

THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY

Legal Pluralism and Human Rights

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PERSONAL STATUS SYSTEMS IN ISRAEL, EGYPT AND INDIA

Yüksel Sezgin, Ph. D.

© 1999, International Council on Human Rights Policy
ICHRP commissioned this document as a Working Paper.

ICHRP has not edited it and is not responsible for its accuracy or for the views and opinions expressed.
ICHRP welcomes the re-use, re-publication and re-distribution of this paper, appropriately cited.

INTRODUCTION

1. A personal status system is a system in which members of various ethno-religious communities that are specifically recognized as such by central authorities are subject to jurisdiction of their communal norms and institutions in regard to personal matters such as marriage, divorce, maintenance and inheritance. In other words, in such systems there is often not a unified or a territorial body of family law that is uniformly applied to every citizen of the land irrespective of his or her ethno-religious background but rather a polycentrically-organized legal order in which a Muslim is subject to Islamic *Shari'a*, a Jew to *Halakhab*, a Christian to Canon Law, a Hindu to *Dharmashastra* and so forth.
2. Polycentric personal status systems had been historically employed by imperial powers to categorize their colonial subjects according to their racial, religious, sectarian, ethnic and parochial differences (Mamdani 1996; Mirow 2004). Yet, personal status is not solely an antiquated system of legal and political ordering. On the contrary, many postcolonial nations from Indonesia to Morocco which originally inherited such pluralistic legal systems from their colonial predecessors still continue to employ variant forms and degrees of personal status in their legal systems. In other words, some states continue to compartmentalize their societies into ethnic, religious and racial groupings and forcefully subject their citizens to communal laws which are fully integrated into state's legal system and backed by its enforcement agencies. We can understand why colonial regimes, which often had a "divide and rule" approach towards their subject populations, may have employed polycentric personal status systems, but it is not easy to comprehend why modern nation-states, which are often constitutionally committed to uphold universal human rights standards and treat their citizens equally before the law, would

ignore their constitutional obligations and discriminate among their citizens on the basis of gender, ethnicity and religion by continuing to recognize archaic personal status laws.

3. Hence, by closely analyzing the Israeli, Egyptian and Indian legal systems, the current study will aim to address the question of why modern nation-states continue to employ polycentric personal status systems and differentiate among their citizens despite the fact that they were initially founded on premises of non-discrimination and equal treatment. And more importantly, this working paper will also explain how polycentric administration of law and justice affect the fundamental rights and freedoms of individuals living under such systems; how these individuals cope with limitations imposed upon their rights by communal institutions; and what tactics and strategies they use to navigate through the maze of personal law.
4. Many scholars have considered the survival and persistence of archaic institutions of personal law as an anachronistic legacy of colonialism or a remnant of a distant past. According to the proponents of the “colonial legacy” thesis, after independence, many postcolonial governments, despite their strong desires to unify their legal system under an overarching network of law and courts, failed to overcome the resistance of social groups and thereby were forced to continue to recognize the jurisdiction of non-state normative orderings which were originally put in place by their colonial predecessors. In other words, personal law systems today continue to exist because the disempowered and incapacitated postcolonial governments had been unable to overcome the opposition of non-state forces and establish a uniform legal system but rather passively acquiesced in the continuation of colonial institutions of personal law (Hooker 1975; Vanderlinden 1989; Dane 1991; Young 1994; Darian-Smith and Fitzpatrick 1999; Thompson 2000; Larson 2001; Benton 2002).
5. However, “colonial legacy” accounts do not suffice alone to explain the reason why variant forms of personal status continue to exist today, as these explanations often neglect the centrality of state and the desire of its leaders to control the field of personal status and turn it into an instrument of their state and nation-building projects. In fact, a close analysis of the experiences of many postcolonial nations reveals that various forms and levels of personal status systems have come into existence not as a result of historical contingency, but a dynamic interaction between two powerful centripetal and centrifugal forces: the ruling elite’s choice of regime type and ideological orientation on the one hand, and the balance of power between the state and social forces on the other.
6. Postcolonial nations, which inherited such polycentric legal systems from their imperial patrons upon the independence, faced more or less the same problems: what were they going to do with these regimes, which were not necessarily conducive to building a unified and civic sense of nationhood? Were they going to preserve them, or eradicate and replace them with completely new bodies of law and legal institutions? Countries’ responses to these challenges were codetermined by their ruling elites’ ideological orientations, and ability to impose their political will upon social forces after overcoming their opposition, and by the capacity of ethno-religious groups to resist the government’s interventions in personal status and preserve their political and juridical autonomy. That is to say, governments’ differing regime choices, ideological orientations, and varying levels of ability to successfully intervene in societal structures on the one hand, and the ethno-religious groups’ varying capacity to resist government interventions, on the other, have led to rise of differing forms and degrees of legal plurality across the postcolonial world. For example, even the countries (e.g., Israel and Egypt), which had exactly the same degree and form of personal status under the colonial rule, have later developed completely different degrees and forms of personal status, as the factors (e.g., ideological orientation, and relative balance of power between the state and society), which originally gave rise to formation of personal status systems in question, have changed and continuously evolved over time.
7. Although prevailing political and social differences have led to development of significantly different degrees and forms of personal status across the postcolonial world, this study will

demonstrate that polycentric personal status systems have been invariably detrimental to the rights and freedoms of individuals (esp. women, children and religious dissidents); and their impact has been even worse in countries where individuals were presented with no secular alternatives and forcefully subjected to jurisdiction of communal norms and institutions without their explicit consent. In the face of such serious human rights violations, many groups and individuals have struggled to bring about changes in polycentric structures that would potentially cease violations and ameliorate the situation. However, by doing so these groups have also unquestionably challenged the legitimacy of state's meddling in personal status; and contested the validity of various categories of subjectivity (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender etc.) by offering their deviant interpretations of officially-sanctioned religious norms and precepts. In fact, experiences of many postcolonial nations evidence that the ongoing contestations in the triangle of state-community-individual have not only exacerbated the existing state-society crises, but also caused profound ideological divisions in their societies. That is to say, the field of human rights in many postcolonial countries has turned into both a site of resistance and a testing ground where the fate of governments' attempts to regulate their polycentric personal status systems has been ultimately decided by the responses of the individuals who interacted with these institutions on a daily basis.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

