIII. The Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 300 VIII. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000 VIII. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000 VIII. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in the European System 320 VIII. V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 320				232				292
XIV. The Courr's Reluctance to Proceed to Verdicts of Violation 234 VI. The Concurring Opinions 300 XV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom 238 VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings 30 The Journal of Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom 238 VIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 30 The judicial interpretation of human rights provisions 30 The judicial interpretation of human rights provisions 30 The internative basis of the courts' reasoning 30 The internative basis of		XIII.		222		V.		206
XV. Is a Return to No Medical Care Compatible with Article 3? The One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom 238  XVI. Glass Half Full? From Chahal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture 241  XVII. Glass Half Empty? Sivanathan 244  XVIII. The Missing Case Law 246  XVIII. The Missing Case Law 246  XVIII. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm?  8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others (After Gaygusuz)  I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz 255  III. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz 255  III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship 257  IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism 258  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant 259  VI. Reining in Gaygusus: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 261  VIII. The State and the Individual Interests: Different Positionings 300  VIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 300  VIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 300  The judical interpretation of human rights provisions 300  The judical interpretation of human rights provisions 300  The judical interpretation of human rights provisions 300  The indical interpretation of human rights provisions 300  The judical interpretation of human rights provisions 300  The normative basis of the courts' reasoning 300  The normative basis of the courts' reasoning 300  The normative basis of the courts' reasoning 3		VIV				3/1		
One-Off Case of D. v. the United Kingdom  XVI. Glass Half Full? From Chahal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture  241  XVII. Glass Half Empty? Sivanathan  244  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  247  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  248  Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others  (After Gaygusuz)  I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz  II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz  III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship  IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism  VI. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  238  VIII. Inter-American Activism and European Restraint: Four Key Indicators 300  The judicial interpretation of human rights provisions  The normative basis of the courts' reasoning  The interpretation of human rights provisions  The normative basis of the courts' reasoning  The normative basis of th				234				
XVI. Glass Half Full? From Chahal to Saadi v. Italy, National Security does not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture  XVII. Glass Half Empty? Sivanathan  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  XVIII. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks or False Alarm?  XIII. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz  II. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz  III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship  IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism  VI. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  X He judicial interpretation of human rights provisions  The normative basis of the courts' reasoning  30. The normative basis of the courts' reasoning  The intended general or particular reach of the ruling  30. Civil society participation  XII. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks  or False Alarm?  X. Conclusion  31. Reparations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico)  31. Haitians in the Dominican Republic  32. Measures in 2000  33. Measures in 2000  34. Measures in 2000  35. Measures in 2000  36. W. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations  36. Measures in 2000  37. Friendly Settlements in the European System  38. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others  48. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others  49. V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations  39. V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations		Av.		238				
not Dampen the Prohibition of a Return to Torture  XVII. Glass Half Empty? Sivanathan  XVIII. The Missing Case Law  XIX. Conclusion  8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others  (After Gaygusuz)  I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz  II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz  III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship  IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart  of Liberalism  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies  to the Legally Settled Migrant  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  241  The normative basis of the courts' reasoning  302  The intended general or particular reach of the ruling  303  Civil society participation  Civil society participation  Civil society participation  247  IX. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks  or False Alarm?  X. Conclusion  310  X. Conclusion  311  X. Conclusion  312  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies  to the Legally Settled Migrant  259  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  241  The intended general or particular reach of the ruling  304  Civil society participation  305  Civil society participation  306  Civil society participation  307  The Intended general or particular reach of the ruling  308  Civil society participation  308  Civil society participation  308  Civil society participation  308  T. The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks  or False Alarm?  X. Conclusion  312  The Anticipated Significance: Real Risks  or False Alarm?  A V. Conclusion  313  The Dangers of a Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks  or False Alarm?  A Visionary Jurisprudence: Real Risks  Or F		XVI.		250		, ,		305
