

VU Research Portal

Privacy Limitation Clauses: Trojan Horses under the Disguise of Democracy

van den Hoven van Genderen, R.

2016

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

van den Hoven van Genderen, R. (2016). *Privacy Limitation Clauses: Trojan Horses under the Disguise of Democracy: On the Reduction of Privacy by National Authorities in Cases of National Security and Justice Matters*. [PhD-Thesis - Research and graduation internal, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam].

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRIVACY LIMITATION CLAUSES: TROJAN HORSES UNDER THE DISGUISE OF DEMOCRACY 1

ON THE REDUCTION OF PRIVACY BY NATIONAL AUTHORITIES IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND JUSTICE MATTERS 1

VRJE UNIVERSITEIT 2

PRIVACY LIMITATION CLAUSES: TROJAN HORSES UNDER THE DISGUISE OF DEMOCRACY 2

ON THE REDUCTION OF PRIVACY BY NATIONAL AUTHORITIES IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND JUSTICE MATTERS 2

1 INTRODUCTION 11

1.1 TYPES OF PRIVACY AND DIFFERENT ROLES 12

1.1.1 *Limitation of Privacy as a Sovereign Right of Society* 14

1.1.2 *Privacy as a Fundamental Right in the Information Society and the Use of Personal Information by Governmental Authorities* 18

1.1.3 *Balancing Conflicting Interests and the Abundance of Information* 21

1.2 INFORMATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY IN A CHANGING WORLD 21

1.2.1 *Crime and Terrorism as a Reason for Interference* 22

1.2.2 *Governmental Authorities are Monitoring Public and Private Information* 24

1.3 METHOD AND STRUCTURE 25

1.3.1 *Research Questions* 25

1.3.2 *Structure and Research Method* 27

1.3.3 *Structure and Contents of the Chapters* 27

2 THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT OF PRIVACY, HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE 29

2.1 BIRTH RIGHT TO PRIVACY 29

2.2 THE BACKGROUND OF PRIVACY 30

2.3 PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND 32

2.4 MODERN PRIVACY 34

2.5 LEGAL QUALIFICATION OF PRIVACY 36

2.5.1 *Limits to Privacy in Public Space* 40

2.6 THE LIMITATION OF PRIVACY IN MODERN SOCIETY, INCLUDING ELECTRONIC MEANS, HISTORICAL LEADING CASES IN US AND GERMANY 42

2.7 RIGHT OF INTRUSION AS A NEGATIVE ASPECT OF PRIVACY 44

2.8 PRIVACY AND DATA PROTECTION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION 46

2.8.1 *Privacy in the TEU and the TFEU* 46

2.8.2 *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000/C 364/01)* 47

2.8.3 *Data Protection in the European Union: Constraints and Opportunities* 49

2.8.4 *Proposal for a New Legal Framework for the Protection of Privacy and the Free Movement of Personal Data (General Data Protection Regulation, GDPR)* 51

2.8.5 *Directive on the Protection of Personal Data by the Processing of Such Data by Criminal Justice Authorities (Justice Data Directive, JDD)* 54

