

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
Chapter 1.	
Introduction	1
1.1. Aims of the Study.....	2
1.2. Setting the Stage.....	2
1.3. Working Definition and Related Concepts.....	9
1.4. State of the Art and Scope of this Study.....	15
1.5. Thesis and Research Questions.....	23
1.6. Methodology.....	27
1.6.1. Analytical and Normative Approach.....	27
1.6.2. Critical Approach and Deconstruction.....	31
1.6.3. Empirical Scope of the Study.....	34
1.7. Structure of the Study.....	41
Chapter 2.	
Typologies of Positive Obligations	45
2.1. Substantive and Procedural Positive Obligations.....	47
2.1.1. The Basic Distinction between Substance and Procedure.....	50
2.1.2. The Difficulties in Distinguishing between Substance and Procedure.....	53
2.1.3. Procedural Positive Obligations – General.....	57
2.1.4. Investigative Obligations.....	61
2.1.5. Access to Effective Remedies.....	66
2.1.6. Careful Decision-Making.....	75
2.2. Horizontal and Vertical Positive Obligations.....	78
2.2.1. Horizontal (Substantive) Positive Obligations.....	82
2.2.1.1. Obligations to Protect Life and Physical or Personal Integrity.....	83
2.2.1.2. Protection within Private Law Relations.....	87
2.2.1.3. Activities of Public Importance: Monitoring and the State’s System Responsibility.....	90

2.2.1.4.	The State's Role as Guarantor of Pluralism.....	94
2.2.1.5.	Selected Other (Horizontal Substantive) Positive Obligations.....	98
2.2.2.	Vertical (Substantive) Positive Obligations.....	100
2.2.2.1.	The "Duty of Schizophrenia".....	100
2.2.2.2.	Creation of Legal Status.....	103
2.2.2.3.	Special Duty of Care towards Persons under the State's Control.....	105
2.2.2.4.	Protection in the Absence of Interference.....	107
2.2.2.5.	Obligation to Take into Account Certain Particularities.....	109
2.2.2.6.	Substantive Equality.....	110
2.3.	Obligations Requiring a Legal and Administrative Framework and Ad Hoc Obligations.....	112
2.3.1.	The Rationale for Requiring an Adequate Legal and Administrative Framework.....	118
2.3.2.	Criminal Law Provisions.....	123
2.3.3.	Non-Criminal Contexts.....	126
2.4.	Conclusion: the Diversity of the Court's Case Law.....	130
 Chapter 3.		
	Relevant Principles and Tests.....	131
3.1.	The Knowledge Condition.....	131
3.2.	Proximity.....	137
3.3.	Effectiveness.....	146
3.4.	Delineating State Responsibility.....	155
3.5.	Qualifying Terms.....	158
3.6.	Proportionality Analysis.....	166
3.6.1.	The Application of the Principle of Proportionality in General.....	167
3.6.2.	Proportionality and Positive Obligations.....	171
3.6.2.1.	Relevant Factors in the Proportionality Analysis....	174
3.6.2.2.	Move Towards Proceduralisation.....	179
	Substance-flavoured procedural review.....	181
3.7.	Margin of Appreciation.....	185
3.7.1.	The Meaning of the Margin of Appreciation.....	186
3.7.2.	Factors Determining the Width of the Margin of Appreciation.....	189
3.7.3.	Consequences of the Margin of Appreciation.....	191
3.7.4.	The Margin of Appreciation and Positive Obligations.....	193
3.7.4.1.	"Quantitative" Reading of the Case Law.....	195
3.7.4.2.	"Qualitative" Reading of the Case Law.....	201

	Women on Waves and Others	201
	Notion of “respect” under Article 8.....	202
	Choice of means	206
3.7.4.3.	Conclusion on the Margin of Appreciation	210
3.8.	Conclusion.....	210
 Chapter 4.		
	Comparison Positive vs. Negative Obligations.....	213
4.1.	The Exceptional Character of Positive Obligations.....	214
4.2.	The Different Structure of the Court’s Examination under Articles 8–11	221
4.3.	The Margin of Appreciation	225
4.4.	Polycentricity.....	226
4.5.	Proportionality.....	228
4.6.	Conclusion.....	237
 Chapter 5.		
	Deconstructing the Dichotomy	241
5.1.	“The State” in the Court’s Case Law	243
5.1.1.	Early Case Law Concerning “Hybrid” Entities.....	247
5.1.2.	The <i>Kotov</i> Case	249
5.1.3.	Deconstructing the Notion of “Public Authority”	254
5.2.	Actions vs. Inactions/Omissions in the Court’s Case Law	261
5.2.1.	Theoretical Difficulties in Distinguishing between Actions and Omissions	262
5.2.2.	Practical Difficulties in Disentangling Action and Omission in the Court’s Case Law	270
5.2.3.	Baselines in the Court’s Case Law.....	276
5.2.3.1.	The “Status Quo” Baseline.....	276
	“Negativist” rights	276
	Modifying an “existing” legal status	277
	“Existing” vs. “new” rights	284
	Denial of health care	288
	Refusal decisions.....	290
5.2.3.2.	Curtailing vs. Implementing a Right.....	291
5.2.3.3.	Domestic Law Making Interference “Lawful”	298
5.3.	Conclusion: Holding the Positive State Accountable	304

Chapter 6.**Transforming the Court's Legal Methodology 309**

6.1.	Wildhaber's Proposal	311
6.2.	The Structure of the Analysis	314
6.2.1.	Scope Stage	314
6.2.2.	Discarding the Categorisation Question	315
6.2.3.	Legality Test	317
6.2.3.1.	Unlawful Inactions	318
6.2.3.2.	Condoning Illegalities	322
6.2.3.3.	Adequacy of the Legal and Administrative Framework	324
6.2.3.4.	Quality of the Law	326
6.2.3.5.	Conclusion on the Legality Test	328
6.2.4.	Legitimacy Test	328
6.2.5.	Proportionality Test	330
6.2.5.1.	Margin of Appreciation	330
6.2.5.2.	Proportionality Analysis	332
6.3.	Some Final Examples	335
6.3.1.	Examples from the Court's Case Law	335
6.3.2.	Re-examining <i>Hristozov</i>	337
6.4.	Conclusion	341

Chapter 7.**General Conclusion 343**

7.1.	Summary of the Findings	343
7.2.	Refuting the Worst Fears of the Critics	346
7.3.	Suggestions for Further Research	347

Bibliography* 351**Corpus of Cases* 367**