8. For analytical purposes this study will introduce three ideal-typical¹ forms of personal status based on their degree of plurality or fragmentation: 1) Low-Degree, 2) Medium Degree, and 3) High-Degree (Sezgin 2004b) . Each category theoretically corresponds to a different prototypical pattern of recognition and incorporation of personal status regimes that could be widely found in the postcolonial world. Moreover, all other things being equal, each category also attests to convergence of a particular type of regime structure or ideological orientation with a particular type and magnitude of counteracting social opposition mounted by ethno-religious communities at a specific time and place.
9. Most postcolonial nations inherited polycentric personal status systems which were historically employed by imperial powers for identifying and categorizing their subjects into racial, ethno-religious and tribal groupings. That is to say, in the process of state and nation building, nearly all postcolonial nations faced the very same problem: what they were going to do with these archaic and highly fragmented systems. Obviously the prolongation of these structures after independence would have not only resulted in further ossification of the colonial categories of race, gender and ethnicity, but also subverted the attempts of postcolonial leaders to redefine the terms of membership in the political community. The responses of postcolonial governments to this very question were first and foremost determined by their choice of regime type and ideological orientation. For example, inclusionary regimes, which are principally committed to the idea of building an egalitarian, homogenous and civic citizenry, have deemed the colonial institutions of personal status inherently inconducive for their vision and taken radical steps to reduce their degree of plurality by abolishing and replacing these structures with territorially-unified systems of law and courts. Along the same lines, many postcolonial governments with secular credentials have also embraced a similar approach towards religiously-based personal status systems, as they have considered it ideologically instrumental to achieve their goal of diminishing the role of religious norms and institutions in public life (Carson 1958; Cotran 1965; Seidman 1978; Bennett and Vermeulen 1979; Prinsloo 1990; Schacht and Layish 1991; Creevey 1996; Mamdani 1996; Massad 2001; Favali and Pateman 2003).

¹ These three ideal typical forms of personal status used here as well as the regime typologies introduced below, are employed for purely analytical purposes. It is extremely rare for states in real life to fit entirely within a single category and have no common characteristics with another state belonging to a different category. Instead, at different times countries will tend more toward one set of characteristics than another.

10. In contrast, exclusionary regimes, which are formally committed to a belief in the supremacy of a particular race, ethnicity or religion over others in the society, have viewed polycentric personal status systems instrumentally and aimed to conserve, and even reinforce, the polycentric nature of these structures in order to promote a particular form of subjectivity and turn their vision of stratified citizenry into reality. In other words, exclusionary regimes have utilized personal status systems to maintain the “purity” of particular groups by imposing strict rules of endogamy and banning or officially discouraging mixed-blood unions among the members of different religious, ethnic, and racial groups. (Bennett and Peart 1983; Burman 1983; Brubaker 1996; Marx 1996; Chesterman and Galligan 1997; Yiftachel 1997, 1999; Butenschön 2000, 2001; Smootha and Jarve 2005; Wadud 2005). Similarly, theocratically-inclined regimes² have also preserved and reinforced the existing polycentric personal status regimes in order to increase the magnitude of religious precepts and institutions within their legal system, and differentiate and favor members of the dominant religion over others. (Smith 1963; Lewis 1968; Allott, Epstein and Gluckman 1969; Ghai 1975; Allott 1980; Bennett and Peart 1983; Molyneux 1991; Berkes 1998; Ortaylı 2004).
11. Unlike these ideologically motivated regimes, some postcolonial nations have been moved by more mechanical considerations in reforming their polycentric personal status systems. These regimes are bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes that are often characterized by a relative lack of ideological interest in personal status issues. They have rather viewed their polycentric regimes as an undesired legacy of colonialism and extra-territoriality which, they thought, had to be completely wiped out to achieve full independence. In their eyes, the prolongation of colonial systems of personal status would not only limit the power and reach of the state, but also compromise the national sovereignty. Thus, these regimes have often intervened in their personal status systems with such motives as consolidating the power of the central administration, increasing its effectiveness, bringing an end to the multiplicity of local jurisdictions on national territory for realization of full sovereignty, and preventing non-state actors (esp. religious and customary authorities) from becoming strongholds of political opposition and posing an immediate danger to the government (Sezgin 2004a).
12. These various motives for intervention have also influenced the choices and means of reform undertaken by postcolonial governments in regulating their pluralistic personal status regimes. Broadly speaking, in terms of their stated objectives, three distinctive categories of reform have been widely undertaken in the postcolonial world: 1) Normative Reform, which seeks to achieve normative unification by unifying personal status laws of various communities under a common civil code that would be applicable to all citizens regardless of their communal affiliations; 2) Institutional Reform, that aims to reduce institutional plurality by unifying communal courts under a system of uniform and hierarchically-structured network of national courts; and 3) Substantive Reform, that solely aims to change the substance of personal status laws without reducing either institutional or normative plurality (e.g., reforms prohibiting bigamy or underage marriages).
13. Since each type of reform serves a different purpose, regimes with different ideological orientations would naturally prefer reforms leading to different outcomes. In fact, the individual examples of many postcolonial governments demonstrate that while the institutional reform has been mostly initiated by regimes with mere efficiency or sovereignty considerations (e.g., bureaucratic-authoritarian), normative reform, which requires a strong ideological commitment on the part of reforming governments, has been often attempted by ideologically motivated inclusionary or secular regimes (Bennett and Peart 1983, p.147). The historical data also suggest that all countries—regardless of their regime type—have undertaken substantive reforms as a response to pressures from intrinsic and extrinsic forces demanding changes in the field of

² A regime with theocratic inclinations can be also viewed as a differentialist or exclusionary regime; as such a regime will not only identify itself with a particular belief system and inherently propagate its supremacy, but also relegate the followers of other faiths to the status of second class citizens.

personal status (e.g., women's right to divorce, minimum marriageable age etc.) (Charrad 2001; Massad 2001).

14. Reforms in personal status or family law never take place in the absence of social opposition. On the contrary, governments' interference in the field of personal status has always drawn the fierce resistance of ethno-religious communities whose norms and institutions have been targeted by reforms. And the intensity and severity of that resistance seem to be directly correlated with the type of reform in question. For example, a close scrutiny of the experiences of postcolonial nations shows that normative reform has instigated the greatest amount of resistance from social forces while opposition fomented against institutional or substantive reforms have been lesser and relatively easier for governments to surmount. This is because undertaking of normative reform necessitates not only the mobilization of larger amounts of government resources but also an unshakable moral and ideological commitment on the part of the ruling elite which are not necessarily required by other types of reforms (Anderson 1958; Kahn-Freud 1969; Read 1972; Cotran 1996).³ Thus, the task for regimes with inclusionary or secular orientations, which often attempted to undertake both normative and institutional reform, has been more difficult than those of regimes with bureaucratic-authoritarian, theocratic or exclusionary orientations which have mostly limited the scope of their intervention to institutional and substantive reforms.
15. In brief, postcolonial governments have often viewed personal status systems instrumentally and attempted to manipulate these polycentric structures in order to implement a particular ideological vision and program, while ethno-religious communities have fiercely resisted the government meddling in personal status and tried to preserve their political and juridical autonomy. In the end, these continuous interactions between various governments and ethno-religious communities across the postcolonial world have given rise to one of the three above-mentioned ideal-typical forms of personal status in each country. Each of these categories attests to convergence of a particular type of regime structure with a particular type and magnitude of counteracting societal opposition. For example, personal status systems with low degree plurality (LDP) has been mostly observed in countries with strong inclusionary and/or secular inclinations that have already achieved considerable levels of unification in their systems, but their attempts at further unification were somewhat forestalled in the face of strong resistance from specific ethno-religious groups. Compared to nations in other categories, these countries possess the most centralized and unified legal systems, as they are just one step short of achieving complete legal unification.
16. Of the cases analyzed in this study, India would best exemplify this ideal-typical category. Despite its inclusionary and secularist proclivities and strong desire to enact a Uniform Civil Code (UCC) that would be applicable to all citizens irrespective of their religious affiliations, the Indian regime has only partially succeeded in its goal of normative unification; moreover, it completely dropped the idea of common civil code after repeatedly failing to surmount the muscular opposition of the Indian Muslim community. As a result, today the country still remains as a pluralistic system, albeit to a much lesser degree than six decades ago.
17. On the other hand, personal status systems with high degree plurality (HDP) have been frequently found in regimes with theocratic and exclusionary inclinations. As such regimes have predominantly viewed polycentric legal structures as instruments for realizing their vision of building ethno-religiously stratified societies and augmenting the role of religious norms and institutions in public life, they have often preserved and reinforced plural systems of personal

