

MODERN STUDIES IN EUROPEAN LAW



UNITY IN ADVERSITY

EU CITIZENSHIP, SOCIAL JUSTICE
AND THE CAUTIONARY TALE OF THE UK

CHARLOTTE O'BRIEN

B L O O M S B U R Y

UNITY IN ADVERSITY

The EU is at a crossroads of constitution and conscience. *Unity in Adversity* argues that EU market citizenship is incompatible with a pursuit of social justice, because it contributes to the social exclusion of women and children, promotes a class-based conception of rights, and tolerates in-work poverty. The limitations of EU citizenship are clearest when EU nationals engage with national welfare systems, but this experience has been neglected in EU legal research.

Unity in Adversity draws upon the groundbreaking EU Rights Project, working first hand with EU nationals in the UK, providing advice and advocacy, and giving ethnographic insight into the process of navigating EU and UK welfare law. Its study of EU law in action is a radical new approach, and the case studies illustrate the political, legal and administrative obstacles to justice faced by EU nationals. Taken together, the strands demonstrate that ‘equal treatment’ for EU nationals is an illusion. The UK’s welfare reforms directed at EU nationals are analysed as a programme of declaratory discrimination, and in light of the subsequent referendum, should be treated as a cautionary tale—both to the EU, to take social justice seriously, and to other Member States, to steer away from xenophobic law-making.

Volume 80 in the Series Modern Studies in European Law

Modern Studies in European Law

Recent titles in this series:

The Pluralist Character of the European Economic Constitution
Clemens Kaupa

Exceptions from EU Free Movement Law
Edited by Panos Koutrakos, Niamh Nic Shuibhne and Phil Syrpis

Reconceptualising European Equality Law: A Comparative Institutional Analysis
Johanna Croon-Gestefeld

Marketing and Advertising Law in a Process of Harmonization
Edited by Ulf Bernitz and Caroline Heide-Jørgensen

The Fundamental Right to Data Protection:
Normative Value in the Context of Counter-Terrorism Surveillance
Maria Tzanou

Republican Europe
Anna Kocharov

Family Reunification in the EU
Chiara Berneri

EU Liability and International Economic Law
Armin Steinbach

The EU and Nanotechnologies: A Critical Analysis
Tanja Ehnert

Human Rights Between Law and Politics:
The Margin of Appreciation in Post-National Contexts
Edited by Petr Agha

The European Union and Social Security Law
Jaan Paju

The Rule of Law in the European Union: The Internal Dimension
Theodore Konstadinides

The Division of Competences between the EU and the Member States:
Reflections on the Past, the Present and the Future
Edited by Sacha Garben and Inge Govaere

**For the complete list of titles in this series, see
'Modern Studies in European Law' link at**

www.bloomsburyprofessional.com/uk/series/modern-studies-in-european-law

Unity in Adversity

EU Citizenship, Social Justice and
the Cautionary Tale of the UK

Charlotte O'Brien



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2017

Hart Publishing

An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

Hart Publishing Ltd
Kemp House
Chawley Park
Cumnor Hill
Oxford OX2 9PH
UK

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

www.hartpub.co.uk
www.bloomsbury.com

Published in North America (US and Canada) by
Hart Publishing
c/o International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213-3786
USA

www.isbs.com

**HART PUBLISHING, the Hart/Stag logo, BLOOMSBURY and the
Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc**

First published 2017

© Charlotte O'Brien 2017

Charlotte O'Brien has asserted her right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 to be identified as Author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

While every care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of this work, no responsibility for loss or damage occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any statement in it can be accepted by the authors, editors or publishers.

All UK Government legislation and other public sector information used in the work is Crown Copyright ©. All House of Lords and House of Commons information used in the work is Parliamentary Copyright ©. This information is reused under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 (<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3>) except where otherwise stated.

All Eur-lex material used in the work is © European Union, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/>, 1998–2017.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-84946-719-3
ePDF: 978-1-50991-853-9
ePub: 978-1-50991-852-2

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: O'Brien, Charlotte, author.

Title: Unity in adversity : EU citizenship, social justice and the cautionary tale of the UK / Charlotte O'Brien.

Description: Oxford ; Portland, Oregon : Hart Publishing, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2017. | Series: Modern studies in European law ; volume 80 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017032008 (print) | LCCN 2017035618 (ebook) | ISBN 9781509918522 (Epub) | ISBN 9781849467193 (hardback : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Europeans—Legal status, laws, etc.—Great Britain. | Citizenship—Great Britain. | Citizenship—European Union countries. | Social legislation—Great Britain. | Social legislation—European Union countries.

Classification: LCC KD4144 (ebook) | LCC KD4144 .O37 2017 (print) | DDC 342.2408/30941—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2017032008>

Typeset by Compuscript Ltd, Shannon

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.hartpublishing.co.uk. Here you will find extracts, author information, details of forthcoming events and the option to sign up for our newsletters.

Acknowledgements

There are so many people to thank it is hard to know where to begin. The empirical research was made possible thanks to an ESRC Future Research Leaders grant. The casework could not have happened without the Citizens Advice offices and their staff who worked with me and referred clients. Special mention must go to Linda Marsden, who backed the collaboration and basic setting up of the framework of the project from the very start.

The trouble with anonymity, essential as it is, is that I cannot thank the direct contributors or collaborators to the research itself without sounding cryptically vague—but here goes. Thanks to all the Citizens Advice offices who referred clients for first and second-tier advice, submitted evidence and who supported the project through requesting knowledge exchange events. And thanks to the wide range of other advice organisations across England and Wales who got involved and sought second-tier advice or submitted evidence. Similarly, thanks to the focus group participants and specialist interviewees. Of course, the anonymous clients themselves were at the heart of the empirical study—I am grateful to them for working with me and contributing crucial data to the research. They were keen that their cases be used to highlight problems in the hope that we would start discussing how to make things better.

This book owes a huge debt to an incredibly supportive group of colleagues who have offered constructive feedback and criticism on relevant work in recent years. Those who have commented upon and so (whether they realise it or not) have contributed to work represented here include: Michael Dougan, Helen Stalford, Niamh Nic Shuibhne, Eleanor Spaventa, Samantha Currie, Dimitry Kochenov, Gareth Davies, Adam Tucker, Tamara Hervey, Herwig Verschueren, Dagmar Schiek, Stefano Guibboni, Peter Dwyer and Roy Sainsbury. I've had tremendous support from York Law School, particularly Stuart Bell, Caroline Hunter, Jenny Steele and Simon Halliday. I've also had helpful input, including detailed dissections of legal arguments, from the Child Poverty Action Group and the AIRE Centre.

I would not have got through the analytical or dissemination stages of the project without the superb, scrupulous help of Jed Meers, on whose research assistance, impeccable organisational skills and expertise in all things technical I have been utterly dependent. And thanks to the always excellent Keleigh Coldron for her help in preparing the manuscript, to Richard Hart for his kind encouragement and enthusiasm, and to all at Hart Publishing, especially Emily Braggins and Emma Platt.

Thanks are due to the friends who have kept me going, especially my much-missed, late friend Claire. Somewhat inevitably, I have to end by thanking my family, who have borne the brunt of my being book-centric in recent months.

vi *Acknowledgements*

Thanks to my husband, Tom, for his staunch support and to my daughters, Lucy and Hannah, for their amiable tolerance, though I have no doubt that the finished product does not conform to their (current) idea of a decent book, afflicted as it is by a dearth of pictures. At least it contains stories.

