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1. Introduction
One might assume when considering equality and human rights together that these two concepts would work cumulatively to create a whole that is greater than the sum of the two parts. However, at times, as the work of Titia Loenen\(^1\) has demonstrated, these two concepts can end up in conflict, with a resulting reduction in each. The reasons for this conflict are numerous, and this paper does not claim to address them all. Instead its focus is on two possible reasons. First, I consider the difficulty that the law in Europe has had in dealing with the increase in the number of grounds on which equality can be claimed. Second, and related to the first, I assess the extent to which the new grounds raise questions about the meaning of the terms ‘equality’ and ‘human rights’. Finally, I suggest that a renewed understanding of the meaning of these terms may help to resolve the supposed conflict between them and lead to ways forward in which these two notions could more positively interact.

2. Commonalities between equality and human rights
Of course the notions of human rights and equality are intimately related. At one level, it might be said that they are two sides of the same coin. Human rights and equality rights can be seen to be founded on the same moral first principles. The Kantian idea that humans should be treated as ends rather than means, with the same essential dignity and unique value, underpins most modern human rights thinking.\(^2\) The idea that human beings can

\(^1\) Loenen 2009; Loenen 2012b; Loenen 2012a.

\(^2\) Kant 1963.
expect others to respect the dignity inherent in their humanity is one that has been agreed virtually universally, perhaps most famously in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’. Here we immediately see a fundamental link between human rights and equality. The concept of human dignity, a foundational concept in human rights theory, does seem to be intimately linked to the idea of equality: humans may not be equal in their abilities and attributes, but they are equal in their humanity and moral worth. There is thus an objective good in upholding their equality, and in attempting to create a society in which all can flourish.

Thought of in this way, equality and human rights should not be in conflict at all. Equality is thus understood as a fundamental human right: indeed many human rights documents include a right to equality, and most equality advocates would see their quest as governed by human rights principles. Moreover, it is also assumed in most human rights documents that human rights should be enjoyed equally by all, again showing the intimate links between the two concepts.

To an extent the overlapping nature of the interests in human rights and equality have had a positive influence on the development of the first grounds of equality. When considering gender and race equality, for example, it seems to be helpful to consider these in terms of equality as well as human rights. Human rights protection came first, with the realisation that talk of the Rights of Man meant the rights of white men coming only later, a few vital participants having been left out of the debate. Eva Brems outlines clearly the development of human rights to become more inclusive, with its extension to race, gender and disability. In these contexts, the use of the language of equality has led to the improvement of human rights protection, and, in turn, equality claims have been bolstered by the recognition that they are based on fundamental human rights claims. This improved understanding of equality as a part of human rights protection has also led more recently to an
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3 Art 1. Dignity also features in the preamble to the United Nations Charter, and the preambles of the ICCPR and ICESCR.
4 See her contribution in this volume.
increase in the grounds on which equality is protected, to cover age, religion and sexual orientation.

This virtuous circle of protection can be seen reflected in the strict scrutiny with which equality interests have been treated in the courts. In the case of gender and race equality, direct discrimination cannot be justified, and even in the case of indirect discrimination any exception to the norm of equality has to be justified very strictly. This means that even if there is a ‘cost’ to compliance with the equality norm, courts will nonetheless order compliance. For example, if an employer has to pay more to employ a woman who goes on maternity leave, or loses custom because its clients do not like to be served by a black member of staff, courts will uphold the right to equality of the worker rather than allow discrimination to be justified on the basis of the ‘needs of the business’. Indeed, the fact that these examples perhaps seem somewhat shocking shows the extent to which these norms of equality have been generally accepted.

3. Conflicts between human rights and equality

Nonetheless, despite the close connections between equality and human rights, it seems that the concepts may also conflict at times. This can be seen perhaps most clearly in relation to the new grounds of equality, particularly the grounds of age and religion. This may be because the protection has been more recently introduced and in addition, the underlying interests at stake have not been generally agreed. For example, the question of whether discrimination on grounds of age and religion should be treated similarly to other grounds is still live in the academic literature, a question that is rarely seen in the case of race or sex. The acceptance of the equality claim is not so well established in relation to age and religion, and so there is perhaps less willingness to accept any ‘cost’ involved in compliance. The example of age equality may illustrate the issue. In EU law, age equality can more readily be justified than other grounds of discrimination with justified direct discrimination potentially lawful. Moreover, retirement ages