³ Perhaps another reason for why normative reforms have been more difficult to undertake is that this type reform is actually a process of double reform, in the sense that it subsequently entails the undertaking of institutional reform, too. Particularly in polycentric regimes where communal laws are directly applied by communal courts, normative reform cannot be undertaken alone. It has to be done in tandem with institutional reform, as there cannot be a system in which communal courts will continue to exist and apply provisions of the same uniform civil code to members of different ethno-religious communities.

status. By the same token, societal opposition has not played an important role in formation of personal status systems with HDP, as governments have not targeted or threatened religious communities with loss of juridical autonomy through their attempts at normative or institutional reform. In short, nations in this category have the most fragmented and decentralized legal systems of all, as they are characterized by extreme levels of communal autonomy and substantial degrees of normative and institutional pluralization in the field of personal status.⁴

18. Among the cases that best epitomize this category is Israel, in which fourteen state-recognized ethno-religious communities run their own communal courts that are staffed with their own communal judges applying religious laws of their very own communities. Israel has maintained the highly pluralistic legal system that it inherited from the Ottomans and the British. As shown below, the reason for preservation of this archaic system was that the founding fathers of Israel had seen it ideologically useful for preserving the “purity” and “supremacy” of the country’s Jewish citizens while differentiating and relegating non-Jewish identities to a second-class status.
19. In between these two prototypical forms exist the personal status systems with Medium Degree Plurality (MDP). This type has been frequently found in bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes that have been solely motivated by such mechanical considerations as achieving bureaucratic efficiency, establishing control over widely scattered non-state jurisdictions, and weakening the independent political vigor of religious institutions. In order to succeed in these objectives, bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes have extensively resorted to institutional measures to unify the communal courts of various communities under the jurisdiction of a uniform and centralized network of national courts, while shying away from normative reforms that were often employed by ideologically motivated states to facilitate a secular or inclusionary transformation in their societies. Although they have exclusively aimed for institutional reform, bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes have still encountered the stiff resistance of some numerically limited but decisively powerful groups who opposed the institutional measures employed by the state. Bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes have usually succeeded in achieving their institutional objectives to the extent that they skillfully managed and overcame the resistance of these groups. Many countries in this category are the countries which in the past inherited highly fragmented personal status regimes from their colonial predecessors, but later managed to cut their plurality scores nearly in half by means of institutional reform.
20. Of the three cases analyzed in this paper, Egypt would be a textbook example of this latter category. Especially, during the reign of Nasser, the Egyptian regime, largely moved by mechanical considerations, abolished the religious courts of both Muslim and non-Muslim communities and transferred their jurisdiction to national courts without undertaking an accompanying reform for normative unification. In the final analysis, the Egyptian regime, after successfully overcoming the opposition of communal leaders who were suddenly deprived of their traditional privileges with abolition of religious courts eventually succeeded in cutting its degree of plurality in half chiefly by utilizing institutional measures.

⁴ For pure theoretical interest it must be noted that in some very rare circumstances, HDP may come about as a result of a balance of power tilting strongly in favor of societal organizations. For example, in cases of total state failure, some dominant segments within the society may well take over the state’s functions and impose a religiously-oriented and highly-pluralized legal system over the rest of the population in concordance with their ideological objectives (e.g., Nigeria and Somalia in the 2000s).

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ISRAELI, EGYPTIAN AND INDIAN REGIMES' RESPONSES TO LEGAL PLURALISM

21. Israel inherited the old *millet*⁵ system under which the Ottoman and British imperial authorities granted juridical autonomy over matters of personal status (e.g., marriage, divorce, succession, maintenance and alimony) to eleven⁶ ethno-religious communities in Palestine. Since its inception as an independent nation, Israel has more or less maintained this highly pluralized and decentralized legal system, and further extended its limits to include three more communities whose jurisdictions were not previously recognized under the Turkish or British rule.⁷ Israel has never attempted to put an end to the multiplicity of religious courts and unify them under a network of national courts, as Egypt did in 1955. Nor has it ever attempted to abolish the religious personal status laws of various communities and enact a secular and uniform civil code in their place, as India did in the 1950s. Rather, it has maintained a highly polycentric system of personal status in which the religious courts of fourteen state-recognized communities, staffed with their very own communal judges who apply religious laws of their own communities, are granted exclusive jurisdiction over matters of marriage and divorce and concurrent jurisdiction with the civil courts in regard to issues of maintenance and succession.
22. The adoption and utilization of the old *millet* structure came as a logical extension of Israel's exclusionary and theocratically-inclined ruling ideology. In this system of thought religion has been assigned to play an exceptionally important role in determination of the rights and duties of the citizen vis-à-vis the state. According to the ruling ideology, Israel was first and foremost the state of Jewish people, a distinct ethnic and religious category. Everyone else was a just second class subject or, at best, a second class citizen. In this regard, the archaic system of *millet* with its strict rules of endogamy has been viewed by the Israeli leaders as a useful tool for the preservation and homogenization of the Israeli-Jewish identity and the differentiation of non-Jewish communal identities by building a hierarchically stratified form of subjectivity that would fully correspond to their ideological vision.
23. In brief, the old *millet* system has been preserved to serve two major objectives: 1) protection and homogenization of Israeli-Jewish identity, and 2) differentiation of non-Jewish identities. That is to say, the *millet* system was further modified by the Israeli government with these two goals in mind. The primary objective, yet, was to create and secure a monolithic Israeli-Jewish national identity by drawing a single, visible ethnic boundary that would encompass all Jewish inhabitants of Israel who differed along ethnic, sectarian, linguistic and ideological lines (Woods 2008). The first step in this direction was taken with the recognition of the jurisdiction of Rabbinical Courts along with the religious courts of other communities over matters of marriage, divorce, maintenance and inheritance in 1947. Judaism has very strict rules of endogamy. Marriage is permissible only between a man and a woman who are both Halachically regarded as Jewish. In other words, marriage to non-Jews or Jews whose Jewishness is not vetted by rabbinical authorities is prohibited (Edelman 1994, p.61). In this regard, with its recognition of the monopoly of rabbinical authorities over marital affairs, the Israeli government aimed to maintain the purity the Israeli Jewish-identity and prevent its possible defilement through mixed marriages (Friedman 1995, p.61). In 1949, the Israeli government further fortified its position against exogamy by officially declaring that it would not introduce a provision for civil marriage and divorce that could potentially open the door to interreligious marriages, and thereby to the

⁵ For more on the Ottoman *millet* system, see Goffman (1994); Braude (1982); and Karpat (1982).