Charlotte O'Brien
May 2017

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xvii

1. Introduction	1
I. An Exclusionary Market Citizenship.....	1
II. A Programme of Declaratory Discrimination.....	2
III. EU Law in Action and Administrative Obstacles to Social Justice.....	3
IV. Outline of the Book.....	4
V. Some Notes on Terminology and Text	6
VI. The UK as a Cautionary Tale	7
2. Welfare, Citizenship and Social Justice in Action	9
I. Introduction	9
II. EU Welfare Rights: Reducing Obstacles to Movement.....	10
A. The Mechanistic Objectives of Social Security Coordination	14
III. Equal Treatment as a Component of Coordination.....	16
A. Discrimination as an Obstacle to Movement	18
B. Key UK Welfare Rights	21
IV. The Need to Study EU Citizenship ‘In Action’: The <i>EU Rights Project</i>	24
A. Advice-Led Ethnography.....	26
B. A Power-Sensitive Analysis.....	30
V. Summary	31
3. The Rise of Market Citizenship and The Illusion of Equal Treatment	33
I. Introduction	33
II. A Disguised Tolerance of Direct Nationality Discrimination.....	34
A. The Continued Salience of Nationality: Real Links	36
B. Is Direct Discrimination Justifiable?.....	38
III. Dealing with Legislative Limitations on Equal Treatment.....	42
A. Appealing to a Primary Law-Based Right of Equal Treatment.....	42
IV. From <i>Brey</i> Onwards: Dismantling EU Social Citizenship and Legitimizing Directly Discriminatory ‘Right to Reside’ Conditions.....	44
A. ‘Nothing to Prevent’ Direct Discrimination	45
B. The Consolation Prize of <i>Brey</i> : A Proportionality Assessment	47
C. Proportionality Crumbles	49
D. Targeting Means-Tested Benefits.....	53
V. Summary	56

4. Discounting Proportionality and Exacerbating Disadvantage	59
I. Introduction	59
II. The Risks for Unmarried Partners	60
III. The UK Right to Reside Test: Direct Discrimination and Law-as-Lists Over Law-as-Justice	64
A. Putting the UK's Right to Reside Test to the Test: <i>Commission v UK</i>	68
IV. Children and Proportionality	71
A. Dismissing Proportionality, Rewriting <i>Baumbast</i> and Disregarding Children's EU Citizenship: UK Courts	71
B. The Case for Recognising Children's Rights in EU Law	74
V. Welfare Cliff-Edges for Families are Sharper without Proportionality	77
A. The Logic of <i>Teixeira</i>	78
B. The Equal Treatment and Child Welfare Gaps in <i>Zambrano</i>	81
C. The Disproportionate <i>Zambrano</i> Welfare Cliff-Edge	87
VI. Summary	90
5. Market Citizenship and Ideological Obstacles to Social Justice: The Market as Morality.....	91
I. Introduction	91
II. The Market Conception of Sex Equality and the Shortcomings of the Reconciliation Agenda.....	92
A. The Union's 'Business Case' for Equality	92
B. Reconciliation as Assimilation and Activation	94
III. Market Citizenship and Disability.....	96
A. Asserting the Primacy of the 'Normal' Labour Market.....	97
B. Market Citizenship and the Persistence of the Medical Model.....	100
IV. Market Citizenship: Exclusion, Activation and the Stigmatisation of Social Justice Measures	103
A. Activation: Punishing the Poor	105
B. The EU: Activation and the Market as the New Morality.....	110
V. Summary	112
6. Activation-Plus: Welfare Reforms and Declaratory Discrimination	115
I. Introduction	115
II. Declaratory Discrimination.....	117
A. Declaratory Obstacles to Movement.....	120
B. The Objective to Reduce Free Movement.....	122
III. Creating Classic Obstacles: Reversing <i>Swaddling</i>	123
A. Absence of Justification	127
IV. Making the Cliff-Edge Steeper: Punishing Those Who Fall Out of Work.....	129
A. Declaring Obstructive Intent and Incentivising Discrimination....	132
B. Automatic Exclusions and Disproportionality: Law-as-Lists Rather than Law-as-Justice.....	136

V.	The Genuine Prospects of Work Test	138
A.	Reliance Upon Problematic Decision-Maker Guidance	142
B.	Undue Conditions Placed on Retained Worker Status	145
C.	Preventing EU Nationals from <i>Finding</i> Work	146
D.	The Perils of Being Defined as a Jobseeker	148
VI.	Making the Cliff-Top Narrower: A Flawed and Narrowing Definition of Migrant Work.....	149
A.	The Invisibility of Unpaid Care Work	151
B.	The Minimum Earnings Threshold	154
C.	Part-Time Work and the Presumption of Marginality	156
D.	Using the Workers Registration Scheme to Negate Work During Transition	160
VII.	The Failure to Cover the Social Security Risk of Domestic Abuse	167
VIII.	Summary.....	170
7.	Resisting Competence for Market Citizens: Shortcomings in the Social Security Coordination Framework	173
I.	Introduction	173
II.	Competence, Care and Disability: The Inappropriate Label of Sickness Benefit	174
A.	Care Benefits and the Gendered Social Security Risk	175
B.	Disability Benefits as Sickness Benefits.....	178
III.	Problems Exporting Benefits	183
A.	Seeking to Export to the UK: Trying to Challenge Another State’s Decision.....	183
B.	Seeking to Export from the UK: Refuse First, Ask Questions Later.....	186
IV.	The Impossibility of Claiming Provisional Payments in the UK.....	188
A.	The UK Authorities’ Condition of its Own Invention	189
B.	A Disproportionate Interference with Social Justice.....	191
C.	Inviting Communication Problems.....	193
D.	The UK’s Reluctance on Granted Provisional Payments	197
V.	Summary.....	199
8.	Market Citizenship and Administrative Barriers to Justice.....	201
I.	Introduction	201
II.	Getting It Wrong: Systemic Constraints on Interpretations of the Law.....	203
A.	Poorly Informed Administrators as De Facto Decision-Makers and Gatekeepers.....	204
B.	Systematic Inaccuracy: ‘We Don’t Look at the Law’	207
C.	Administrative Regard to a Restricted Palette of Issues	209
III.	Not Caring About Getting It Right: Procedural Deficiency and Reduced Institutional Expectations	214
A.	Refuse First, Ask Questions Later.....	214

B. Claimants Bear the Brunt of Administrative Errors	220
C. Normalising Delay	221
IV. Stopping Claimants Putting It Right: Systemic Insulation of Law and Practice	224
A. Obstacles to Communication: Language, Accents and Automated Helplines	225
B. Obstacles to Communication: Departments Who Will Not Speak to Us.....	228
C. Obstacles to Communication: Departments That Cannot Speak to Each Other	230
D. Bureaucratic Hurdles	233
E. Administrative Hostility	238
V. Summary	239
9. Is European Social Justice Possible?.....	243
I. Introduction	243
II. Nationality is Still Determinative	244
III. Proportionality as a Means to Redefine Fairness.....	247
A. Fairness as Rights-Restricting Rather than Rights-Giving	247
B. Fairness as a Rights-Giving Principle of Administrative Justice	249
IV. European Principles of Social Justice	250
A. Protecting Child Welfare	251
B. Promoting Gender Equality	255
V. Social Justice and European Solidarity: Unity Not Division in Adversity.....	259
A. Market Citizenship Instrumentalises and Alienates.....	259
B. Declaratory Discrimination Amplifies Prejudice	262
VI. Summary	267
10. Unity in Adversity: Some Conclusions.....	269
<i>Index</i>	<i>275</i>

