

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xiii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xv
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxv
Introduction	1
The European Court of Human Rights and Military Operations	3
Applying the Convention to All Military Operations	4
International Humanitarian Law	7
The Court's Mandate and International Humanitarian Law	9
Central Arguments	13
Territorial Bias	16
Operationalising Human Rights Protection	17
Substantive Content	18
Relationship between the Convention and IHL	19
1 Jurisdiction over Domestic Military Operations	21
1.1 Introduction	21
1.2 Defining Jurisdiction	22
1.3 Jurisdiction over Domestic Territory	26
1.4 Losing Control	29
1.5 Positive Obligations	35
1.6 Discharging Positive Obligations	37
1.7 Conclusion	41

2	Jurisdiction over Extra-Territorial Military Operations	43
2.1	Introduction	43
2.2	Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction: A Primer	44
2.2.1	Personal Jurisdiction	44
2.2.2	Personal Jurisdiction and Military Personnel	46
2.2.3	Spatial Jurisdiction	47
2.3	Bankovic	48
2.3.1	The Court's Understanding of Jurisdiction	49
2.3.2	Exceptional Jurisdiction	50
2.3.3	Espace Juridique	51
2.3.4	Instantaneous Acts	53
2.4	Al-Skeini	56
2.4.1	Instantaneous Acts after Al-Skeini	59
2.4.2	Integrity of Convention Obligations	62
2.4.3	Early Occupation	63
2.5	Spatial Jurisdiction Tests	64
2.5.1	Public Powers	64
2.5.2	Effective Control over Territory	65
2.6	Conclusion	71
3	Article 2: Substantive Obligations	73
3.1	Introduction	73
3.2	Obligations under Article 2	74
3.3	The Standard of Necessity	75
3.3.1	Interpreting Absolute Necessity	77
3.3.2	Necessity of Attack	77
3.3.3	Immediate Threats	79
3.3.4	Consistency in Applying IHL	80
3.3.5	Abandoning Absolute Necessity?	82
3.4	Proportionality	86
3.4.1	Implicit Use of IHL	87
3.4.2	Indiscriminate Attacks	89
3.5	Positive Obligation to Protect during Military Operations	93
3.5.1	Protection of Civilians	93
3.5.2	An Obligation to Protect Soldiers?	98
3.5.3	Interpreting the Positive Obligation to Protect Soldiers	101
3.5.4	State Application of Positive Obligations	106
3.6	Conclusion	107

4	Article 2 Procedural Obligations	110
4.1	Introduction	110
4.2	The Procedural Obligations in Article 2	111
4.3	General Scope of the Procedural Obligations	112
4.4	Modifying the Procedural Obligation	115
4.4.1	Derogation	116
4.4.2	Sharing the Procedural Obligation	117
4.4.3	Co-application of IHL and the Convention	118
4.4.4	Flexible Interpretation of Article 2	122
4.5	Independence	122
4.5.1	Independence during Extra-Territorial Military Operations	123
4.5.2	Adapting Investigation Procedures	126
4.6	Conduct of Investigations	128
4.6.1	Legal Barriers to Investigation	130
4.7	Transparency	132
4.7.1	State Secrecy	133
4.7.2	Political Compromises	134
4.8	Promptness	135
4.8.1	Concessions for Delay	136
4.8.2	Post-Conflict Situations	137
4.9	Conclusion	139
5	Norm Conflict	141
5.1	Introduction	141
5.2	Approaches to Norm Conflict Resolution	143
5.2.1	Lex Posterior	143
5.2.2	Lex Superior	145
5.2.3	Lex Specialis	151
5.2.4	Harmonious Interpretation	155
5.3	Hassan v. United Kingdom	157
5.3.1	Derogation	160
5.3.2	Beyond Interpretation	161
5.3.3	Guiding Adaptation	163
5.4	Conclusion	164
6	Article 7	166
6.1	Introduction	166
6.2	Overview of Article 7	168

6.3	The Interpretation and Application of IHL under Article 7	170
6.3.1	Omissions	170
6.3.2	Reinterpreting Historical Law	175
6.3.3	Construing Law to the Applicant's Detriment	182
6.3.4	Interference with Domestic Rulings	183
6.4	Analysis	184
6.4.1	Genuine Error	185
6.4.2	Deliberate Error	186
6.4.3	Institutional Capacity	188
6.5	Conclusion	191
7	Derogation	192
7.1	Introduction	192
7.2	Benefits of Derogation	193
7.3	Derogation Practice	197
7.4	Key Issues with Derogation during Military Operations	200
7.4.1	War or Other Public Emergency	200
7.4.2	'Threaten the Life of the Nation as a Whole'	203
7.4.3	Proportionality and Necessity	206
7.4.4	Interaction of Derogations with IHL	208
7.4.5	Tailoring Extra-Territorial Derogations	210
7.5	Conclusion	212
	Conclusion	214
	<i>Bibliography</i>	221
	<i>Index</i>	239