⁶ According to the Second Schedule to the Palestine Order in Council, as amended in 1939, the following communities were officially recognized by the Mandatory regime in addition to the Sunni Muslim community: the Eastern (Orthodox) Community, the Latin (Catholic) Community, the Gregorian Armenian Community, the Armenian (Catholic) Community, the Syrian (Catholic) Community, the Chaldean (Uniate) Community, the Jewish Community, the Greek Catholic Melkite Community, the Maronite Community, and the Syrian Orthodox Community (Wright 1952, p.127).

⁷ These three communities recognized after the establishment of the State of Israel are: the Druze Community (1957), the Evangelical Episcopal Church (1970), and the Bahai Community (1971) (Shava 1981, pp.239, 247; Goldstein 1992, p.145; Edelman 1994, p.51; Abou Ramadan 2003, p.255).

impurification and degeneration of the Jewish identity (Abramov 1976, p.194; Segev and Weinstein 1986, p.252).

24. Four years later, in 1953, the government took a much more radical step towards homogenization of the Israeli-Jewish identity with a new law that abandoned the earlier principle of voluntary association and forcefully imposed the jurisdiction of Judaic law and courts on all Jewish residents of the country. Now the jurisdiction of non-conformist Jewish communities (e.g., Karaites, Samaritans etc.) which enjoyed wide legal autonomy under the colonial rule was completely terminated and the state-run, Rabbinical Courts, which applied only the Orthodox version of *Halakhab*, were elevated to the position of government-backed status-conferring institutions to determine the privileges and disabilities of the Jewish citizens of Israel. In other words, with the passage of the 1953 Rabbinical Courts Jurisdiction (Marriage and Divorce) Law, Israeli authorities aimed to replace the internal plurality of Jewish law with a uniform legal structure which, they hoped, would help create a unified Jewish identity by removing the barriers to mixed marriages between Jews with different ethnic, sectarian and theological backgrounds who migrated to Israel from four corners of the world. After all, for the success of the Zionist nation-building project, an Oriental Jew from Yemen and an Ashkenazi Jew from Eastern Europe had to be able to marry one another without wondering whether his or her future spouse was a “proper” Jew. And this was precisely what the Israeli leaders had set out to achieve through their interventions in the personal status throughout the first decade of statehood (Bentwich 1964, p.244; Chigier 1967, p.156; Rubinstein 1967, p.386; Strum 1989, p.488).
25. The process of homogenization among Israeli Jews logically necessitated the invention and conservation of non-Jewish identities. In this regard, Israeli leaders also exploited the existing *millet* system as an instrument of exclusion and differentiation. In their eyes, differentiation of non-Jewish identities was not only necessary to ensure the purity of the Israeli-Jewish identity but also highly desirable to further divide the native population of Palestine along sectarian, tribal and ethnic lines for the establishment of an effective regime of control and domination (Lustick 1980, pp.133-135). In fact, the number of recognized religious communities, which are legally entitled to run their own religious courts, has soared from 11 to 14 under Israeli rule. Among these newly recognized communities, the case of Druze community is particularly indicative of the Israeli state’s exclusionary purposes in its preservation and modification of the old *millet* system. As once Ben-Gurion put it so eloquently, the main objective for the creation of Druze religious courts was to “foster among the Druze an awareness that they are a separate community vis-à-vis the Muslim community” (Firro 1999, p.94). In the final analysis, the old *millet* system was utilized by the Israeli state not only to guarantee the homogeneity of its Jewish population, but also to prevent the Druze, Christian and Muslim Arab communities from forming an overarching Arab or Palestinian identity by officially banning mixed-marriages between their members.
26. At the time of its independence, like Israel, Egypt too had inherited the very same *millet* system from the Ottomans and the British in which the government recognized the jurisdiction of fifteen ethno-religious communities⁸ in the field of personal status. With the passage of Law No: 462 in September 1955, however, the Egyptian government took a radical step towards institutional unification, and drastically lowered plurality of its personal status system. The new law abolished all communal courts including the courts of Muslim community and transferred their jurisdiction to national courts where civil judges were now put in charge of applying religious laws of parties in matters of personal status (Abécassis and Le Gall-Kazazian 1992). Yet, the institutional reform was not accompanied by normative reform that would unify the laws of various communities under a common civil code which could be uniformly applied to all Egyptian subjects irrespective of their religious affiliations.

⁸ These communities are: the Muslims, the Copts, both Orthodox and Catholic, the Melkites, the Greek Orthodox, the Maronites, the Armenian Gregorians, the Armenian Catholics, the Syrian Orthodox, the Syrian Catholic, the Chaldeans, the Roman Catholics, the Anglican Protestants, the Karaite Jews and the Rabbanite Jews.

27. The reason for the abstention of the Nasserite regime from normative reform is that it was primarily moved by such motives as to increase the efficiency of its central administration and reinstate the sovereignty of the Egyptian state by terminating non-state jurisdictions, rather than ideological considerations such as secularizing the public sphere or redefining the provisions of membership in the political community. In fact, concerns of bureaucratic rationality and sovereignty were so central to the process that the memorandum explaining motives for promulgation of Law No: 462 read more like a Weberian manifesto rather than a document prepared by a military government (Hajjar 1956; Safran 1958).
28. Although it was not explicitly stated in the memorandum for obvious reasons, another objective of Law No: 462 was to subjugate the Egyptian *ulama* and bring al-Azhar under the firm control of the government (Creelius 1966, p.35). In fact, by abolition of the *Shari'a* courts, the government was able to not only strip the members of *ulama* of their traditional privileges, but also to “break the independent political power of Islamic institutions so it could use them for its own [political] purposes” (Creelius 1980, p.65). Since government did not directly intervene in religious laws of communities by means of normative reform, the opposition to its measures mostly came from a small group of people whose interests were directly challenged by abolition of communal courts. Most notable among those who opposed Law No: 462 were members of *ulama* and leaders of Christian communities who lost their traditional privileges and status. In response, the Egyptian government successfully neutralized the opposition by co-opting religious leaders who in turn helped the government continue its program uninterrupted by publicly throwing their support behind the regime. Thus, from the mechanical perspective of the Nasserite regime, there simply was no need for normative reform, because not only it lacked ideological commitment to undertake such a costly and troublesome process but also the institutional unification achieved through Law No: 462 was deemed sufficient to attain the regime’s aforementioned political and bureaucratic goals.
29. India also inherited a similar model of personal status by the time of its independence in 1947. However, in terms of the form and degree of its plurality, Indian system was already at the point where Egypt ended up after its reforms in 1955. In other words, thanks to the British colonial rule, secular Indian judges at the national courts were already applying the personal laws of various religious communities⁹ in matters of family law as of 1947. Yet, especially in the aftermath of partition, the persistence of colonial institutions of personal law was considered as a serious impediment to achievement of national unity by the leaders of independent India. National unity, Gandhi and Nehru believed, was to be achieved only through establishment of a secular state. In such a state, they envisioned, communal and sectarian differences had to be wiped out and the people of India had to learn to think themselves, first and foremost, as members of a composite nation, not as members of a particular religious group or caste. In this regard, application of different bodies of law to citizens with different ethnic and religious backgrounds was simply not helping the cause of national unity. Hence, the next logical step for the new government was to end the normative plurality of its field of personal status by enacting a uniform civil code (UCC) that would be applicable to all citizens throughout the national territory. And, that desire of the founding fathers was embodied in Article 44 of the 1950 Constitution which stipulated that “the state shall endeavor to secure for the citizens a uniform civil code throughout the territory of India.”

