



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

'Hard power 'and the European Convention on Human Rights

Kempees, P.M.

Citation

Kempees, P. M. (2019, June 18). *'Hard power 'and the European Convention on Human Rights*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/74051>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/74051>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/74051> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Kempees, P.M.

Title: 'Hard power 'and the European Convention on Human Rights

Issue Date: 2019-06-18

‘Hard Power’ and the European Convention on Human Rights

‘Hard Power’ and the European Convention on Human Rights

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 18 juni 2019
klokke 11.15 uur

door

Peter Martinus Kempees

geboren te Amsterdam
in 1959

Promotoren: Prof. dr. R.A. Lawson
Prof. dr. H. Duffy

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. E.A. Alkema
Prof. dr. A.C. Buyse (Universiteit Utrecht)
Prof. dr. L.J. van den Herik
Prof. P. Leach (Middlesex University London, UK)
Dr. J.P. Loof
Prof. J. Murdoch (University of Glasgow, UK)

Copyright 2019 by Peter Kempees.

The views expressed in this work are those of the author alone, as held at the time when they were formulated. They do not necessarily correspond to views held by any other person or institution, including the European Court of Human Rights or any one of its judges, or that Court's Registry or any one of its members other than the author himself.

To Ingrid

Contents

1	Introduction	
1.1	The European Convention on Human Rights and 'hard power'	1
1.2	Understanding of 'hard power' for purposes of this study	4
1.2.1	Armed conflict	4
1.2.2	Other exercise of 'hard power' relevant to this study	7
1.2.3	Defining 'hard power'	8
1.2.4	Problems of applying the Convention to the use of 'hard power'	9
1.3	Object of this study	12
1.3.1	Research question	12
1.3.2	Method and approach	12
2	Problems of substantive Convention law in relation to 'hard power'	
2.1	Introduction	17
2.2	Article 2, right to life	18
2.2.1	Substantive obligations	18
2.2.2	Procedural obligations	19
2.3	Article 3, prohibition of torture	23
2.3.1	Substantive obligations	23
2.3.2	Procedural obligations	25
2.4	Article 5, right to liberty and security	25
2.4.1	Substantive obligations	25
2.4.2	Procedural obligations	28
2.5	Protection of home and property	28
2.6	Article 13	31
2.7	The problem of proof	32
2.8	Conclusion	33
3	Interplay between the Convention and international humanitarian law	
3.1	Introduction	35
3.2	Drafting history	35
3.3	<i>Lex specialis</i> ?	36
3.3.1	Is international humanitarian law <i>lex specialis</i> in relation to human rights law?	36
3.3.2	If not <i>lex specialis</i> , then what?	42
3.4	Case-law of the Court	44
3.4.1	Article 2	45
3.4.2	Article 5	46
3.4.3	Article 7	54
3.4.4	Article 4 of Protocol No. 7	55
3.5	Conclusion	56

4 Derogation

- 4.1 Introduction 59
- 4.2 The nature of derogation 60
- 4.3 War 63
 - 4.3.1 Defining a 'war' 63
 - 4.3.2 Use of the expression 'war' in practice 67
 - 4.3.3 Must a 'war' constitute a 'threat to the life of the nation' for derogation under Article 15 to be possible? 70
 - 4.3.4 Provisional conclusion 78
- 4.4 Legal consequences of lawful derogation in time of war 80
- 4.5 Derogation in response to an 'emergency threatening the life of the nation' in practice 80
 - 4.5.1 Commission and Court case-law 82
- 4.6 When does a public emergency threaten the life of the nation? 104
- 4.7 Non-derogable rights 109
 - 4.7.1 Article 2 109
 - 4.7.2 Article 3 113
 - 4.7.3 Article 4 113
 - 4.7.4 Article 7 114
 - 4.7.5 The death penalty 116
 - 4.7.6 Article 4 of Protocol No. 7 117
 - 4.7.7 Implied non-derogable rights 117
- 4.8 Strictly required by the exigencies of the situation 122
- 4.9 Not inconsistent with the State's other obligations under international law 123
- 4.10 Formalities 125
- 4.11 The *Hassan* judgment 127
- 4.12 Conclusion 128

5 Jurisdiction of the Contracting States

- 5.1 Introduction 131
- 5.2 Territorial and quasi-territorial jurisdiction 133
 - 5.2.1 The 'colonial clause' 133
- 5.3 Sea, airspace and outer space under the sovereignty of States 138
 - 5.3.1 Sea 138
 - 5.3.2 Territorial airspace 142
 - 5.3.3 Outer space 143
- 5.4 Ships, aircraft and spacecraft 143
 - 5.4.1 Ships 144
 - 5.4.2 Aircraft 150
 - 5.4.3 Spacecraft 153
- 5.5 Extraterritorial jurisdiction 155