6 See the debate surrounding the concept of the ‘fair innings’ argument in relation to age discrimination: See Fredman 2003. With regard to religion, see Mccolgan 2009.
are reasonably easy to justify and remain common across Europe. Applied to other grounds of discrimination such an approach would not be allowed. The arguments about the rights of younger workers and their need for work, which are accepted in relation to debates surrounding retirement, would be very unlikely to be accepted if applied to gender. For example, when in 2011 the UK’s Universities Minister David Willets blamed educated working women for the lack of jobs available to aspiring working class men – he said that feminism was the ‘single biggest factor’ in a lack of social mobility – he was roundly criticised. One certainly cannot imagine such an argument gaining the support of the CJEU as a justification for gender discrimination. Yet the argument that older people must be treated unfavourably in order to protect younger people has been accepted in the context of age discrimination. A second area in which conflicts between rights have arisen in relation to the new equality grounds relates to religion, and this will be the focus of what follows. The conflict can be summarised with a few examples from the case law which illustrate the potential clashes between equality law and human rights.

The first example involves the wearing of the hijab or headscarf, and can be illustrated by Şahin v Turkey in which a university student objected to the prohibition of religious attire being worn in her university as a breach of her freedom to manifest her religion and belief. The ECtHR accepted that the ban on the headscarf could be justified, and referred in its reasoning to the view that the headscarf is ‘hard to square with the principle of gender equality’. A second example of the potential clash between human rights and equality can be seen in the cases involving Christian marriage registrars. In the case of Ladele, heard with Eweida v. United Kingdom the claim that dismissal for a religiously motivated refusal to conduct civil partnerships was a breach of the right to freedom of religion was rejected. Instead the equality
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8 Mulholland 2011.
9 ECtHR, Leyla Şahin v. Turkey, 10 November 2005 (Appl.no. 44774/98).
10 ECtHR, Leyla Şahin v. Turkey, 10 November 2005 (Appl.no. 44774/98), at para. 111.
11 ECtHR, Eweida and others v UK, 15 January 2013 (Appl.nos. 48420/10, 59842/10, 51671/10 and 36516/10) (on Ladèle).
rights of gay couples justified the limitation on religious freedom represented by the dismissal. A third example involves employment by religious organisations. Although freedom of religion will justify some exceptions to equality, the extent of those exceptions is unclear. Thus, the fact that the Catholic Church requires that priests be Catholic is uncontroversial, despite its overt discrimination against non-Catholics. But other equality exceptions are more contested, such as requirements for priests to be male; and it is not clear how widely the exceptions should apply, for example whether churches could require staff to be heterosexual.

These examples demonstrate some of the tensions and conflicts that can arise between the human right to religious freedom, and equality. These issues are all ones in which we may identify ‘trouble’ coming from the interaction of equality and human rights, issues which have been contested in a burgeoning literature. The conclusions of this literature are not rehearsed in full here, but are considered in summary form.

4. Debating human rights and equality

One major issue which arises within the debate between human rights and equality is whether, and if so how, they might be reconciled. However, some have criticised the polarity of this debate, counselling particularly against essentialising religion in general, and Islam in particular, as ‘anti-equality’. As Maleiha Malik has said: ‘The exaggeration of the problem of ‘conflict’ between different groups – and especially races, cultures and religions – gives rise to an assumption that there is a radical difference of values between different social groups in society.’ This concern is important. It can be all too easy to assume that religion is antithetical to equality, an assumption that itself can lead to hostility to religion, which in turn could lead to less favourable treatment against religious adherents.

Even if we avoid this danger, however, we are still left with some ‘clashes’ in practice, as illustrated by the scenarios mentioned above. Suggested approaches, including the approach of Malik herself, are to ensure

12 McCollgan 2009.
13 Malik 2008.
appropriately nuanced balancing of the different interests, with appropriately
drawn boundaries around any areas in which religion may be allowed
to ‘trump’ equality interests. For example, in the case of employment by
religious bodies, EU Directive 2000/78 allows for limited occupational
requirement exceptions to the non-discrimination principle, thus allowing
limited discrimination on grounds of religion where necessary to maintain
the religious ethos of an organisation. However discrimination on other
grounds is unlawful. Thus requiring an employee in a religious organisation
to share its religion would be lawful if it was proportionate as a means of
maintaining the religious ethos, but it would not be lawful to require such
staff to be heterosexual, as this would discriminate unacceptably on other
grounds.