⁹ The laws of following communities were applied in personal status matters of their members by the courts of British-India: Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Jews and Parsis. Sikhs, Jains and Buddhist can be also added to this list. Yet, the issue of whether these communities had historically their own religious precepts and norms that stood as independent legal systems in their own right is a matter of great controversy and debate in the literature (Mitra 1913, pp.49-82; Goswami 1994; Singh 1995; Kharak 1998; Jain 2004). Nonetheless, it must be also remembered that during the colonial period, the laws of these communities were usually accommodated and applied as part of the customary law and usage in accordance with the rulings of the Privy Council in London and several high courts in India. Moreover, some of these communities even came closer to being recognized as independent legal communities and granted certain privileges. In this respect, the 1909 Anand Marriage Act, which legally recognized a particular form of marriage that had long been exercised among the Sikhs, and the earlier Punjab Laws Act IV (1872), which had granted formal recognition to customary laws of Punjabi communities, including that of Sikhs, are particularly worth mention.

30. However, today, nearly six decades after the promulgation of the Constitution, India still does not have such a common code applicable to all citizens irrespective of their religion. This is because Indian leaders have not been able to overcome the opposition of religious minorities to the idea of a common civil code (especially the Muslim community), and unify the law once and for all. Instead, they carried out a limited version of normative reform that they originally planned by bringing Hindus, Sikhs, Jains and Buddhists under the purview of a single territorial law with a hope that it would encourage other communities to follow the course so that one day the entire country could be brought under the purview of a UCC. Even though the resultant Hindu Code Bill (HCB) reform of 1955-56 significantly reduced India's degree of plurality, it was still far from satisfying the ideological expectations of the secular regime as it was still a communal legislation in its essence. For instance, under the HCB it was not possible to solemnize a marriage between a "Hindu", as defined by law, and a non-Hindu.¹⁰ That is to say, the law was not really serving the regime's secular or inclusionary objectives. Therefore, the problem before the government was that if India was to be truly a secular and democratic nation, then it had to allow interfaith marriages and provide citizens with an alternative civil code of marriage, divorce, and succession, at least in the interim. In the end, all these considerations led the government to enact the Special Marriage Act (SMA) in May 1954 and make other secular remedies available to all its citizens irrespective of their religious affiliations (e.g., Section 125 of the CrPC of 1973). Yet, the question remains whether the availability of the 1954 SMA and other secular remedies have really provided Indian citizens with a protection against the encroachments of communal laws; and more importantly whether Indian citizens who were presented with these so-called secular alternatives were any better off than citizens of Israel and Egypt who were forcefully subjected to laws of their communities without an alternative like the 1954 SMA of India. The next section will answer these questions, while shedding light upon the impact of personal status laws on human rights in these three countries.

THE IMPACT OF PERSONAL STATUS SYSTEMS ON INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

31. It would plainly be wrong if matters of personal status were merely analyzed from an angle of judicial consolidation or nation-building, as they are intimately related to the rights and freedoms of the individuals who live under such systems. In other words, questions of who can marry whom or whether one could obtain a divorce are not just questions of identity or "border stones" demarcating communal boundaries. For a Christian woman who needs to change her religion to be able to divorce her husband in Egypt, for a Russian Jew forbidden to marry within Israel for not being considered a "proper" Jew by the rabbinical authorities, or for a Muslim woman in India who is ripped of her legal entitlements to maintenance by an unholy alliance between self-proclaimed leaders of her community and the Prime Minister, these questions are of utmost significance, as they often turn the everyday lives of millions of people upside down and cause years of suffering and tragedy.
32. The central premise of this working paper is that regardless of their form or degree polycentric personal status systems are invariably detrimental to the rights and freedoms of individuals who are subject to their jurisdiction. This is because personal status systems often institutionalize the "discriminatory" patriarchal structures and gender inequalities of major religious traditions by giving them formal recognition and state-sanctioned backing. Particularly, in countries where citizens are forcefully subjected to the jurisdiction of religious courts and norms without their clear consent, and where no alternative civil or secular procedures are made available for citizens who do not want to make use of the religious channel, the impact of formal plurality in personal status on rights and freedoms of citizens are even more severe.

¹⁰ Persons professing Hinduism, Sikhism, Jainism, and Buddhism were declared as "Hindus" for the purposes of the HCB. In the consecutive amendments, the definition of "Hindu" was further expanded to include any person who was not a Muslim, Christian, Jew or a Parsi by religion (Koenraad 2002)