- 5.5.1 Legal acts of domestic authorities in another country, such as diplomatic or consular activity 155
- 5.5.2 The exercise of jurisdiction by a State over its own troops abroad 156
- 5.5.3 *Ad hoc* domestic tribunal set up abroad with the permission of the receiving State 157
- 5.5.4 Cases in which the presence of foreign judges is not exercise of extraterritorial jurisdiction by another State 157
- 5.6 Cases in which acts producing effects abroad are not exercise of extraterritorial jurisdiction 158
 - 5.6.1 Expulsion and extradition 158
 - 5.6.2 Attack on foreign territory 160
- 5.7 Conclusion 161

6 Typology of Article 1 jurisdiction in 'hard power' situations

- 6.1 Introduction 163
- 6.2 States acting exercising 'hard power' on their own territory 163
 - 6.2.1 Acknowledging jurisdiction 163
 - 6.2.2 Denying jurisdiction 165
- 6.3 Foreign State agents committing unlawful acts with the acquiescence of Convention State 173
 - 6.3.1 'Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia' 175
 - 6.3.2 Bosnia and Herzegovina 176
 - 6.3.3 Poland 176
 - 6.3.4 Italy 177
 - 6.3.5 Lithuania 178
 - 6.3.6 Romania 179
- 6.4 'Hard power' as exercise of extraterritorial jurisdiction 180
 - 6.4.1 Maintaining a military presence on foreign territory 180
 - 6.4.2 Maintaining a proxy government on foreign territory 184
 - 6.4.3 Air attack on foreign territory 187
 - 6.4.4 Incursion into foreign territory 195
 - 6.4.5 Exercise of jurisdiction in foreign territorial waters 197
 - 6.4.6 Targeted killing abroad 198
 - 6.4.7 Cyber-attack 204
- 6.5 Peacekeeping and peace-enforcing 207
 - 6.5.1 All European members of the 'coalition of the willing' in Iraq 207
 - 6.5.2 United Kingdom in Iraq 208
 - 6.5.3 The Netherlands in Iraq 215
- 6.6 Exercise of jurisdiction on territory of foreign State with the latter's permission 216
 - 6.6.1 Turkey in Kenya 216
 - 6.6.2 France in Somalia 217

6.7	The status of ‘occupying power’	217
6.8	Conclusion	222
7	Jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights	
7.1	Introduction	225
7.2	Territorial limitations to the acceptance of Convention jurisdiction	225
7.3	Reservation (Article 57 of the Convention)	227
7.4	Conflicting international obligations	229
7.5	Conclusion	235
8	Attribution	
8.1	Introduction	237
8.2	‘Jurisdiction’ and ‘attribution’ in the logic of the Court	237
8.2.1	Relationship to the general law on State responsibility for internationally wrongful acts	237
8.2.2	The concepts of ‘jurisdiction’ and ‘attribution’ in the case-law of the Court	238
8.3	Attribution of the exercise of ‘hard power’ by the Contracting State	241
8.3.1	Attribution of extraterritorial exercise of ‘hard power’	241
8.3.2	Attribution of exercise of ‘hard power’ committed within the territory of a Contracting State	243
8.4	Involvement of agents other than organs of the Contracting State	245
8.4.1	General international law	245
8.4.2	Private agents: case-law of the Court	247
8.4.3	Private military security contractors	247
8.4.4	Cyber-attacks as a new problem of attribution	252
8.4.5	International organisations	255
8.5	Subordinate pseudo-states	273
8.5.1	The ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’	273
8.5.2	The ‘Moldovan Republic of Transdniestria’	274
8.5.3	Requirements governing remedies offered by subordinate entities	276
8.5.4	<i>Ad hoc</i> remedy: the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’	276
8.5.5	Internationally imposed quasi-indigenous institutions	282
8.6	Conclusion	296
9	Summary and conclusions	
9.1	Applicability of the Convention <i>ratione pacis sive belli</i>	299
9.2	The first defence: no violation	300
9.2.1	Denying the facts	300
9.2.2	The possibilities of derogation	300

- 9.3 The second defence: denying the jurisdiction of the Contracting State 304
 - 9.3.1 Existence of Article 1 jurisdiction 304
 - 9.3.2 Typology of Convention-relevant exercise of jurisdiction in 'hard power' situations 306
- 9.4 The third defence: denying the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights 309
- 9.5 The fourth defence: denying attribution 309
- 9.6 Final observations 312

Samenvatting (*Summary in Dutch*) 315

References 345

Curriculum vitae 379

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due to Roderick Liddell and Françoise Elens-Passos, Registrar and Deputy Registrar of the European Court of Human Rights ('the Court') respectively, for permission to publish this work; to Lawrence Early and Anna Austin, Jurisconsult and Deputy Jurisconsult of the Court respectively, for their support; to Professors Rick Lawson and Helen Duffy, for their inspired and inspiring supervision; to the indefatigable Genevieve Woods, Head of the Court's Library, and her team, for their invaluable assistance; to all the friends and colleagues who gave me their encouragement (they know who they are); and finally, to my wife, Ingrid, for her faith in the project, her patience and her love. To her I dedicate this book.