4.1 Contrasting approaches of the CJEU and ECHR

Other concerns about the tension between human rights approaches and
equality relate to the potential clash in approach between the ECHR and
the CJEU in dealing with issues such as those outlined above. In short, in
relation to headscarves, the human rights case law in the education context
has upheld the restrictions on headscarves,¹⁴ and such arguments are likely to
apply in the employment context. However this approach can be questioned
given the disparate impact of such restrictions on women, leading to a
suggestion that the human rights based approach of the ECtHR, which see
the practice of restricting headscarves as legitimate, may be incompatible
with an approach based on equality. After all, where equality is concerned,
the CJEU has not adopted such a similarly flexible approach. The standard
of review for interference with equality is strict: any requirement must have a
legitimate aim, the means chosen for achieving that objective must correspond
to a real need on the part of the undertaking, must be appropriate with a
view to achieving the objective in question and must be necessary to that
end.¹⁵ If such a strict approach is taken to justifying religious discrimination,

¹⁴ ECtHR, Leyla Şahin v. Turkey, 10 November 2005 (Appl.no. 44774/98); ECtHR, Dablav v.
Switzerland (admissibility decision), 15 February 2001 (Appl.no. 42393/98).
it may be that restrictions on headscarves would not be so readily justified as they have been using the approach under the ECHR.

This different legal approach to a similar factual issue demonstrates that the ECHR and CJEU legal cultures may clash on this issue: the ECtHR traditionally allows a margin of appreciation to apply in difficult cases where consensus is difficult to determine; the CJEU sets standards for all of the EU, and aims at uniformity in order to achieve the economic aims of the union. The concept of a margin of appreciation while not unknown (in the form of a margin of discretion and a principle of subsidiarity) is much more limited. The concept of the margin of appreciation is also arguably inappropriate in the context of gender and race: both are areas where the consensus and traditions have long been sexist and racist. The aim of the EU is to eradicate such tendencies, not to reflect them in the standards set.

An additional concern relates to the danger that the difficulties in balancing competing interests when it comes to religion and age will lead to courts using a less strict level of scrutiny when it comes to justifying indirect discrimination. A serious concern is that this will lead to a levelling down or dilution of protection for other grounds as courts seek to treat all equality grounds equally.

In summary, there are a number of concerns which can be identified relating to potential clashes between religion and equality. To an extent, these may be reconciled by careful and sensitive interpretation of the various competing legal frameworks. Both frameworks contain flexible components such as the requirement that limits on equality or human rights should be proportionate. In the next section, I consider some additional challenges which may arise if concepts and approaches developed in the context of religious human rights are translated into the context of equality law.

5. ‘Lost in translation’

In some senses, both the ‘human rights’ perspective and the ‘equality’ perspective can be seen to use similar methodologies when dealing with difficult cases involving religious rights. Both ultimately rely on a balancing approach, with both the ECHR and the Equality Directive providing limits on their protection. With regard to human rights claims, this is reflected
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in the fact that although religion, belief and conscience are protected absolutely, manifestation of religion and belief can be limited where justified. With regard to discrimination claims this is seen in the fact that while direct discrimination cannot be justified, exceptions are allowed where religious employers impose genuine occupational requirements which are justified and proportionate; and indirect discrimination can be justified where proportionate. Thus, beyond the right to believe at all, both systems allow some balancing of competing interests. To an extent then, there is a commonality of approach between the two frameworks. This can be seen in the ready translation of four religious equality cases brought from the UK to the ECtHR in January 2013. At the domestic level, these case were brought under the Directive derived UK Equality Act 2010, as claims of indirect discrimination (the application of a neutral rule, not to wear a visible cross or not to refuse services to gay clients, put the Christian claimants at a particular disadvantage compared to other staff, and the rules could not be justified). After their rejection by the domestic courts, an application was made to the ECtHR for their consideration under Article 9 cases, on the basis that the claimants’ freedom to manifest religion had been interfered with. The question for the court was then whether this failure could be justified. However, the human rights jurisprudence brings some approaches to the balancing exercise which do not translate readily between the two perspectives. Indeed, care is needed to avoid the danger that matters are ‘lost in translation’, if concepts developed in the human rights context are used without further reflection in the equality context.