33. Although personal status laws are detrimental to the rights and freedoms of all individuals, their impact on some groups tend, to be much harsher. These usually include women, children, religious dissidents, secular individuals, individuals who are not member of a “recognized” community (e.g., the Bahai in Egypt or Protestants in Israel), and persons who do not necessarily subscribe to the particular version of religious or customary law which are recognized and sanctioned by the courts. For example in the case of women’s rights, many religious traditions either explicitly discriminate against women or favor male relatives over females in familial matters such as marriage, divorce, inheritance and maintenance. Under Islamic law in Israel, Egypt and India, Muslim women’s right to divorce is severely truncated vis-à-vis the Muslim men who have a relatively easier access to divorce. The situation is no different for Jewish women who need to bribe or beg their husbands to receive a divorce writ (*get*) to be formally released from the bound of marriage or for the Hindu women who have been traditionally denied an equal share in allocation of joint family property.
34. As they exercise their jurisdiction communal courts also function as status-conferring institutions that determine rights and disabilities of majority of citizens who are subject to their purview. In personal status systems, an individual’s religious affiliation is more than a matter of personal conviction, but an issue of public law as it singlehandedly determines what set of norms should apply to his particular case. In this regard, authorities who are in charge of communal laws first need to determine what community a person belongs to. This often leads to the problem of defining who is a Jew; who is a Muslim; who is a Hindu and so forth, as authorities often need to investigate whether people truly belongs to the community they say they belong to on the basis of religious law. For example in Israel, rabbinical authorities refuse to marry individuals whose Jewishness according to *Halachic* criteria is in question. Given the fact that there is no civil marriage in Israel, rabbinical authorities’ refusal unmistakably means that these individuals will be permanently banned from marriage in the country. In fact, the problem has recently reached some worrisome levels. According to some, the number of Israeli Jews who are denied their most fundamental right to marry and establish a family is now well over 300,000 (Rosenblum and Tal 2004, p.5).
35. The failure of the state to protect the rights and freedoms of individual citizens against the encroachment of communal authorities in many countries have led individuals to take matters into their own hands and attempt to bring about the desired changes within the system through various means. One of the tactics frequently used by individuals to navigate through the maze of personal law is known as forum-shopping.¹¹ Forum shopping usually occurs in polycentric legal systems in which there are multiple normative orderings with parallel jurisdictions. In such systems, litigants alter their strategies accordingly and tend to move their cases from one jurisdiction to another in pursuit of legal gains by exploiting inherent inconsistencies and loopholes of polycentric jurisdictions. Among the cases analyzed in this paper, forum shopping is most visible in Egypt where Christian Egyptians frequently convert to Islam or migrate between different churches in order to escape disabilities imposed upon their rights by their own communities. For example, members of churches which do not allow divorce may migrate to another denomination which permits divorce and remarriage in the church. Similarly people have often exploited a loophole left by Law No: 462 of 1955. According to the law, non-Muslim couples who belonged to a different sect and rite were subject to Islamic law.¹² This encouraged non-Muslim litigants who wanted to divorce their spouses but were unable to do so under their communal laws to move to another church other than their spouses’ so that they can obtain a divorce under the Islamic law, which has a more liberal stance on divorce than many churches.
36. Some individuals and groups also respond to violations of their rights by forming hermeneutic or interpretative communities that challenge the officially-sanctioned restrictive and discriminatory

¹¹ Forum shopping can be briefly defined as “a litigant’s attempt to have his action tried in a particular court” of his choice where he thinks “he will receive the most favorable judgment” (Black, Nolan and Connolly 1979, p.590).

¹² Although Law No: 462 of 1955 was abrogated and replaced by Law No: 1 of 2000, this still holds true today under the Egyptian case law.

interpretations of religious precepts, and offer their own “progressive” or “deviant” interpretations in the hope of advancing their rights and reforming the communal structures from within. Groups seeking to alter communal practices employ a great variety of tactics. But, hermeneutic communities especially resort to moderate means to induce changes they desired through reform from within. In order to get the conservative communal authorities to agree to reform, they also seek the support of external actors (e.g., government representatives, judiciary, politicians, intellectuals etc.), build coalitions with like-minded groups, and lobby for judicial and legislative interventions in communal practices.

37. Such groups are best exemplified by women’s organizations in Egypt, Israel and India that challenge the hermeneutic monopoly of religious institutions and offer alternative women-friendly reinterpretations of religious norms in order to advance their rights to divorce, maintenance and inheritance. As mentioned above, in doing so such organizations could resort to a range of tactics from seeking intervention of judicial and legislative authorities to building coalitions to change the policy and influence the public opinion. The particular strategy or tactic that a hermeneutic group eventually adopts is usually determined by a number of factors including strategic objectives of the group, political and legal culture of the country, institutional constraints, opportunities and existence of a broader support structure (i.e., allies, financial and legal resources etc.) or lack thereof.
38. For a number of reasons, legislative tactics seem to be heavily favored by Egyptian women’s organizations, which ran a very successful grassroots campaign from the mid-1980s until the enactment of Law No: 1 in 2000 (the so-called *Kbul* Law) which expanded Muslim women’s right to divorce in Egypt. Apparently Egyptian women’s organizations drew very important lessons from the failure of the 1979 Jihan’s Law (No:44) that attempted to expand their rights through unpopular top-down processes (Hatem 1992). Most important lesson taken by women was that as evidenced in the Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court’s 1985 ruling, which struck down the 1979 Law as unconstitutional, a solely liberal or secular approach to personal status was likely to backfire and do more harm than good to the cause of Egyptian women. Thus, any change in the personal status laws had to be firmly rooted in historical sources and tradition of *Shari’a*. Indeed, for the next two decades, this is what the Egyptian women’s organizations did. They adopted the “strategy of engaging religious discourse, based on the women’s reading of their [own] rights under the principles of *Shari’a*” (Singerman 2005, p.161). In doing so, they successfully reinvented the Islamic tradition and expanded the scope of their rights after the discovery of a lesser known *hadith*, which eventually opened the door to the 2000 *Kbul* Law (Sonneveld 2007).
39. Another tactic most commonly employed by women’s organizations is legal mobilization, or instrumental use of the courts to challenge the legitimacy of patriarchal norms, raise awareness within the community, and lay the groundwork for long-term institutional changes from within using the threat of external judicial intervention. India has been a fertile ground for this type of legal work with its vigorous tradition of judicial activism and public interest litigation (Desai and Muralidhar 2000). In fact, since the 1980s the women’s rights organizations have increasingly resorted to this strategy, and with the help of some sympathetic judges they have pushed for some important changes in the personal status laws of the country. Especially in the aftermath of the infamous 1986 Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Divorce) Act, women’s organizations launched a judicial campaign through which they aimed to defeat the ill-famed legislation’s minimalist interpretation at courts that could further exacerbate the Muslim women’s right to post-marital maintenance. Their campaign reached its point of culmination in 2001 with the Indian Supreme Court’s Danial Latifi case in which the court overruled the restrictive interpretations of the legislation while upholding its expansionist interpretations that eventually extended the Muslim women’s right to postnuptial maintenance beyond the religiously-sanctioned *iddat* period (Subramanian 2005).

