Contents

Acknowledgements XI
Acronyms and Abbreviations, Legal Citation Format XIII

1 **Any Alleged Breach: The Inter-State Application under the ECHR** 1
1.1 Growing Relevance of the Inter-State Application under the ECHR 1
1.2 Object and Purpose of the Inter-State Application 5
1.3 Link to Current Debate Concerning the Role of the European Court of Human Rights 7
1.4 Stream of Inquiry: Between Collective Enforcement and International Dispute Settlement 7
1.4.1 *The Drafting Process and the Evolution of the Supervisory Framework of the ECHR* 8
1.4.2 *Comparisons in Light of Leading Question* 8
1.4.3 *Case Law: Documentation, Context and Functions* 9
1.4.4 *Recommendations for Reform* 10
1.5 Collective Enforcement *and* International Dispute Settlement 11

2 **The Inception and Evolution of the Inter-State Application under the European Convention on Human Rights** 13
2.1 Overview: The Privilege of Hindsight 13
2.1.1 *Filling the Academic Gap* 13
2.1.2 *Methodological Considerations* 13
2.1.3 *Descriptive Concern of the Chapter* 14
2.2 International Human Rights on the Universal Level: Developments Without Specific Enforcement Structures 14
2.3 The Regional Initiative: The Council of Europe and Its Idiosyncrasies 16
2.3.1 *Human Rights: A Central Feature and the Need for Enforcement* 16
2.3.2 *The Object and Purpose of the Convention: More Collective Enforcement than Individual Justice* 17
2.4 Retracing the Notion of Collective and Enforcement 18
2.4.1 *Introducing the Notion of Collective Enforcement* 19
2.4.2 *Enforcement – A Point of Contention* 19
2.5 The 1950 Convention Revisited 20

2.5.1 *Amenable to Judicial Enforcement: The Substantive Guarantees of the ECHR* 20
2.5.2 *The Architecture of Supervision: A Complex Compromise* 21
2.5.3 *Supervision à la Carte* 23
2.5.4 *Evaluation of the 1950 Convention's Supervisory Structure* 25
2.6 Towards Judicial Supervision: Subsequent Amendments of the Convention 27
2.7 Results: The Inter-State Application between Collective Enforcement and International Dispute Settlement 28

3 International Dispute Settlement and Collective Enforcement Functions of the Inter-State Application Approached Through Comparison 30
3.1 Inter-State Litigation in Strasbourg and The Hague – A Comparison with a View to the Function of International Dispute Settlement 31
3.1.1 *Overview* 31
3.1.2 *Jurisdiction Compared* 35
3.1.3 *The Respective Yardsticks and the Cinderella Problem* 44
3.1.4 *Interim Result: Dispute Settlement Functions in Light of the Object and Purpose of the Inter-State Application?* 45
3.2 The Inter-State and the Individual Application under the European Convention on Human Rights – A Comparison with a View to the Function of Collective Enforcement 46
3.2.1 *Overview* 46
3.2.2 *Applicable Rules of Admissibility in Individual and Inter-State Cases* 49
3.2.3 *Standing* 51
3.2.4 *The Requirement of the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies* 53
3.2.5 *Interim Results: Collective Enforcement Functions as Added Value of the Inter-State Application Within ECHR Supervisory Framework* 59
3.3 Results: The Inter-State Application between International Dispute Settlement and Collective Enforcement 61
3.3.1 *Dispute Settlement Functions, Jurisdiction and Yardstick* 61
3.3.2 *Collective Enforcement: Added Value of the Inter-State Application* 62