XVII. Glass Half Empty? Sivanathan XVIII. The Missing Case Law XVIII. The Missing Case Law XIX. Conclusion  8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others (After Gaygusuz)  I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz  II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz  III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant VII. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  244  The intended general or particular reach of the ruling Civil society participation 305  X. Conclusion  X. Conclusion  310  X. Conclusion  311  X. Haitians are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico) 312  II. Haitians in the Dominican Republic 313  III. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000 314  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant 325  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  244  The intended general or particular reach of the ruling Civil society participation 307  X. Conclusion 310  X. Conclusion 310  X. Haitians in the Dominican Republic 311  III. Haitians in the Dominican Republic 312  III. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico 313  IIII. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico 314  V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 326				241				305
XIX. Conclusion  8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others (After Gaygusuz)  1. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz 250 251 252 253 254 255 255 255 257 257 258 258 258 258 259 259 259 259 259 250 250 250 250 250 250 250 250 250 250		XVII.						306
8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others (After Gaygusuz)  I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz 252 III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  or False Álarm? X. Conclusion  31.  X. Heparations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico) 31.  Reparations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico) 31.  II. Haitians in the Dominican Republic 31.  Measures in 2000 31.  No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico 32.  Settlements in the European System 32.  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 32.  VI. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 32.								307
8. Social Protection? All are Equal, But Some More So than Others (After Gaygusuz)  I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz 255 III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  250  X. Conclusion  31.  Reparations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico) 31.  II. Haitians in the Dominican Republic II. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000 31.  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  261  V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 326		XIX.	Conclusion	247		IX		200
I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  250  10. Reparations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico) 31: 11. Haitians in the Dominican Republic II. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000 31: 12. Measures in 2000 31: 13. Wesaures in 2000 31: 14. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico 32: 15. Reparations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step Further (Yean and Bosico) 31: 31: 31: 32: 33: 34: 35: 36: 37: 38: 38: 38: 38: 38: 38: 38: 38: 38: 38	0	C! -1 D	Described All and Found Book Come Many Conthant	1		37		
I. The Short and Straightforward Gaygusuz 252 II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz 255 III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship 257 IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism 258 V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant 259 VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 261 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 320 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 320	0.			250		X.	Conclusion	311
II. The Anticipated Significance of Gaygusuz 255  III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship 257  IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism 258  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant 259  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 261  V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 319  Structher (Yean and Bosico)  II. Haitians in the Dominican Republic 319  III. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000  319  VIII. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico 320  320  321  322  323  324  325  V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 320			ACT CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACT		10.	Re	parations are a Big Issue: Taking Human Rights One Step	
III. Immigration and Welfare: A Viable Relationship 257 I. Haitians in the Dominican Republic 310 IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism 258 III. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000 310 IV. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant 259 IV. Friendly Settlements in the European System 320 IV. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 261 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 320								313
<ul> <li>IV. Universalism and Closure: A Contradiction at the Heart of Liberalism</li> <li>V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant</li> <li>VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure</li> <li>III. The Inter-American Court Orders Provisional Measures in 2000</li> <li>Measures in 2000</li> <li>Measures in 2000</li> <li>IV. Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico</li> <li>V. Friendly Settlements in the European System</li> <li>V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations</li> </ul>						-	The second secon	
of Liberalism  V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure  258  Measures in 2000  III. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico Tiv. Friendly Settlements in the European System 32.  V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 32.				237				310