Table of Cases

Domestic Cases

<i>AMS v SSWP (PC)</i> [2017] UKUT 48 (AAC)	65
<i>Harrison v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2012] EWCA Civ 1736.....	85
<i>Humphreys v Revenue and Customs</i> [2012] UKSC 18, 25	75, 251
<i>IC v Glasgow City Council and Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> [2016] UKUT 0321 (AAC)	132
<i>JK v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (SPC)</i> [2017] UKUT 179 (AAC).....	162
<i>Kerr v Department for Social Development</i> [2004] UKHL 23; [2004] 1 WLR 1372	70
<i>Mirga v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> [2012] EWCA Civ 1952	163
<i>Mirga and Samin v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and Anor</i> [2016] UKSC 1	71, 73, 163–64, 252
<i>R (1 PO 2 KO 3 RO) v London Borough of Newham</i> [2014] EWHC 2561 (Admin).....	88, 131
<i>R (G) v Barnet LBC</i> [2003] UKHL 57	88
<i>R (on the application of HC) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> <i>and others</i> UKSC 2015/0215.....	89
<i>R (SG & Ors) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> [2015] UKSC 16, 125.....	75, 251
<i>Revenue and Customs v IT (CTC) (European Union law: workers)</i> [2016] UKUT 252 (AAC)	75, 79
<i>Sanneh and Ors v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> [2015] EWCA Civ 49	88, 131
<i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v Dias</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 807.....	152
<i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v HR (AA) (European Union Law:</i> <i>Council Regulations 1408/71/EEC and (EC) 883/2004)</i> [2014] UKUT 571, 11	195
<i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v MK CIS/2423/2009</i>	52
<i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v Sequeira-Batalha</i> [2016] UKUT 511 (AAC)	72–73, 136, 245, 252
<i>Shabani v SoSHD</i> [2013] UKUT 315 (IAC).....	79
<i>TG v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (PC)</i> [2015] UKUT 50 (AAC)	164–65, 169–70
<i>VP v Secretary for Work and Pensions (JSA)</i> [2014] UKUT 32 (AAC).....	52, 64–65, 210

European Cases

Case 267/83 <i>Aissatou Diatta v Land Berlin</i> EU:C:1985:67	60, 130
Case 66-74 <i>Alfonso Farrauto v Bau-Berufsgenossenschaft</i> EU:C:1975:18.....	14
Case 32-75 <i>Anita Cristini v Société nationale des chemins de fer français</i> EU:C:1975:120	17
Case C-94/07 <i>Andrea Raccanelli v Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der</i> <i>Wissenschaften eV</i> EU:C:2008:425.....	19

xii *Table of Cases*

Case C-413/99 <i>Baumbast and R v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> EU:C:2002:493.....	18, 42–43, 57, 71–72, 78, 89, 137, 170, 245
Case C-3/90 <i>Bernini</i> EU:C:1992:89.....	78
Case 36-74 <i>BNO Walrave and LJN Koch v Association Union cycliste internationale, Koninklijke Nederlandsche</i> EU:C:1974:140.....	19
Case C-138/02 <i>Brian Francis Collins v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> EU:C:2004:172	19, 52, 123
Case C-77/95 <i>Bruna-Alessandra Züchner v Handelskrankenkasse (Ersatzkasse) Bremen</i> EU:C:1996:425.....	78, 112, 151
Case C-188/00 <i>Bülent Kurz, né Yüce v Land Baden-Württemberg</i> EU:C:2002:694	78, 150
Case C-148/02 <i>Carlos Garcia Avello v Belgian State</i> EU:C:2003:539	81
Case C-8/94 <i>CB Laperre v Bestuurscommissie beroepszaken in de provincie Zuid-Holland</i> EU:C:1996:36.....	39
Case C-54/07 <i>Centrum voor gelijkheid van kansen en voor racismebestrijding v Firma Feryn NV</i> EU:C:2008:397	2, 117
Case C-542/09 <i>Commission v Netherlands</i> EU:C:2012:346.....	35, 122
Case C-308/14 <i>Commission v United Kingdom</i> EU:C:2016:436.....	59, 63, 68–70, 75–76, 112, 176, 252, 258, 265, 270
Case C-319/06 <i>Commission of the European Communities v Grand Duchy of Luxemburg</i> EU:C:2008:350	260
Case C-299/05 <i>Commission of the European Communities v European Parliament and Council of the European Union</i> EU:C:2007:608	22, 178
Case 167-73 <i>Commission of the European Communities v French Republic</i> EU:C:1974:35	18
Case C-187/98 <i>Commission of the European Communities v Hellenic Republic</i> EU:C:1999:535	39
Case 249/81 <i>Commission of the European Communities v Ireland</i> EU:C:1982:402	3, 120
Case C-371/04 <i>Commission of the European Communities v Italian Republic</i> EU:C:2006:668	17
Case C-465/01 <i>Commission of the European Communities v Republic of Austria</i> EU:C:2004:530	39
Case C-320/03 <i>Commission of the European Communities v Republic of Austria</i> EU:C:2005:684	121
Case C-337/97 <i>CPM Meeusen v Hoofddirectie van de Informatie Beheer Groep</i> EU:C:1999:284	17
Joined Cases C-267/91 and C-268/91 <i>Criminal proceedings against Bernard Keck and Daniel Mithouard</i> EU:C:1993:905	121
Case 207/78 <i>Criminal proceedings against Gilbert Even and Office national des pensions pour travailleurs salariés (ONPTS)</i> EU:C:1979:144	17
Case 137/84 <i>Criminal proceedings against Robert Heinrich Maria Mutsch</i> EU:C:1985:335	17
Case C-43/95 <i>Data Delecta Aktiebolag and Ronny Forsberg v MSL Dynamics Ltd</i> EU:C:1996:357	41
Case C-323/95 <i>David Charles Hayes and Jeannette Karen Hayes v Kronenberger GmbH</i> EU:C:1997:169	41
C-367/11 <i>Déborah Prete v Office National de L'Emploi</i> , EU:C:2012:668.....	19