2.8.6 *Differentiation of Data Subjects in the Proposed Directive* 55

2.9 CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVACY 56

3 LIMITING HUMAN RIGHTS: FROM EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES TO GENERAL CONDITIONS 59 8

3.1 INTRODUCTION	59
3.2 TRANSFER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, SPECIFICALLY PRIVACY	59
3.3 THE CONCEPT OF CITIZEN TOWARDS THE STATE ACCORDING TO HABERMAS	61
3.4 RESTRICTIONS OR LIMITATIONS	65
3.4.1 <i>Limitation Rules on Fundamental Rights</i>	67
3.4.2 <i>Almost Forgotten: The Siracusa Principles</i>	69
3.5 DEROGATIONS TO FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AS CONSIDERED ACCEPTABLE BY THE SIRACUSA PRINCIPLES	70
3.5.1 <i>'Prescribed by Law'</i>	74
3.5.2 <i>'In a Democratic Society'</i>	76
3.5.3 <i>'Public Order (Ordre Public)'</i>	76
3.5.4 <i>'National Security'</i>	77
3.5.5 <i>'Public Safety'</i>	79
3.5.6 <i>'Rights and Freedoms of Others' or the 'Rights or Reputations of Others'</i>	79
3.6 DEROGATIONS IN A PUBLIC EMERGENCY	80
3.7 EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND DECISIONS BY THE ECtHR ON PUBLIC INTEREST	83
3.8 NECESSARY IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY	85
3.8.1 <i>Burden of Proof</i>	86
3.8.2 <i>Intrusion of Human Rights for Reasons of National Security, Proportionality</i> .	87
3.9 CONCLUDING REMARKS ON GENERAL LIMITATIONS ON FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS	89
4 THE APPLICATIONS OF THE EXCEPTIONS IN ECtHR CASE LAW, SPECIFICALLY ON ARTICLE 8(2)	91
4.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE LIMITATION ACTIONS	91
4.2 DIFFERENTIATION OF CRIMES AGAINST NATIONAL SECURITY AND PREVENTION OF CRIME IN GENERAL	92
4.2.1 <i>Interpretation: Terrorism vs. Ordinary Crime</i>	93
4.3 CRIME AND NATIONAL SECURITY	94
4.4 ECtHR CASE LAW ON RESTRICTIONS: BALANCING THE PROCESS	98
4.4.1 <i>Limitation in an Emergency or Normal Situation?</i>	99
4.4.2 <i>Prescribed (and Limited) by Law in the ECHR</i>	101
4.4.3 <i>Detournement de Pouvoir or Legitimized Limitation?</i>	104
4.4.4 <i>Quality of Law Also Means no Arbitrary Interference by Public Authorities</i> .	109
4.4.5 <i>Limitations of Article 8: Necessary in a Democratic Society</i>	110
4.4.6 <i>Balancing the Rights by the Principles</i>	111
4.4.7 <i>Margin of Appreciation, Proportionality Test</i>	112
4.4.8 <i>Proportionality in Investigations of Personal Information in Stored Files</i>	112
4.4.9 <i>Professional Secrecy? (Trust Exception)</i>	114
4.4.10 <i>'Necessary in a Democratic Society' in Proportional Balancing, Technology Related in 'Aalmoes'</i>	118
4.4.11 <i>Margin of Appreciation</i>	120
4.4.12 <i>Surveillance: is the Use of Covert Devices in Line with Democratic Society? Specific Case Law</i>	120
4.4.13 <i>The Existence of an Interference with Private Life by Technology</i>	123
4.4.14 <i>Data Retrieved Following Surveillance, View of the ECtHR</i>	124
4.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE ECtHR CASE LAW	126
5 TELECOMMUNICATION LAW AND LIMITATIONS ON PRIVACY	127 9