V. A Belated Answer to the Austrian Government: Gaygusuz Applies to the Legally Settled Migrant 259 VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 111. No 'Friendly Settlement' in Yean and Bosico 32. V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 32. V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations		1 V.		258		11.		318
to the Legally Settled Migrant 259 IV. Friendly Settlements in the European System 32.  VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 261 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 32.		V.		2,0		111		322
VI. Reining in Gaygusuz: Three Cases Reaffirm Closure 261 V. Yean and Bosico's Merits: Multiple Inter-Related Violations 320		v Koze		259				323
		VI.						326
							4	

Contents

xvii

xvi	ii	Contents	- 1			Contents	xix
	VI.	The Declaring Role of the Strasbourg Court and the Development of		12	. Don	nestic Asylum Procedures Aside: Scrutinising Strasbourg's	,
		the Pilot Procedure	334		'Scru	itiny' (M.S.S.)	402
	VII.	The Strasbourg Court's Incursions into Execution and the Hirsi	-		I.	The Context: 'Dublin II'	404
		Jamaa Indication	337		II.	The Extraordinary M.S.S.: A Brief Tour of the Judgment	405
	VIII.	The Dominican Republic Digs its Heels: Did the Inter-American	-		III.	The Court Distances Itself from the Respondent States	408
		Court Request Too Much in Yean and Bosico?	340		IV.	Embracing a Human Rights Reasoning: The Reversal	
	IX.	The European System's Not-So-Impeccable Execution Record	341		2	of the Reversal	411
	X.	'Execution' and 'Execution': A Rare Comment from the Strasbourg			V.	How the Court Overcame its own Case Law: From T.I. to K.R.S. to	
		Court in Emre (No.2)	344			M.S.S.	412
	XI.	Judicial Restraint in the European System Not a Guarantee of	- 1		VI.	M.S.S.: An Exceptional Situation, an Exceptional Applicant, an	
		State Respect	346			Exceptional Lawyer, an Exceptional Judge	416
	XII.	Provisional or Perennial Measures? The Inter-American Court			VII.	The States' Standard Arguments—And Possibly an	
		Cannot Act Alone	348			Irritated Court	420
	XIII.	Conclusion	350		VIII.	Awaiting the Repetition of M.S.S.	422
					IX.	Defective Asylum Domestic Procedures: The Strasbourg	
		III DDOCDECTS	- 1			Story up to $M.S.S.$	425
		III. PROSPECTS	- 1		X.	Paying the Price for a Lack of Scrutiny: The Rise and Fall of Rule 39	
11.	Migr	ants, Not Criminals: The Continual Elaboration of	-			Requests	434
		ng Human Rights Norms in the Inter-American System	- 1		XI.	After M.S.S.: Afghan Refugees in the Strasbourg Case Law	436
		z Loor)	359		XII.	When will the Court Intervene: A Matter of Documentation	438
	-				XIII.	Conclusion	440
	l.	Mr Vélez Loor has his Day in Court	361				
	II.	The Position of the State of Panama and the Rest of	264	13	. The	Darkest Case Law: Condoning Rightlessness (Bonger et alia)	442
	III	the Hearing The Oversion Asked in Summer 2010, Wiles will the New Court	364		I.	Rightlessness under the Convention: The Bonger Case Law	446
	III.	The Question Asked in Summer 2010: What will the New Court Decide?	265		II.	At Issue in the Bonger Case Law: A Kafkaesque Stalemate	448
	IV.		365		III.	How We Came to Bonger, I., and K.: Long Established Principles and	
	IV.	The Beginnings of a San José Reversal? The Inter-American Court Grapples with the Same Tension as the Strasbourg Court	266			Ways of Reasoning	451
	V.		366		IV.	On Destitution and the Inapplicability of Article 3: Back to Müslim	
	٧.	Vélez Loor's Findings: Immigration Detention Subjected to Safeguard after Safeguard	260			as if M.S.S. had Never Happened	452
	VI.	Recapitulation: Immigration Detention under the American	368		V.	The Residence Permit Case Law in Three Paragraphs	456
	V 1.	Convention	374		VI.	The Implacable Logic of Inadmissibility: The Examples of Solomon	
	VIII	A World Apart: The Strasbourg Court's Approach to Immigration	3/4			and Dremlyuga	457
	V 111.	Detention	375		VII.	The Case Law Evolves: The Sisojeva, Mendizabal, and	
	IX.	The Source of the European and Inter-American Chasm: A Matter of	3/)			Da Silva's Chambers' Verdicts of Violation	459
	171.	Text, Context, Judges and Judicial Habitus	382		XIII.	Back to the Non-Violation Mainstream: The Sisojeva Grand Chamber	
	X.	The Realism, Humanism and Thoroughness of the Inter-American	302			Judgment	463
	21.	Court	384		IX.	The Best Interests of the Child versus a Fait Accompli: An Inherent	
	XI.	A Lone Five-Year-Old in Detention: <i>Tabitha</i> Proves an	304			Tension, a Divided Court, a Lottery	464
	222	'Inter-American Tipping Point' for the Strasbourg Court	387		X.	A Successful Parallel to Bonger: The Swiss Canton Case Law	466
	XII.	The European Court of the Rights of States? Subsequent Case Law	307		XI.	Russian Case Law Paves the Way: Liu (No. 2) and Alim	469
	~ ****	on Children's Detention	392		XII.	Why did Adult Children Suddenly Count in Hasanbasic?	474
	XIII	Don Jésus' Story (Continued): What Mr Vélez Loor did not get from	372		XIII.		476
	~ ******	the Inter-American Court	397		XIV.	7,1	478
	XIV	Vulnerability rather than Equality: Where the Inter-American Court	371		XV.	Rightlessness: The Ultimate Discrimination	479
	11	refused to go in Vélez Loor	399		XVI.	Conclusion	480
	XV.	Conclusion	400				
	P400 - 1250	24 August transportation on a vice recovery	100				

14.	On	the Road to Substantive Equality: Due Process and	
		n-discrimination at San José (Nadege Dorzema and Pacheco	
		eo)—by Lourdes Peroni	482
	I.	Nadege Dorzema: Continuing on the Road to Equality, Albeit	
		Hesitantly	484
		Joining the equality road	484
		Wandering off the equality road	486
		Remaining nonetheless on the equality road	489
	II.	Pacheco Tineo: Enlarging the Due Process Road	490
		Specific procedural standards in migration proceedings:	
		following the well-paved road of due process	491
		The Pacheco Tineo contribution: adding an asylum lane onto the due	
		process road	492
		Applying the principles to the case: the absence of procedural	
		guarantees	494
		Passerelle to the equality road?	495
	III.	Migrant Children: In Search of Yet More Specific Standards for	
		Another Sub-Group	497
	IV.	Conclusion	500
	V.	Postscript	501
15.	Cor	nclusion: The Way Forward	503
	I.	The Problem with the Strasbourg Case Law	503
	II.	The Substantive Contours of a Strong Strasbourg	
		Jurisprudence: Articles 3, 6, and 14 ECHR	505
	III.	Thinking about Process: Expecting the Court to Act with Equanimity	506
	IV.	The Inter-American Experience	508
	V.	What Does the Future Hold?	509
	VI.	Equality, Open Borders and the Right to Act Humanely	510
		*	
Inde	ex		513