Case C-147/95 <i>Dimossia Epicheirissi Ilektrismou (DEI) v Efthimios Evrenopoulos</i> EU:C:1997:201	39
Case C-346/06 <i>Dirk Ruffert v Land Niedersachsen</i> EU:C:2008:189	260
Case C-244/06 <i>Dynamic Medien Vertriebs GmbH v Avides Media AG</i> EU:C:2008:85	76
Joined Cases 35 and 36/82 <i>Elestina Esselina Christina Morson v State of the Netherlands and Head of the Plaatselijke Politie within the meaning of the Vreemdelingenwet; Sweradjie Jhanjan v State of the Netherlands</i> , EU:C:1982:368, 15	18
Case C-333/13 <i>Elisabeta Dano and Florin Dano v Jobcenter Leipzig</i> EU:C:2014:2358	49, 71, 240
Case C-20/12 <i>Elodie Giersch and Others v État du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg</i> EU:C:2013:411	35
Case 131/85 <i>Emir Gül v Regierungspräsident Düsseldorf</i> EU:C:1986:82	33
Case C-233/14 <i>European Commission v Kingdom of the Netherlands</i> EU:C:2016:396	42
Case C-542/09 <i>European Commission v Kingdom of the Netherlands</i> EU:C:2012:346	35, 122
Case C-75/11 <i>European Commission v Republic of Austria</i> EU:C:2012:605	61
Case C-540/03 <i>European Parliament v Council of the European Union</i> EU:C:2006:429	76
Case C-18/95 <i>FC Terhoeve v Inspecteur van de Belastingdienst Particulieren/Ondernemingen buitenland</i> EU:C:1999:22	125
Case C-316/13 <i>Fenoll</i> EU:C:2015:200	98
Case C-160/02 <i>Friedrich Skalka v Sozialversicherungsanstalt der gewerblichen Wirtschaft</i> EU:C:2004:269	45
Case C-171/01 <i>Gemeinsam Zajedno/Birlikte Alternative und Grüne GewerkschafterInnen/UG and Others</i> EU:C:2003:260	39
C-406/04 <i>Gérald De Cuyper v Office national de l'emploi</i> EU:C:2006:491	180
Case C-34/09 <i>Gerardo Ruiz Zambrano v Office National de L'Emploi (ONEm)</i> EU:C:2011:124	21, 59, 81, 83, 251
Case 152/73 <i>Giovanni Maria Sotgiu v Deutsche Bundespost</i> EU:C:1974:13	161
Case C-212/06 <i>Government of Communauté française and Gouvernement wallon v Gouvernement flamand</i> EU:C:2008:178	83, 92
Case C-14/09 <i>Hava Genc v Land Berlin</i> EU:C:2010:57	150
Case C-133/15 <i>H C Chavez-Vilchez and Others v Raad van bestuur van de Sociale verzekeringsbank and Others</i> EU:C:2017:354	86
Case C-224/02 <i>Heikki Antero Pusa v Osuuspankkien Keskinäinen Vakuutusyhtiö [2004]</i> EU:C:2004:273	36, 253
C-335/11 and C-337/11 <i>HK Danmark, Acting on Behalf of Jette Ring v Dansk almennyttigt Boligselskab and HK Danmark, Acting on Behalf of Lone Skouboe Werge v Dansk Arbejds giverforening, Acting on Behalf of Pro Display A/S</i> EU:C:2013:222	100, 179
Case 344/87 <i>I Betray v Staatssecretaris van Justitie</i> EU:C:1989:113	33, 98–99
Case 171/88 <i>Ingrid Rinner-Kühn v FWW Spezial-Gebäudereinigung GmbH & Co. KG</i> EU:C:1989:328	150
Case C-438/05 <i>International Transport Workers' Federation and Finnish Seamen's Union v Viking Line ABP and OÜ Viking Line Eesti</i> EU:C:2007:772	260

xiv *Table of Cases*

Case C-135/08 <i>Janko Rottman v Freistaat Bayern</i> [2010] ECR I-01449	36, 127
Case C-158/07 <i>Jacqueline Förster v Hoofddirectie van de Informatie Beheer Groep</i> EU:C:2008:630.....	37, 246
Case C-415/93 <i>Jean-Marc Bosman and others and Union des associations européennes de football (UEFA) v Jean-Marc Bosman</i> EU:C:1995:463	19
Case C-507/12 <i>Jessy Saint Prix v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> EU:C:2014:2007	154, 255
Case C-67/14 <i>Jobcenter Berlin Neukölln v Nazifa Alimanovic and Others</i> EU:C:2015:597	51, 55–56, 60, 92, 246, 255
Case C-192/05 <i>K Tas-Hagen and RA Tas v Raadskamer WUBO van de Pensioen- en Uitkeringsraad</i> EU:C:2006:676	185
Case C-154/05 <i>Kersbergen-Lap and Dams-Schipper</i> EU:C:2006:449	16
Case C-405/98 <i>Konsumentombudsmannen (KO) v Gourmet International Products AB (GIP)</i> EU:C:2001:135.....	121, 265
Case 39/86 <i>Lair</i> EU:C:1988:322	52
Joined cases C-523/11 and C-585/11 <i>Laurence Prinz v Region Hannover and Philipp Seeberger v Studentenwerk Heidelberg</i> EU:C:2013:90	36, 253
Case C-431/05 <i>Laval un Partneri Ltd v Svenska Byggnadsarbetareförbundet, Svenska Byggnadsarbetareförbundets avdelning 1, Byggettan and Svenska Elektrikerförbundet</i> EU:C:2007:809	260
Case 66/85 <i>Lawrie-Blum</i> EU:C:1986:284.....	97, 150
Case 53/81 <i>Levin v Staatssecretaris van Justitie</i> EU:C:1982:105	149
Case C-46/12 <i>LN v Styrelsen for Videregående Uddannelser og Uddannelsesstøtte</i> EU:C:2013:97	42
Case C-310/08 <i>London Borough of Harrow v Nimco Hassan Ibrahim and Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> , EU:C:2009:641	75
Case C-503/09 <i>Lucy Stewart v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> EU:C:2011:500	179
Case 92/63 <i>M Th Nonnenmacher, widow of HE Moebs v Bestuur der Sociale Verzekeringsbank</i> EU:C:1964:40,1	11
Case C-343/92 <i>MA De Weerd, née Roks, and Others v Bestuur van de Bedrijfsvereniging voor de Gezondheid, Geestelijke en Maatschappelijke Belangen and Others</i> EU:C:1994:71.....	39
Case C-391/09 <i>Malgozata Runevič-Vardyn and Łukasz Paweł Wardyn v Vilniaus miesto savivaldybės administracija and Others</i> EU:C:2011:291, 90.....	18
Case C-160/96 <i>Manfred Molenaar and Barbara Fath-Molenaar v Allgemeine Ortskrankenkasse Baden-Württemberg</i> EU:C:1998:84.....	17, 174
Case C-85/96 <i>María Martínez Sala v Freistaat Bayern</i> EU:C:1998:217	10, 34–35, 245
Case C-10/90 <i>Maria Masgio v Bundesknappschaft</i> EU:C:1991:107	16
Case C-480/08 <i>Maria Teixeira v London Borough of Lambeth and Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> EU:C:2009:642.....	59, 123, 209
Case C-224/98 <i>Marie-Nathalie D’Hoop v Office National de L’Emploi</i> EU:C:2002:432	36, 185
Case C-60/00 <i>Mary Carpenter v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> EU:C:2002:434	86
Case C-434/09 <i>Shirley McCarthy v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> EU:C:2011:277	84