40. As they strive for legislative and legal changes in personal status systems hermeneutic communities often reach out to other groups who share a similar sense of deprivation and victimization, and build coalitions with them to fight against the oppression of personal status laws and institutions. These coalitions, which often take a cross-communal form, include a large variety of human rights organizations from different religious, sectarian, ethnic and ideological backgrounds. This trend has been particularly visible among the Israeli women's and human rights organizations which have come together to build a united front against patriarchal and religious oppression by transcending their communal boundaries. An example of these successful alliances is ICAR (International Coalition for *Agunah* Rights) that brings together 25 women's organizations from the North America and Israel in search of a solution to the problem of *agunot*¹³ (anchored women, plural of *agunah*). ICAR is a diverse array of organizations that includes women's organizations from Orthodox, Conservative and Reform streams as well as representatives of secular women's groups. In recent years ICAR has devoted a considerable part of its efforts to influence the process through which the *dayanim* (religious judges, plural of *dayan*) are appointed to the Israeli Rabbinical Courts. In fact, in December 2002, after an energetic lobbying campaign by ICAR members, Sharon Shenhav, an ICAR attorney, was successfully elected as one of two representatives of the Israel Bar Association to the ten-person commission that appoints the Rabbinical Court judges (Shenhav 2004).¹⁴ According to the law, only Orthodox Jewish men who are specialized in *Halakhab* can be appointed as a *dayan*. But, now, Shenhav tries to influence the process of selection, by making sure that only those judges, who are familiar with the problems of Jewish women under the religious law and are willing to work around these problems, get appointed to the courts.
41. Another successful example of such coalitions is the Working Group for Equality in Personal Status Issues, an alliance of various civil rights movements and women's groups representing Muslims, Jews and Christians in Israel. The Working Group was especially instrumental in passage of the Law of Family Courts Amendment (No: 5) of 2001, which equalized the legal status of Muslim and Christian women to that of Jewish and Druze women by granting them "the option of recourse in maintenance suits—as well as in all other matters of personal status, except for marriages and divorces – to the new civil family courts" (Shahar 2006, p.130).
42. Nonetheless, some hermeneutic communities adopt more subtle tactics. This is particularly true for religiously oriented conservative movements which usually strive for relatively limited openings in the system. For example, Kolech, an Israeli Orthodox women's organization that works with other feminist organizations to improve the status of women in Jewish law, embraces innovative methods to change the way *dayanim* interpret the *Halakhab*. Apart from organizing meetings in which both the representatives of women's organizations and *dayanim* participate, they also approach the wives of *dayanim* with a hope that they could influence the thinking of their husbands and help them adopt a more sympathetic stance towards the problems of Jewish women. Similarly, some religious groups, recognizing the urgency of problems people suffer under the personal status systems also offer some "religiously permissible" minor solutions. In such cases, however, as evidenced by some Orthodox groups which design *balachically* acceptable prenuptial agreements to ease the problem of *agunah* and *mamzerut* (bastardy) in Judaism, the main purpose of such religious initiatives is often to deflect threat of a more comprehensive reform by secular forces.
43. Although interpretative communities usually adopt moderate means and strive for limited changes from within, some of them may gradually become more marginalized and adopt a more

¹³ A woman denied a *get* (divorce writ) by her husband is technically called *mesurevet get* in Jewish law, yet the term *agunah* is much more commonly used. An *agunah* cannot get married to another man or conceive a child from a man other than her husband until her *get* is properly issued. Otherwise, her relationship will be deemed adulterous and her children will be stigmatized as *mamzerim* (a Biblical term referring to the offspring of such relationships and subsequent generations) whose offspring will not be allowed to marry other Jews for ten generations. The Ministry of Interior Affairs maintains a list of certified bastards or *mamzerim* in Israel. As of 2004, the list contained the names of 92 Israeli citizens (Rosenblum and Tal 2004, p. 39). For further information on legal consequences of bastardy in Israel, see Gross (2001) and Feldblum (1997-1998).

¹⁴ Ms. Shenhav was reelected for a second term in December 2005

radical agenda by demanding complete abolition of polycentric personal status systems. Examples of many postcolonial nations show that as these systems fail to respond to their demands or induce changes in the desired direction, such groups often cease to make use of mainstream channels of personal status and gradually evolve into “self-ruling” communities, by setting up their own judicial bodies that apply their own “version” of the law to the members of their self-proclaimed “communities”.

44. Self-ruling communities are best epitomized by such secular associations as the New Family in Israel that offers an alternative non-religious mode of marriage and divorce to Jews who do not want to be subject to the jurisdiction of rabbinical authorities, or by such religious organizations as the All India Muslim Personal Law Board (AIMPLB), which, after long years of dissatisfaction with the particular version of *Shari'a* applied by the Indian courts, decided to set up an alternative network of Islamic courts (*Darul Qazas*) and apply its own version of Islamic law in the field of personal status (Mahmood 2001). Governments' responses to emergence of these alternative bodies of law and justice widely vary from one case to another. For instance, the courts of the New Family organization or the rabbinical courts of Conservative and Reform movements in Israel do not have any official standing vis-à-vis the state's legal system, while in India both the government and courts tend to tolerate *Darul Qazas* and even recognize some of their decisions in accordance with the provisions of the 1996 Arbitration Act (Khan 2005; Thomas 2006).
45. In the final analysis, however, the rise of non-state normative orderings in an already polycentrically-organized legal system can be viewed as a failure of the central administration to regulate the plurality of its personal status field. Moreover, the rise of self-ruling communities would also undermine the authority of central government by directly challenging the theological and political legitimacy of its juridical control over the field of personal status. The same can be also said for hermeneutic communities. When they build cross-communal coalitions or offer deviant interpretations of state-sponsored religious norms, these communities challenge not only the authority of communal norms and institutions, but also the state and its value system that upheld a “discriminatory” system of personal status in the first place. In this regard, one can argue that in polycentric societies the field of human rights functions just as another site of resistance where boundaries of political community and hegemonic meta-narratives of gender and subjectivity are continuously contested and redefined by various groups and individuals who interact with the religious norms and institutions on a daily basis.
46. Yet, the field of human rights also serves as a testing ground where one can observe whether governments have actually attained any of their goals, which originally led them to intervene in legally polycentric structures through means of institutional, normative or substantive reform. For example, the original intent of the Israeli government to maintain the old *millet* system was the preservation and homogenization of the Israeli-Jewish identity. Given the fact that the existing personal status system has caused a serious state-society crisis and profound ideological divisions in the country and further fragmented the Jewish majority by dividing them into two groups as marriageable and unmarried Jews, one can argue that the *millet* system has, to a great extent, failed to produce its intended goals—particularly in regard to homogenization of the Jewish population.
47. Similarly, the goal of Nasserite regime in 1955 was to rationalize its legal system and break down the independent political power of religious authorities. However, the exploitation of the current system of personal status by fundamentalist groups to discredit the regime and secularist forces in Egypt (as shown by the infamous Abu Zayd case) and continuing use of such tactics as forum-shopping by individuals in pursuit of legal gains have shown that the half-baked reform of 1955 has only half-succeeded in its goals (Najjar 2000; Shaham 2006). Likewise, the Shah Bano of 1985 and the ensuing events demonstrated that the Indian leaders have, to a great extent, failed to establish a truly inclusionary and secular regime in which an individual's religious conviction or lack thereof was to play no role in determining her rights and freedoms. Considering the rising

number *Shari'a* Courts run by fundamentalist groups as well as the increasing communal violence across the country it becomes crystal clear that India is still light years far from the secular, democratic society that its founding fathers envisioned.