4 The Inter-State Case-Law under the European Convention on Human Rights: Approaching the Object and Purpose of the Inter-State Application in Practice 63
4.1 Collective Enforcement Functions 63
4.1.1 *Collective Enforcement beyond Individual Justice* 63
4.1.2 *Public Interest Litigation* 64
4.1.3 *Enforcement in the Specific Inter-State Context* 64
4.1.4 *More than Diplomatic Protection* 65
4.2 Dispute Settlement Functions 65
4.2.1 *Judicial Review in Times of Crises: Proportionality and the Role of the Court in the Context of Inter-State Applications* 65
4.2.2 *Private Interest Litigation* 66
4.2.3 *Fact-Finding, Adversarial, Inquisitorial, Cooperational* 66
4.3 Carving Out the Potential and the Need for Reform of the Inter-State Application 66
4.4 Greece v United Kingdom (1956–59) 67
4.4.1 *Overview* 67
4.4.2 *Documentation* 68
4.4.3 *Collective Enforcement Functions* 71
4.4.4 *Dispute Settlement Functions* 73
4.4.5 *Evaluation: Incident Collective Enforcement, but Mainly Settling the Status of Cyprus* 76
4.5 Austria v Italy (1960–1963) 77
4.5.1 *Overview and Documentation* 78
4.5.2 *Context: The Situation of the German-Speaking Minority in Italy* 79
4.5.3 *Collective Enforcement Functions* 79
4.5.4 *International Dispute Settlement Functions* 81
4.5.5 *Evaluation: Strasbourg as a Forum for Kin-State Litigation* 82
4.6 Denmark et al. v Greece (1967–1976) 83
4.6.1 *Overview* 83
4.6.2 *Documentation* 84
4.6.3 *Context: Greece Falling Prey to a coup d'état* 87
4.6.4 *Collective Enforcement Functions* 88
4.6.5 *Dispute Settlement Functions* 91
4.6.6 *Evaluation: Collective Enforcement Tested by Reality* 95
4.7 Ireland v United Kingdom (1971–1978 and 2014–Present) 97
4.7.1 *Overview and Documentation* 98
4.7.2 *Context: A Protracted, Multy-Layered Conflict* 101

4.7.3 *Collective Enforcement Functions* 102
4.7.4 *Dispute Settlement Functions* 107
4.7.5 *Evaluation: A Preponderance of Collective Enforcement Functions* 111
4.8 Cyprus v Turkey (1974–Present) 113
4.8.1 *Overview* 113
4.8.2 *Context: Cyprus as Object of Greek and Turkish Interests* 116
4.8.3 *Collective Enforcement Functions* 119
4.8.4 *Dispute Settlement Functions* 125
4.8.5 *Evaluation: Neither Collective Enforcement nor Dispute Settlement: Learning from Past Mistakes* 128
4.9 Denmark et al. v Turkey (1982–1985) and Denmark v Turkey (1997–2000) 130
4.9.1 *Overview and Documentation* 130
4.9.2 *Context: A Coup d'état and Its Long-Term Consequences* 133
4.9.3 *Collective Enforcement Functions* 135
4.9.4 *International Dispute Settlement Functions* 136
4.9.5 *Evaluation: Friendly Settlements: Efficient for the Collective Enforcement of Human Rights, but Not Universal Remedies* 138
4.10 Georgia v Russia (2008–Present) 139
4.10.1 *Overview and Documentation* 140
4.10.2 *Context: The Frozen and Not so Frozen Conflicts in the Aftermath of the Breakup of the Soviet Union* 143
4.10.3 *Collective Enforcement Functions* 145
4.10.4 *Dispute Settlement Functions* 148
4.10.5 *Evaluation: Strasbourg as Appropriate Forum for the Settlement of a Complex Conflict?* 151
4.11 Ukraine v Russia (2014–Present) 151
4.11.1 *Overview and Documentation* 152
4.11.2 *Context: Competing Interests Over Ukraine – East vs West Reloaded* 154
4.11.3 *Collective Enforcement Functions: Focus on Interim Measures* 156
4.11.4 *Dispute Settlement Functions in View of Ukrainian Multi-Forum Litigation Strategy* 157
4.11.5 *Evaluation: Open Questions about the Role of the Strasbourg Court* 159
4.12 Results from the Analysis of Inter-State Case Law 160
4.12.1 *Collective Enforcement Functions* 160
4.12.2 *Dispute Settlement Functions* 167

4.12.3 *Grouping of Inter-State Case Law: Private and Public Interest Litigation* 168
4.12.4 *Between Collective Enforcement and International Dispute Settlement* 169

5 Reform Considerations: The Inter-State Application between Collective Enforcement and Dispute Settlement 171
5.1 General Reform Considerations for the Inter-State Application 171
5.2 Spelling Out the Object and Purpose of the Inter-State Application 173
5.3 Dispute Settlement Functions 174
5.3.1 *No Broader Yardstick and No Counterclaims* 174
5.3.2 *Broadening the Court's Advisory Jurisdiction under Article 47 ECHR* 178
5.3.3 *Fact-Finding* 181
5.4 Collective Enforcement 186
5.4.1 *The Accession of the European Union to the ECHR and the Looming Admissibility Restrictions for the Inter-State Application* 186
5.4.2 *The Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies and the Exceptions* 191
5.4.3 *The Court's Remedial Toolbox in Light of the Object and Purpose of the Inter-State Application* 192
5.5 Cross-Cutting: Relationship of Individual and Inter-State Applications 208

Appendix 211
Index of Authorities 226
Index 277