5.1 LIMITATION OF THE ESCAPE ROUTE FOR INVESTIGATIVE AND NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE AUTHORITIES?	127
5.2 INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS THAT PROVIDE FOR LIMITATION OF PRIVACY RIGHTS FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES IN TELECOMMUNICATIONS	129
5.3 INTERCEPTION, GENERAL PRINCIPLES	131
5.3.1 <i>Data Retention Laws and Regulations: Traffic Data and Location Data to be Retained for the Prevention of Crime and National Security</i>	134
5.3.1.1 Traffic Data	134
5.3.2 <i>The Value of Traffic Data</i>	135
5.3.3 <i>European Union, Directive 2006/24/EC Evaluation Report; an Illegal Directive</i>	138
5.3.4 <i>The Disputed Directive in EU Countries: In Perspective</i>	138
5.3.5 <i>Preservation or Retention of Telecommunication Data: What is the Difference?</i>	143
5.4 ANALYSIS OF PROBLEMS AS CONSIDERED IN THE EVALUATION REPORT AND CONSTITUTIONAL COURT DECISIONS IN THE MEMBER STATES	147
5.4.1 <i>Purpose and Scope of Data Retention</i>	147
5.4.2 <i>Data Retention Definitions</i>	148
5.4.3 <i>The Addressed Operator and Access: a Definition of Data</i>	150
5.4.4 <i>Data Categories, Traffic and Location Data</i>	151
5.4.5 <i>Retention Period and Decisions of Constitutional Courts</i>	152
5.4.6 <i>The German Constitutional Court Case</i>	153
5.4.6.1 Proportionality	154
5.4.6.2 Requirements of the Transparency of Data Transmission	155
5.4.6.3 Purpose	155
5.4.7 <i>Further Action of the European Commission</i>	156
5.4.7.1 Four Principles of Data Security	157
5.4.7.2 Effectiveness	157
5.4.7.3 Storage Period	159
5.4.8 <i>Killing the Directive, the ECJ Ruling of April 8th, 2014</i>	160
5.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS CONCERNING LIMITING PRIVACY IN ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS BY RETENTION, THE FINAL DECISION OF THE ECJ.	163
6 ANTI-TERRORISM AND ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING REGULATIONS AND LIMITATION OF PRIVACY	165
6.1 INTRODUCTION	165
6.2 ANTI-TERRORISM AND ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING: AN INTRODUCTION	165
6.2.1 <i>Definition of Terrorism</i>	166
6.3 CHARACTER OF UNITED NATIONS ACTIONS	169
6.3.1 <i>Doubts about the Legitimacy of Measures</i>	172
6.3.2 <i>Lawfulness of the Legal Instruments of the UN in Anti-Terrorist and AML Regulations</i>	174
6.4 ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING AND THE UN	177
6.4.1 <i>Interaction between UN and Financial Action Task Force (FATF)</i>	180
6.4.2 <i>The FATF Recommendations</i>	182
6.4.3 <i>The Essence in Controlling Money Laundering: The FIU Construction</i>	183
6.4.4 <i>Terrorist Financing in FATF: the Recommendations</i>	184
6.4.4.1 The FATF review of 2012	186
6.4.5 <i>Describing Financing of Terrorism and Money Laundering in European Perspective</i>	188
	10

6.4.6 Unpacking the Ambiguity in the Definitions: Terrorism	191
6.4.7 Financing Terrorism	193
6.4.8 Replacement of the Third AML Directive by the Fourth AML Directive	195
6.4.8.1 Definition of Money Laundering and the Financing of Terrorism	198
6.4.8.2 Obligations of Covered Entities and Persons Vis-à-Vis their Customers	198
6.4.8.3 Establishment of a Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU) in the EU countries ..	200
6.4.8.4 Enforcement of the Directive and Imposition of Sanctions	201
6.4.9 The Privacy and Data Protection Aspect.....	201
6.4.10 Risk-Based Approach	206
6.4.11 Personal Data Protection within FIU Exchange	208
6.4.12 The Problem of Inconsistencies	211
6.4.13 Concluding Remarks on AML Regulations	212
6.5 CONCLUSION	215
7 CONCLUSION	218
7.1 RESEARCH OUTCOMES	218
7.2 FIRST RECOMMENDATION	225
7.3 SECOND RECOMMENDATION: USE OF THE SIRACUSA PRINCIPLES	225
7.4 THE PROOF OF THE PUDDING	226
7.5 THE PROBLEM OF ‘ARBITRARINESS’: NO LIMITATION SHALL BE APPLIED IN AN ARBITRARY AND NON-DISCRIMINATORY MANNER	228
7.6 FINAL OBSERVATIONS	231
SUMMARY	235
ANNEX I FATF	238
ANNEX II FATF RECOMMENDATIONS	240
ANNEX III SIRACUSA PRINCIPLES	242
BIBLIOGRAPHY	253
CASE LAW AND OTHER SOURCES	267