5.1. The specific situation rule

The first example is in the traditional acceptance in the jurisprudence of the ECtHR of the ‘specific situation rule’. This is the recognition that a person’s Article 9 rights may be influenced by the particular situation of the
individual claiming that freedom. In particular, where individuals voluntarily submit themselves to a system of rules which limits their manifestation of religion, their claims will be limited. Examples of the specific situation rule were clear in the context of religion and employment, but can also be seen in other dress code cases. In the recent ECtHR case of Eweida the court held that the fact that the claimant could resign should not mean there was no interference at all, but nonetheless they still held that the possibility of changing job should be weighed in the overall balance when considering whether or not the restriction was proportionate. This approach to the protection of religious freedom is undoubtedly an improvement on what went before. Prior to the most recent Eweida decision, the specific situation rule amounted to a significant restriction on religious freedom at work, despite some strong reasons to allow the protection, such as the importance of religion to the individual, and the interests in distributing the benefits of employment without discrimination on religious grounds. Yet, despite a number of strong reasons to protect religious interests at work, in the final analysis the right to resign does seem to have a role to play, even if only as a residual form of protection for religious freedom. After all, if the employee has very strong and inflexible beliefs that are impossible to reconcile with her work based obligations (for example a religious believer who refuses to work with men), she is free to leave: there is no obligation to work. Thus the specific situation rule will still have some effect on the law, albeit in a more limited manner way than was the case prior to the Eweida decision.

However, even the newly diluted specific situation rule may be less easy to accept when considered from an equalities perspective. In relation to equality norms, an onus is rarely put on an individual to take steps to avoid discrimination by ‘staying out of harm’s way’. ‘Separate but equal’ provision is not accepted as a defence to direct or indirect discrimination; and the language of choice is never used to deny an equality claim. Although,

19 EComHR, Ahmad v United Kingdom, 12 March 1981 (Appl.no. 8160/78); EComHR, Stedman v United Kingdom (admissibility decision), 9 April 1997 (Appl.no. 29107/95).
20 For example, see the UK House of Lords case of R (on the application of Begum) v Headteacher and Governors of Denbigh High School [2006] UKHL 15.
21 ECtHR, Eweida and others v UK, 15 January 2013 (Appl.nos. 48420/10, 59842/10, 51671/10 and 36516/10), at para. 83.
post-Eweida, the specific situation rule in relation to religious freedom has moved from an *a priori* rule against protecting religion in certain circumstances to a factor to determine proportionality, it is arguable that the approach would not be viewed as appropriate if used as a proportionality factor in an equality-based case.

5.2. The value of communal interests

A second possible ‘clash’ of approaches can be seen in the acceptance from a human rights perspective of the value of group interests in religious equality. The Article 9 right is one to be enjoyed alone ‘or in community with others’. This is justified, despite the fact that religion may be protected on the basis of its link to human dignity and autonomy, because involvement in communities who share one’s religious identity can be crucial to the development and enjoyment of one’s religious identity and so forms a part of what religious freedom means. This means that religious organisations have their own religious interests which may be at odds with the equality interests of others. This is most obviously seen in the interests of religious employers who may wish to reflect their own religious ethos in their employment practices. For example, in *Obst and Schüth v Germany* churches dismissed staff for failing to comply with religious teaching. In both cases staff had been involved in extra-marital relationships, in *Schüth* this was a Catholic Church organist and in *Obst* the Director of European Public Relations for the Mormon Church. Despite the apparent similarity of their facts, the ECtHR upheld the claim of the Catholic organist but rejected that of the Mormon PR Director. However, this largely related to a procedural question about the extent to which privacy rights had been considered by the decision makers in each case. Moreover, in the UK case of *Reaney v Hereford*, a Christian youth worker was denied employment as a diocesan youth officer because the Bishop did not believe his lifestyle would remain compatible with the church’s teachings on homosexuality. Here the Court upheld the right of
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22 Réaume 2003, at p. 678.
the Church to impose a requirement connected to sexuality, although the church ultimately lost the case, because the tribunal held that the Bishop was unreasonable in his belief that the applicant would not meet the requirement to remain celibate whilst in the post. Although the religious employers were not successful in all these cases, the courts all accepted the principle that religious ethos employers should enjoy the freedom to take action to protect the religious ethos of the organisation. The principle can also be seen in the approach to equality as applied to priests. There would be little chance that a court would interfere with the requirements of many churches that priests must be male and (depending on the Church) heterosexual or celibate. Interference with such practices by a court would be understood to infringe religious freedom.