Case C-456/02 <i>Michel Trojani v Centre public d'aide sociale de Bruxelles</i> (CPAS) EU:C:2004:488.....	37, 78, 150, 245
Case C-291/05 <i>Minister voor Vreemdelingenzaken en Integratie v RNG Eind</i> EU:C:2007:771	80
Case 7/75 <i>Mr and Mrs F v Belgian State</i> EU:C:1975:75.....	33
Case 75/63 <i>Mrs MKH Hoekstra (née Unger) v Bestuur der Bedrijfsvereniging</i> <i>voor Detailhandel en Ambachten</i> EU:C:1964:19.....	11, 149
Case C-256s/11 <i>Murat Dereci and Others v Bundesministerium für Inneres</i> EU:C:2011:734	84
Case C-73/08 <i>Nicolas Bressol and Others and Céline Chaverot and Others</i> <i>v Gouvernement de la Communauté française</i> EU:C:2010:181.....	39, 69, 264
Case C-378/12 <i>Nnamdi Onuekwere v Secretary of State for the Home</i> <i>Department</i> EU:C:2014:13.....	253
Case C-529/11 <i>Olaitan Ajoke Alarape and Olukayode Azeez Tijani v Secretary</i> <i>of State for the Home Department</i> EU:C:2013:290.....	78
Case 298/84 <i>Paolo Iorio v Azienda autonoma delle ferrovie dello Stato</i> , EU:C:1986:33	18
Case C-140/12 <i>Pensionsversicherungsanstalt v Peter Brey</i> EU:C:2013:565	1, 44, 64, 176, 246
Case 8/74 <i>Procureur du Roi v Benoît and Gustave Dassonville</i> EU:C:1974:82	120
Case C-537/09 <i>Ralph James Bartlett and Others v Secretary of State</i> <i>for Work and Pensions</i> EU:C:2011:278	22, 148, 178
Case 139/85 <i>RH Kempf v Staatssecretaris van Justitie</i> EU:C:1986:223	150
Joined Cases C-11/06 and C-12/06 <i>Rhiannon Morgan v Bezirksregierung</i> <i>Köln and Iris Bucher v Landrat des Kreises Düren</i> EU:C:2007:626.....	36, 185, 253
Case C-262/97 <i>Rijksdienst voor Pensioenen v Robert Engelbrecht</i> EU:C:2000:492	15
Case C-90/97 <i>Robin Swaddling v Adjudication Officer</i> EU:C:1999:96	116
Case C-184/99 <i>Rudy Grzelczyk v Centre public d'aide sociale d'Ottignies-</i> <i>Louvain-la-Neuve</i> EU:C:2001:458.....	37, 67
Case C-424/97 <i>Salomone Haim v Kassenzahnärztliche Vereinigung Nordrhein</i> EU:C:2000:357	147
Case C-35/70 <i>SARL Manpower v Caisse primaire d'assurance maladie de</i> <i>Strasbourg</i> EU:C:1970:120	14
Case C-115/15 <i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v NA</i> EU:C:2016:259	74, 92, 256
Case C-325/09 <i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v Maria Dias</i> EU:C:2011:498	112, 152, 255
Joined Cases C-147/11 and C-148/11 <i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> <i>v Lucja Czop and Margita Punakova</i> EU:C:2012:538	79
Case C-162/09 <i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v Taous Lassel</i> EU:C:2010:592	152
Case C-430/14 <i>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v Tolley</i> EU:C:2017:74	175
Joined Cases C-502/01 and C-31/02 <i>Silke Gaumain-Cerri v Kaufmännische</i> <i>Krankenkasse—Pflegekasse and Maria Barth v Landesversicherungsanstalt</i> <i>Rheinprovinz</i> EU:C:2004:413.....	78, 151
Case C-286/03 <i>Silvia Hosse v Land Salzburg</i> EU:C:2005:621	175

xvi *Table of Cases*

Case C-13/05 <i>Sonia Chacón Navas v Eurest Colectividades SA</i> EU:C:2006:456.....	101, 179
Case 59/85 <i>State of the Netherlands v Ann Florence Reed</i> EU:C:1986:157	17
Case C-122/96 <i>Stephen Austin Saldanha and MTS Securities Corporation v Hiross Holding AG</i> EU:C:1997:458	42
Case C-398/95 <i>Syndesmos ton en Elladi Touristikon kai Taxidiotikon Grafeion v Ypourgos Ergasias</i> EU:C:1997:282.....	121
Case C-209/03 <i>The Queen, on the application of Dany Bidar v London Borough of Ealing and Secretary of State for Education and Skills</i> EU:C:2005:169.....	37
Case C-292/89 <i>The Queen v Immigration Appeal Tribunal, ex parte Gustaff Desiderius Antonissen</i> EU:C:1991:80	138
Case C-3s70/90 <i>The Queen v Immigration Appeal Tribunal and Surinder Singh, ex parte Secretary of State for Home Department</i> EU:C:1992:296	80
Case 196/87 <i>Udo Steymann v Staatssecretaris van Justitie</i> EU:C:1988:475	78, 150
Case C-299/14 <i>Vestische Arbeit Jobcenter Kreis Recklinghausen v Jovanna García-Nieto and Others</i> EU:C:2016:114	51, 59, 61, 92
Case C-123/10 <i>Waltraud Brachner v Pensionsversicherungsanstalt EU:C:2011:675</i>	39
Case C-213/05 <i>Wendy Geven v Land Nordrhein-Westfalen</i> EU:C:2006:616	36–37
Case C-356/12 <i>Wolfgang Glatzel v Freistaat Bayern</i> EU:C:2014:350.....	102
C-363/12 <i>Z v A Government Department and The Board of Management of a Community School</i> EU:C:2014:159.....	99, 101

Table of Legislation

UK

Primary Legislation

Care Act 2014	131
Children Act 1989	88, 131
Equality Act 2010	118, 179
Finance Act 2012	22
Human Rights Act 1998.....	53
Income Tax (Earnings and Pensions) Act 2003	22
National Assistance Act 1948.....	131
Social Security Administration Act 1992	131–32
Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992	176
Welfare Reform Act 2012	105, 247

Secondary Legislation

The Accession (Immigration and Worker Registration) Regulations 2004, SI 2004/1219.....	161–162
The Child Benefit and Child Tax Credit (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2012, SI 2012/2612	88
The Child Benefit (General) and Tax Credits (Residence) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, SI 2014/1231	116
The Child Benefit (General) Regulations 2006, SI 2006/223	21
The Employment & Support Allowance Regulations 2008 SI, 2008/794.....	21
The Housing Benefit (Habitual Residence) Amendment Regulations 2014, SI 2014/539.....	3, 52, 73, 116, 131–33
The Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2006, SI 2006/1003.....	20, 116, 169
The Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2016, SI 2016/1052.....	6, 21, 63, 217
The Immigration (European Economic Area) (Amendment) (No 2) Regulations 2012, SI 2012/2560	87
The Immigration (European Economic Area) (Amendment) (No 2) Regulations 2013, SI 2013/3032	3, 116, 138–39
The Immigration (European Economic Area) (Amendment) (No 3) Regulations 2014, SI 2014/2761	3, 116, 138
The Jobseeker's Allowance (Habitual Residence) Amendment Regulations 2013, SI 2013/3196	3, 116, 123
The Social Security (Habitual Residence) (Amendment) Regulations 2012, SI 2012/2587	88

The Social Security (Lone Parents and Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2012, SI 2012/874	111, 254
The Social Security (Persons from Abroad) Amendment Regulations 2006, SI 2006/1026.....	21
The Universal Credit Regulations 2013, SI 2013/376.....	106–07, 148

European Legislation

Act concerning the conditions of accession of the Czech Republic, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Cyprus, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Malta, the Republic of Poland, the Republic of Slovenia and the Slovak Republic and the adjustments to the Treaties on which the European Union is founded OJ [2003] L236/33	160–61
Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union [2000] OJ C-364/01	53, 76, 240, 251
Council Decision 2010/48/EC concerning the conclusion of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, OJ 2010 L23/35	100
Council Directive 79/7/EEC of 19 December 1978 on the progressive implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security OJ [1979] L6/24.....	39, 151, 257
Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ [2000] L 180/22	38–39, 117
Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ [2000] L 303/16	39, 97
Council Directive 2004/113/EC of 13 December 2004 implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services OJ [2004] L 373/37	38
Council of Europe European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) as amended by Protocols Nos. 11 and 14.....	66
Directive 93/96/EEC of the Council of 29 October 1993 on the right of residence for students OJ [1993] L 317/59.....	40
Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States [2004] OJ L158/77	2, 20, 62, 145
Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (recast) OJ [2006] L 204/23	38
Directive 2010/41/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on the application of the principle of equal treatment between men and women engaged in an activity in a self-employed capacity and repealing Council Directive 86/613/EEC, OJ [2010] L 180/1	38

Directive 2014/54/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council
of 16 April 2014 on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred
on workers in the context of freedom of movement for workers
OJ [2014] L 128/8 19, 266

European Parliament Resolution of 15 September 2016 on application
of Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general
framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation
(‘Employment Equality Directive’), 2015/2116(INI).....97

Regulation No 3 of the Council of the EEC of 25 September 1958 concerning
social security for migrant workers, as amended by regulation No 24/64
of 10 March 196414

Regulation No 4 of the Council of 3 December 1958 (OJ of 16.12.1958, p. 597)
implementing and supplementing Regulation No 3 on social security
for migrant workers.....14

Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 of the Council of 14 June 1971 on the application
of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving
within the Community, OJ [1971] L 149/02 14–17, 172, 174,
176, 179, 181

Regulation (EEC) 1612/68 of the Council of 15 October
1968 on freedom of movement for workers within the Community [1968]
OJ L257/2 17–18, 20, 40, 67, 74–75,
78–79, 81, 160–61, 208

Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council
of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems
OJ [2004] L 200/1 14–16, 45–46, 48–51, 54–55, 67, 69,
125–27, 172, 174, 176–77, 181–85,
188, 190–92, 195, 199

Regulation (EU) No 492/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council
of 5 April 2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union
(codification) OJ [2011] L 141/1..... 17, 19, 78–79, 81, 266

Treaty on European Union (consolidated version 2016) OJ [2016] C 202/1376

Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (consolidated version
2016) OJ [2016] C 202/47 20–21

International Legislation

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child adopted and opened
for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly
Resolution 44/25 of 20 Nov 1989.....76

United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities adopted and
opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly Resolution
61/106, 19 Dec 2006..... 100–01

Introduction

WHERE DO WE go from here? The European Union's long-running identity crisis has become ever more shrill in recent years and has reached something of a peak with the UK's vote to leave. Prior to the referendum on UK membership, efforts to keep the British people on side included an unedifying scramble on the part of the European Council, the Commission and the Court of Justice to roll back progress on a social Europe and relinquish interests in social justice.

But it did not work out. The UK voted to leave anyway, and now it is essential to take stock and learn from the UK's cautionary tale. This book argues that Union citizenship has staunchly remained a market economy form of citizenship, deeply stratified according to socio-economic class, and inadequate to deliver principles of social justice. It is not just the 'economically inactive' who are ill-served, but workers in low-paid, low-status and low-security jobs, and those whose work histories are punctuated by, for example, periods of child care or adult care.

I. AN EXCLUSIONARY MARKET CITIZENSHIP

This study argues that market citizenship endorses a system of law-as-lists, rather than law-as-justice, in which EU nationals must conform to anachronistic and patriarchal economic categories on a list. It entrenches existing power dynamics and reinforces enduring exclusionary market structures. Those who do not sufficiently serve that market on its own terms (children, lone parents, carers, disabled people and poorly paid and exploited workers, for example), fall through the gaps.

The EU's own species of welfare law is an offshoot of the single market: it is relatively indifferent to social justice principles. Both social security coordination and the concept of equal treatment on the grounds of nationality are conceived of as means to reduce obstacles to economic movement. Even in the heyday of the European Court of Justice's citizenship case law, it did not mean a great deal on the ground for EU nationals seeking to assert equal treatment rights within host state's welfare regimes. Since the case of *Brey*,¹ the ECJ has beaten a hasty and inelegant retreat, affirming the primacy of the list of economic categories in

¹ Case C-140/12 *Pensionsversicherungsanstalt v Peter Brey* EU:C:2013:565.

2 Introduction

Directive 2004/38,² and absolving Member States from having to engage in questions of social justice when dealing with EU nationals.

Women, children and disabled people face disproportionate disadvantages in this market citizenship regime. But the Union's conceptions of equal treatment on the grounds of sex and disability similarly stem from the market, and a desire to increase EU citizens' market activity (while children's rights barely register on the market radar). The principles of activation flow through the free movement framework, fuelling the commodification of EU national workers, and their alienation from the fruits of their labours. This commodification process is not a neutral, 'rational' one, but reflects entrenched, discriminatory power imbalances.

An EU market citizenship that is indifferent to social justice permits Member States, and in particular the UK, to take activation to its logical conclusion with each others' nationals, and to find that once someone ceases to fit onto the economic list, they cease to be entitled to social protection. The UK has in recent years rolled out an activation-plus regime for EU nationals, introducing reforms that more quickly and more comprehensively disentitle those who fall between the gaps in the list provided by Directive 2004/38.

II. A PROGRAMME OF DECLARATORY DISCRIMINATION

The UK government introduced a highly publicised raft of reforms throughout 2014 specifically targeting EU nationals. The then Prime Minister, David Cameron, penned articles in the national press, announcing that free movement needed to be 'less free'³ and that we had to do something about the 'magnetic pull' of the UK welfare system.⁴ This book argues that these reforms, along with the publicity, government documents and decision-maker guidance that accompanied them, form a programme of declaratory discrimination on the grounds of nationality.

Employers' discriminatory declarations can themselves be acts of discrimination.⁵ The state ought to be held to at least as high standards of equal treatment, since its actions are capable of conditioning access to the labour market wholesale, not just to particular jobs. The pejorative and stigmatising language adopted when announcing its measures, along with stated intentions to reduce free movement, are discriminatory and are capable of forming declaratory obstacles to movement. The ECJ has prohibited discriminatory positive advertising

² Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States [2004] OJ L158/77.

³ D Cameron, 'Free Movement within Europe Needs to be Less Free', *The Financial Times* 26 November 2013.

⁴ D Cameron, 'We're Building an Immigration System that Puts Britain First', *The Telegraph*, 28 July 2014.

⁵ Case C-54/07 *Centrum voor gelijkheid van kansen en voor racismebestrijding v Firma Feryn NV* EU:C:2008:397.

of national produce;⁶ it does not seem much of a stretch to suggest that discriminatory *negative* advertising with regard to other states' nationals could be equally obstructive. The stated intentions to prevent people from exercising free movement rights could dissuade people from moving. Indeed, the government's *Before You Go* campaign warns of the 'dangers' of moving to the UK without an imminent job or adequate resources, explicitly aiming to dissuade EU nationals from moving in order to seek work.⁷

These declaratory obstacles found expression not just in official statements and publicity, but in the ensuing laws and non-legal guidance which emphasised the legal differentiation between own nationals and EU nationals, and codified a rejection of social justice principles for the latter. The lists have proliferated: lists of conditions, lists of circumstances in which a right to reside is lost, and lists of exclusions applied to EU national jobseekers.⁸ Law-as-justice has receded further as UK courts have all but extinguished requirements to apply EU law proportionately, and so condoned a disregard of factors like social integration, past economic activity, absence of links with other states, vulnerability, need, and so on. Together, the UK and the ECJ have kicked over the dying embers of Union social citizenship.

III. EU LAW IN ACTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE OBSTACLES TO SOCIAL JUSTICE

In order to appreciate the exclusions created by market citizenship, it is necessary to test EU law, and EU citizenship, in action. This study draws upon the findings of the *EU Rights Project*, a legal action research project funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), in which I conducted an advice-led ethnography. This involved working directly with EU nationals, supporting them through first-tier advice and advocacy, and offering second-tier support (such as drafting) to advisers. I conducted a parallel ethnography, drawing up case studies accompanied with field notes and documentary excerpts. I supplemented the case studies with expert interviews, and preparatory and reflective focus groups with advisers.

It was only by attempting to use EU law that I could properly analyse its limits in practice. It is a novel and radical approach to studying EU law, which traditionally has tended to be dominated by doctrinalism or studies of implementation,

⁶ Case 249/81 *Commission of the European Communities v Ireland* EU:C:1982:402.

⁷ Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), *Response to the Report by the Social Security Advisory Committee—The Housing Benefit (Habitual Residence) Amendment Regulations 2014*, SI 2014/539 (November 2014), 4. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/376103/PRINT-HB-Habitual-Residence-Amendment-Regs-2014-SSAC-report.pdf.