In these cases, the ‘rights of discriminators’ have some traction in the legal reasoning, as the freedom of a religious group to practice their faith in community with others may best be met by allowing them to employ staff who share the faith. Indeed, in the context of religious freedom claims, the right of religious adherents to choose their leaders is given clear protection under the ECHR.25 The interest of having religious homogeneity in a workplace thus has some recognition. However, this again may be a concept that is ‘lost in translation’ when applied to the equality context. Trying to find equivalents in respect of other equality grounds is hard. Thus, some direct gender discrimination may be lawful where there is a genuine occupational requirement for a job to be done by person of a particular gender, for example, where a women’s rape crisis centre requires staff to be female, as they can better meet the emotional needs of the client base. However, exceptions to gender equality are interpreted extremely strictly, and moreover would not also allow discrimination on other grounds, as was potentially the case in Reaney and as is the case with the employment of clergy.

25 ECtHR, Hasan and Chaush v Bulgaria (Grand Chamber), 26 October 2000 (Appl.no. 30985/96), at para. 62; see also ECtHR, Serif v Greece, 14 December 1999 (Appl.no. 38178/97).
5.3. The margin of appreciation

A third area where concepts may lose something in translation relates to the margin of appreciation and its use in human rights cases. To an extent this has already been noted, with regard to its use in gender or race context. But there remains a wider concern which is significant in the context of a debate regarding the interaction of human rights and equality. The concern relates to the extent to which a lack of consensus and reasonable differences of opinion should be allowed to determine the outcome of human rights protection. Whilst it is perhaps useful as a matter of practical politics to leave some discretion to states on contentious issues about which there is disagreement (such as the headscarf issue in Europe) there are clear dangers in relying on consensus and settled practice to set the boundaries of protection, particularly with respect to minority rights and interests. After all, if the aim of human rights protection is to protect the individual from the power of the majority (as represented by the state), then the boundaries of this protection should not be set by reference to majority opinion.26 This concern has particular resonance when used in the context of equality, where protection is often being afforded to minority or other disadvantaged groups, who have been badly served by the majority. The problem is well illustrated in relation to the debate on the German headscarf case, which was heard in the German Constitutional Court.27 Here the Federal Constitutional Court decided that the issue was best dealt with via the democratic process so that only legislative bans would be upheld. In the case before the court, that meant that the headscarf ban was unlawful. However, this was not the end of the matter. Following the judgment, several German legislatures acted to introduce a ban, despite the fact that such bans had a disproportionate impact on Muslim women. With the democratic mandate in favour of the ban, the Constitutional Court’s objection was removed. Thus, allowing the majority to determine the rights of the minority via a reliance on political consensus can lead to a diminution of protection for disadvantaged groups. Yet these are the very groups that those striving for equality are seeking to

26 See Letsas 2004 and Dzehsiarou 2011.
27 Bundesverfassungsgericht, 24 September 2003, Ludin, 2 BvR 1436/02. For more detailed discussion see Loenen 2012b.
protect. In effect, allowing protection to be ‘norm-reflecting’ rather than ‘norm-setting’ can serve equality interests of minority groups very badly.

6. Seeking a solution

These various challenges and conflicts may lead one to suppose that equality and human rights are destined to be forever in some sort of circle of contradiction: they are at once two sides of the same coin, and yet potentially in conflict. Moreover, it seems that it is the new grounds of equality that have given rise to much of the conflict. How then, might one go about moving towards a resolution of this conflict? The suggestion here is that things could improve if ‘equality’ is viewed less as a unitary concept, and more as a concept with a plurality of meanings. This involves not only the recognition of a range of meanings of equality, but also an acceptance that equality grounds are not all the same.28 If it is accepted that ‘equality’ is a multi-faceted concept, and that not all grounds of equality are equal, this may enable a better reconciliation of the conflicts identified above.