⁸ See DWP, *Decision-Maker Guidance Part 3—Habitual Residence and Right to Reside: IS/JSA/SPC/ESA (June 2015)* 073031 and 073080. The new jobseeker exclusions can be found in a list of legislation: The Jobseeker's Allowance (Habitual Residence) Amendment Regulations 2013 SI 2013/3196; The Housing Benefit (Habitual Residence) Amendment Regulations SI 2014/539; The Immigration (European Economic Area) (Amendment) (No 2) Regulations 2013/3032; and The Immigration (European Economic Area) (Amendment) (No 3) Regulations 2014 SI 2014/2761.

4 Introduction

and as a method it committed me to being an active part of the field of study. The relevant law is so complex and opaque, and existing advice and support so scarce, that working with EU nationals was the only realistic way to get inside the claims and appeals processes, otherwise those processes would in many cases never have happened. The case studies highlight the problematic and discriminatory effects of the UK's legal reforms and, in particular, the interaction of legal and *administrative* obstacles to justice for EU nationals in the UK.

These case studies demonstrate that equal treatment on the grounds of nationality is an illusion. Clients faced severe welfare rights cliff-edges, and UK and EU law tolerated the enforced destitution of EU national children. The class contingent nature of market citizenship meant that many of the exclusions targeting the economically inactive actually affected EU national *workers* because of their fluid work statuses, or because of the detrimental effects of living under the threat of exclusion, or because of the heightened administrative burdens imposed on all EU nationals. Equal treatment 'just' for the economically inactive proved to be equal treatment for no one.

An exclusionary and punitive legal environment contributed to a default of administrative complexity, obstruction and suspicion. The administrative obstacles spoke to a minimalist approach to societal responsibility to give effect to equal treatment rights, and a low commitment to cross-border social justice. Particular administrative obstacles—such as poor decision-maker understanding, problematic decision-maker guidance, and a 'refuse-first, ask questions later' approach—all seemed to be exacerbated by the ongoing legal reforms.

IV. OUTLINE OF THE BOOK

The premise of this book is that welfare, social justice and citizenship are inextricably interlinked. Chapter two explores this relationship in the context of EU welfare law, highlighting its mechanistic origins and purpose, and arguing that equal treatment on the grounds of nationality has been constructed as subsidiary to the higher objectives of the market. It also sets out the need to test EU citizenship through legal action research and explains the methods (and methodological background) of the *EU Rights Project* and its analytical framework.

EU citizenship was always extremely limited in terms of the social protections it offered EU migrants. Chapter three explores these limitations and, in particular, highlights the thorny issue of tolerated direct discrimination on the grounds of nationality in domestic welfare regimes. I suggest a narrative in which recent case law continues, and strengthens, the trajectory of market citizenship by dismantling the social trappings of earlier citizenship case law. A key lever for EU citizenship-based rights in those earlier cases was the concept of proportionality: that is, that equal treatment on the grounds of nationality was a primary law right attaching to EU nationals in their capacity as citizens, which could be subject to conditions and limitations, but those conditions and limitations must in their turn be subject

to a proportionality review. But proportionality is crumbling, and the conditions and limitations are becoming constitutive of the rights in themselves, displacing primary law. Chapter four explores some of the key consequences of the demise of proportionality and highlights those groups—children and lone parent families—placed at a greater disadvantage. It makes the case for giving children's rights substantially more weight (or even just any weight) in EU free movement law.

The ideological presumptions bound up with market citizenship are explored in chapter five with a focus on the concepts of responsibility and fairness as defined in the activation agenda. Activation denies societal responsibility for disadvantage and poverty, promoting individualism and an associated political agenda. It infuses concepts of equal treatment on the grounds of sex and disability, so that discrimination is only relevant insofar as it interferes with the functioning of the existing market systems. As such it provides its own justification for the discriminatory exclusions market citizenship creates along lines of sex and disability. Notions of economic virtue endow that agenda with a moral claim, giving it more of a rhetorical pull and masking its political origins and effects. EU and UK law interact to make EU migrants an apotheosis of activation.

Chapter six analyses the activation-plus regime imposed on EU nationals in the UK and presents the case that the series of reforms amounts to a programme of declaratory discrimination and creates declaratory obstacles to movement. I look at the rules that have made the cliff-edge steeper, so that those who are classified as jobseekers are quickly disentitled from social protections, and also the rules that make the cliff-top narrower. A narrowing definition of the migrant worker makes it more likely that low-paid and part-time workers are shunted over the welfare cliff-edge. Various restrictions overlap and interact, so that many EU nationals at various points fall through the gaps in the list of Directive 2004/38. In particular, I look at the ways in which the lawful residence clock is re-set, so that long-term residents, with substantial work histories, can be denied permanent residence and, as a result, be later found to have no right to reside. One group of EU migrants especially disadvantaged by the law-as-lists approach is that of victims of domestic abuse.

While chapter six considered equal treatment claims, chapter seven looks at the problems attending attempts to invoke the social security regulation legislation. This draws primarily upon case studies to highlight the shortcomings of the coordinating instruments, which require claimants to access and use complicated—and, in many cases, unclear—points of law. The principles of exportation and aggregation do not work smoothly. Member State resistance of competence belies a rather minimalist approach to social solidarity and market citizenship's law-as-lists approach enables them to limit their responsibilities. The states themselves have little incentive to be good coordinators or to avoid claimants being caught between two systems and protected by neither.

Failures of coordination are only one type of administrative obstacle. Chapter eight explores some of the myriad administrative hurdles encountered during the *EU Rights Project*. These include 'getting it wrong' through, for

example, poor decision-making and poor information-gathering. The chapter then explores procedural deficiencies that reveal a lack of will to ‘get it right’ (such as normalising delay, and refusing first and asking questions later). Some of the more frustrating obstacles were those that stopped us putting things right: obstacles to our communication with the relevant decision-makers, obstacles to decision-makers communicating amongst themselves, and bureaucratic hurdles placed in the way of communication. These obstacles were amplified because the claimants were EU nationals. All had direct consequences for social justice, and reflected a considerably dehumanised process, congruent with a market citizenship and law-as-lists framework.

Having argued that market citizenship is inadequate for the realisation of social justice, chapter nine then indeed does argue that European social justice is possible. In accepting market norms and values, we not only neglect questions of social justice in individual cases, but we neglect questions about the kind of society we want ‘social Europe’ to promote. We need to challenge the language of responsibility-centric, competition-based fairness, and to resurrect concepts of need, social responsibility and egalitarianism. Chapter nine suggests we resuscitate the idea of fairness as a rights-giving principle of administrative justice, and that we can make decision-making fairer if we resurrect, and reinforce, the requirement of a proportionality review of restrictions on EU nationals’ rights. But simply saying ‘proportionality’ is not enough: we need to establish which principles are to have weight, and here I suggest that we explicitly adopt some European principles of social justice—starting with protecting child welfare and the promotion of gender equality.

V. SOME NOTES ON TERMINOLOGY AND TEXT

Throughout, both EU and EEA are used, depending on the context and the literature/law in question. The emphasis in this book is upon the reach and effects of Union citizenship, and so ‘EU nationals’ are the focus.

In my case studies I have, naturally, changed the names of clients. However, I wanted to make sure that the cases were as anonymous as possible. I have therefore worked out a simple scheme for switching each EU Member State for another, so the nationalities and states referred to are, where possible, changed from those in the original cases. The exception is John who, by the nature of the case as a UK national returning to the UK, could not easily be switched. Where dates are given I have altered these as well, while making sure that the duration of periods of time in question are the same, and that events are still documented as happening in the relevant legal period (for example, before the end of transition measures, or before the 2014 reforms, and so on).

The fieldwork all took place before the introduction of the Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2016. These largely replicate the regulations which were in force at the time of the advice work: the Immigration (European

Economic Area) Regulations 2006. While tidying up that instrument's multiple amendments, they have introduced some more stringent or punitive provisions. Much of the work completed here was based on the 2006 Regulations, and I have given references to the 2016 Regulations where there are relevant differences.

VI. THE UK AS A CAUTIONARY TALE

The cacophony of negative messages coming from UK authorities, and to some extent from EU institutions, has created a toxic politics of free movement which could not help but percolate into administrative culture. This book argues that the administration of welfare cannot be disaggregated from the government's own messages and guidance to decision-makers. Nor can the government's programme of scapegoating EU nationals be dissociated from the UK public's vote to leave the EU in the EU membership referendum.

That referendum result should not be a basis for retreating from the project of social Europe, or for abandoning the attempt to establish European social justice principles, on the grounds of popular prejudice towards, and distaste for, each other's nationals. Nor is it grounds for promoting more commodification and alienation and rendering free movement even more of a prerogative for the privileged. Rather, it repeats a lesson from history: that we do not make populations more tolerant by adopting discriminatory laws and by using the law as a tool of stigma.

Substantial legal reforms have accentuated administrative obstacles and contributed to the construction of EU national benefit claims as 'problems', feeding into messages about how decision-makers should (or more accurately, should not) use their discretion. This has significant ramifications for EU nationals during the course of the UK's exit from the EU, which will involve a more dramatic legal upheaval, and for other states going through periods of reform and welfare retrenchment. The EU needs to think about whether and how it wishes to guard the efficacy of EU law, and whether its citizens merit social protection, should the risks of administrative friction become more acute in times of legal transition.

Our apparent desensitisation to market citizenship means that it has become even more influential. If unquestioned, it shapes our ideas of fairness, personhood and fundamental rights and lays claim to our construction of morality itself. If we accept this, we not only neglect questions of social justice in individual cases, but we neglect questions about the kind of society we want Europe to be.

Welfare, Citizenship and Social Justice in Action

I. INTRODUCTION

WELFARE, CITIZENSHIP AND social justice are deeply interlinked: social protection is an expression of social justice and a precondition for social inclusion.¹ The very concept of a welfare state implies a citizen–state relationship and, by extension, is linked to nationality and citizenship. The idea of social justice is bound up with that of solidarity, suggesting a network of relationships and the notion of membership.² Citizenship has come to define to whom we owe the greatest duty of social justice,³ and welfare the most important mechanism by which it is met.

Borders still matter, in no small part because they delineate the in-group—the people entitled to membership from a national effort at collective solidarity. The salience of the boundaries of the nation state is bound up with the continued existence of a bounded, national welfare state. Whether EU citizenship can really present a post-national citizenship depends on how well it adapts those boundaries and allows EU citizens to be accommodated within other Member States' solidarity networks.⁴ The development of EU citizenship scholarship has largely

¹ AM Magnussen and E Nilssen, 'Juridification and the Construction of Social Citizenship' (2013) 40 *Journal of Law and Society* 2, 228, 238.

² On linking membership to social justice: B Jordan, *The New Politics of Welfare* (London, Sage, 1998); on linking solidarity to membership: M Ross, 'Solidarity: A New Constitutional Paradigm for the EU?' in M Ross and Y Borgmann-Prebil (eds), *Promoting Solidarity in the European Union* (Oxford, OUP, 2010); C Jacqueson, 'For Better or For Worse? Transnational Solidarity in the Light of Social Europe' in N Countouris and M Freedland (eds) *Resocialising Europe in a Time of Crisis* (Cambridge, CUP, 2013).

³ These categories are not fixed but are defined through, and as a result of, dispute and the outcome of power struggles: J Clarke, K Coll, E Dagnino and C Neveu, *Disputing Citizenship* (Policy Press, Bristol, 2014).

⁴ Verschuereen argues that restrictions on free movement are a mechanism for delineating welfare systems (see H Verschuereen, 'European (Internal) Migration Law as an Instrument for Defining the Boundaries of National Solidarity Systems' (2007) 9 *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 307). Kostakopoulou argues that the hierarchy of national over European citizenships is unhelpful, and that we should aim for a multi-layered, multicultural conception of citizenship (see: D Kostakopoulou, 'European Union Citizenship: Writing the Future' (2007) 13 *European Law Journal*, 623; and D Kostakopoulou, 'Thick, Thin and Thinner Patriotisms: Is This All There Is?' (2006) 26 *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 1, 73).

become a study of equal treatment, and a study of EU citizens' welfare rights in other states as citizens, rather than workers, so including (at least some of) the 'economically inactive'.⁵

But there has never been equal treatment between own-state citizens and EU citizens, and EU citizenship has never been a social citizenship. It has continued to be a market citizenship, indifferent to child poverty and destitution.⁶ In theory we have a default of equal treatment, which is then modified by conditions,⁷ but this is not the case. This book argues that equal treatment on the grounds of nationality is an illusion: nationality is still determinative of social rights, and market citizenship has facilitated the rise in the UK of declaratory discrimination on the grounds of nationality by the state. Economic conditions have been constitutive of welfare rights. This chapter covers the key EU and UK welfare laws that have shaped EU citizenship rights and modified our understandings of equal treatment on the grounds of nationality. It then presents the case for studying EU law in action, outlining the basis for legal action research into the rights of EU citizens, and explaining the methodology for the *EU Rights Project*, the source of many findings presented in this book.

II. EU WELFARE RIGHTS: REDUCING OBSTACLES TO MOVEMENT

Freeing up movement has meant the dismantling of obstacles to movement, and EU welfare law has operated explicitly as an obstacle-reducer. Since the creation of the free movement regime, Community/Union law has provided for some cross-border welfare rights, in the form of social security coordination.⁸ In conceiving of EU welfare measures as mechanisms, I use Niamh Nic Shuibhne's work drawing together the horizontal themes across different branches of free movement law. Nic Shuibhne described 'the interconnected nature of EU objectives' as being

⁵ The treatment of the economically inactive has been considered a litmus test for EU citizenship, see: HUIJ d'Oliveira, 'Union Citizenship: Pie in the Sky?' in A Rosas and E Antola (eds), *A Citizen's Europe: In Search of a New Order* (London, Sage Publications, 1995); H Verschuere, 'Free Movement of EU Citizens: Including for the Poor?' (2015) 22 *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law* 1, 10; D Thym, 'The Elusive Limits of Solidarity: Residence Rights of and Social Benefits for Economically Inactive Union Citizens', (2015) 52 *CML Rev* 1, 17; AP Van der Mei, *Free Movement of Persons within the European Community: Cross Border Access to Public Benefits* (Oxford, Hart, 2003).

⁶ Hervey noted in 1995 that reference to the market was a mechanism by which to maintain structural inequality and thereby protect dominant interests. See T Hervey, 'Migrant Workers and their Families in the European Union: The Pervasive Market Ideology of Community Law' in J Shaw and G More (eds) *New Legal Dynamics of European Union* (Oxford, OUP, 1995).

⁷ According to the CJEU in Case C-85/96 *María Martínez Sala v Freistaat Bayern* EU:C:1998:217, which appeared to establish a default of equal treatment, the logic of which meant that Member States could only avoid equal treatment duties through expulsion (E Spaventa, 'Seeing the Wood Despite the Trees? On the Scope of Union Citizenship and its Constitutional Effects' (2008) 45 *CML Rev* 13, 29), or 'keep[ing] them out in the first place': M Dougan, 'Fees, Grants, Loans and Dole Cheques: Who Covers the Cost of Migrant Education Within the EU?' (2005) 42 *CML Rev* 943, 971.

⁸ Council Regulation No 3 concerning social security for migrant workers [1958] OJ L30/561.