There has been extensive academic debate about the meaning and purposes of equality29 which will not be expanded upon here. Suffice to say that a number of meanings exist beyond the most obvious meaning of formal or symmetrical equality; meanings that seek to meet the basic difficulty in equalities thinking about identifying which categories are sufficiently alike to warrant like treatment.30 More substantive conceptions of equality focus on the link between equality and individual dignity and identity; on the use of equality to address disadvantage and redistribution;31 and on equality as a means of addressing social exclusion and promoting participation.32 It is arguable that these different understandings of equality may match better with some grounds than others. For example, it has been suggested that
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28 See McCrudden 2005.
30 See Westen 1982.
31 See Barnard and Hepple 2000.
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sexual orientation equality ties in more fully with ideas of equality based on dignity and identity, than with ideas about redistribution and economic disadvantage. Conversely, it may be that the issue of age discrimination has more resonance with an understanding of equality based on redressing economic disadvantage rather than confirming identity.

A more varied understanding of the meaning of equality may help to meet some of the difficulties identified above: if age equality is founded on a concept of disadvantage, this may help us to balance the interests of the older worker against younger workers better than if we see the issue as one relating to individual dignity. For example, viewed as a matter of redistribution, age equality protection may allow the justification of retirement; viewed as a matter of identity, this would be very difficult to justify.33

Not only is it worth considering that equality is not a unitary concept, it may also be helpful to accept that different grounds of equality may not need to be treated the same, even though this goes against the current rhetoric from the CJEU which suggests that there should be no hierarchy as between the various equality provisions across the EU.34 A number of suggestions have been made in the literature about ways in which the grounds of discrimination are inherently different, which may justify the development of a degree of hierarchy as between them. For example, it has been suggested that some grounds (gender, race, sexual orientation) are truly irrelevant to a person’s ability to undertake work, while other grounds are relevant some of the time, because they may either limit availability to do a job (pregnancy, religion) or may limit ability to perform a job (disability, age). Thus treating different strands differently may be an acceptable way forward.35 Other differences identified include differences between the grounds in terms of whether the characteristics are biological differences (sex, age), ascriptive differences (ethnicity), or chosen characteristics (sexual orientation, religion).36 The question of whether these latter characteristics are chosen is clearly contentious, but the fact that distinctions can be drawn between the

33 Manfredi and Vickers 2013.
35 Bell and Waddington 2003.
36 For example, Schiek 2002.
different grounds does suggest that discrimination is not all equal, and that hierarchies may not only be inevitable but may also be useful tools to help us find a way around the contradictions that have been identified above, when we try to reconcile the two goods of equality and human rights.

7. Conclusion
The pursuit of the twin goals of the protection of human rights and of equality at times lead to some difficulty. As explored above, they work both in ways that are complementary and in ways that can conflict. This can cause particular difficulties when the same factual scenario, such as how to deal with religious symbols at work, raise both human rights and equality concerns. Moreover, there is a danger that approaches which add clarity to the debate in relation to human rights thinking can be ‘lost in translation’ and can cause difficulties in the treatment of equality. It has been suggested that recognition of a range of meanings for equality may allow for some creative and flexible responses to these tensions.

However in the shorter term, these tensions are bound to continue. This is largely due to the social and political environment in which the issues are played out, one in which support for the protection of human rights and equality seems to be diminishing. In a world in which protection for equality and human rights can feel under attack it is attractive to join forces and use the additional power which the linking of the two concepts offers: the rhetoric is much stronger if human rights and equality are seen as two sides of the same coin. There is a real danger that if the different grounds of equality part company in terms of their application, so that different justifications are allowed for different grounds of equality, this could lead to a dilution of protection for all grounds. This is because the language of parity of grounds can then be reintroduced in order to level down, rather than level up, the protection. This can be seen in the context of the Netherlands, in the discussions on the accommodation of religious manifestations in the public sphere.37 Thus, it may well be that politically it is important for the two concepts to remain linked for the time being. However, where tensions

37 For an overview of developments in the Netherlands see Van den Brink and Loenen 2012.
between the concepts arise, consideration of varied meanings of equality may help courts to feel a way towards a reasoned resolution.
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