CONCLUSION

48. As noted earlier, all postcolonial nation responded to the challenges of legal pluralism and attempted to regulate their polycentric structures in accordance with their ideological orientations and regime choice. Interactions between the central authorities and societal forces opposing the state's interventions in familial and religious affairs have led to rise of particular forms and degrees of personal status in each country. Yet, this working paper has argued that, regardless of their form or degree, all personal status systems have been invariably detrimental to the rights and freedoms of individuals. Put this way, as far as the impact of personal status regimes on human rights is concerned, there have not been much difference between high and low degree plurality, nor for that matter between an exclusionary/theocratically-oriented regime and an inclusionary/secular one, as exemplified by the cases of Israel and India.
49. However, this should not come as a surprise, as yet no society seems to have come up with an answer to the question of whose rights should prevail if the rights of individuals and communities are in conflict; or to what extent a democratic regime should tolerate communal norms and institutions that exercise illiberal sanctions and restrictions upon their members; and when the state needs to intervene in order to save a citizen from the oppression of her community. In search of an answer to these question, many scholars, from Gutmann (2003), Shachar (2001), Rawls (1999), Kukathas (1992; 1998), Benhabib (2002), Young (2000) and Kymlicka (1995; 1996) to Barzilai (2003; 2004) have offered their own prescriptions and emphasized the importance of individuals' right to associate with and exit from their parochial communities. In plain words, they have argued that if international human rights standards are to prevail, citizens must be completely free to leave the communal track and transfer their disputes to civil courts at their own will, especially when there is a direct and imminent threat by communal norms and institutions to the constitutionally protected rights and freedoms of individuals.
50. Yet, like Kukathas (1992), I am of the opinion that an individual's right to exit is usually a hollow right, which exists merely on paper. The right to exit can be meaningful only if the community in question grants such a freedom willingly to its individual members and, more importantly, if there is a larger society outside which embraces liberal values and is willing to welcome the person after she has deserted her own cultural community. Unfortunately, individuals are usually not allowed to make their own decisions freely, especially when they dissent from the community's line of thinking; and even when they are courageous enough to raise their voice against the community, they often do not find a broader society embracing liberal values and waiting to welcome and protect them against the possible retaliations of their cultural communities. This is what happened to the seventy-five year old Shah Bano when she decided step outside of her communal boundary to make use of the so-called secular remedies guaranteed by the Indian state (Engineer 1987; Hussain 1992), and this is what could possibly happen to a Palestinian woman, should she ever dare to leave her own religious community and seek refuge in the larger Jewish polity in Israel.
51. This is a dire picture. But, there is still much to be hopeful about. There is a silent revolution taking place in personal status systems of many postcolonial nations. The revolution is spearheaded by hermeneutic communities which offer their deviant interpretations of officially-sanctioned religious norms and precepts in the hope of inducing some change from within. The change introduced through such means, as noted by the Human Rights Watch in its critique of Law No: 1 of 2000, which was passed as a result of Egyptian women's organizations' two-decade

long successful campaign (Deif 2004), may fall short of the so-called universal and secular standards of human rights. Moreover, the pace of change may not be “right”. The outcome may leave much to be desired. But they are symbolic changes as they often come about as a result of a grand bargaining between conservative and progressive forces in the society. That is to say, they usually better reflect the realities of their own societies. And by the same token, they are more likely to be readily adopted by the majority people. And they are more likely to affect the individuals’ rights in a more positive direction than those alien remedies which are often forcefully imposed upon non-western societies through top-down processes, and in the long run cause more harm than good by diminishing chances of ever upholding international human rights standards in these societies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abécassis, Frédéric and Le Gall-Kazazian, Anne. 1992. "L'identité Au Miroir Du Droit, Le Statut Des Personnes En Égypte (Fin 19e-Début 20e Siècle)". *Égypte-Monde Arabe* 11:11-38.
- Abou Ramadan, Moussa. 2003. "Judicial Activism of the Shari'ah Appeals Court in Israel (1994-2001): Rise and Crisis". *Fordham International Law Journal* 27:254-298.
- Abramov, S. Zalman. 1976. *Perpetual Dilemma: Jewish Religion in the Jewish State*. Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Allott, A. N., Epstein, A. L. and Gluckman, M. 1969. "Introduction", in *Ideas and Procedures in African Customary Law: Studies Presented and Discussed at the Eighth International African Seminar at the Haile Sellassie I University, Addis Ababa, January 1966*, edited by M. Gluckman. London: Oxford University Press, 1-92.
- Allott, Anthony. 1980. *The Limits of Law*. London: Butterworth.
- Anderson, J.N.D. 1958. "The Tunisian Law of Personal Status". *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 7:262-279.
- Barzilai, Gad. 2003. *Communities and Law: Politics and Cultures of Legal Identities*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 2004. "Culture of Patriarchy in Law: Violence from Antiquity to Modernity". *Law & Society Review* 38 (4):867-883.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 2002. *The Claims of Culture*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Benjamin, Braude. 1982. "Foundation Myth of the Millet System", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, edited by B. Braude and B. Lewis. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc., 69-88.
- Bennett, T. W. and Peart, N. S. 1983. "The Dualism of Marriage Laws in Africa", in *Family Law in the Last Two Decades of the Twentieth Century*, edited by T. W. Bennett. Cape Town: Juta, 145-170.
- Bennett, T. W. and Vermeulen, T. 1979. "Codification of Customary Law". *Journal of African Law* 23 (1):206-219.
- Benton, Lauren A. 2002. *Law and Colonial Cultures: Legal Regimes in World History, 1400-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bentwich, Norman. 1964. "The Legal System of Israel". *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 13:236-255.
- Berkes, Niyazi. 1998. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. London: Hurst Co.
- Black, Henry Campbell, Nolan, Joseph R. and Connolly, Michael J. 1979. *Black's Law Dictionary*. St. Paul: West Pub. Co.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1996. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Burman, S. 1983. "Roman-Dutch Family Law for Africans: 'The Black Divorce Court in Action'", in *Family Law in the Last Two Decades of the Twentieth Century*, edited by T. W. Bennett. Cape Town: Juta, 171-189.
- Butenschön, Nils A. 2000. "State, Power and Citizenship in the Middle East, a Theoretical Introduction ", in *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East: Approaches and Applications*, edited by N. A. Butenschön, U. Davis and M. S. Hassassian. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 3-27.
- . 2001. "*Politics of Ethnocracies: Strategies and Dilemmas of Ethnic Domination* ". [cited Feb 2006]. Available from <http://www.statsvitenskap.uio.no/ansatte/serie/notat/fulltekst/0193/index.html>.
- Carson, J. B. 1958. "Further Notes on the African Court System in Kenya". *Journal of African Administration* 10 (1):34-38.
- Charrad, Mounira M. 2001. *States and Women's Rights: The Making of Postcolonial Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chesterman, John and Galligan, Brian. 1997. *Citizens without Rights: Aborigines and Australian Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chigier, M. 1967. "The Rabbinical Courts in the State of Israel". *Israel Law Review* 2 (2):147-181.
- Cotran, Eugene. 1965. "Integration of Courts and Application of Customary Law in Tanganyika". *East African Law Journal* 1 (2):108-123.
- . 1996. "Marriage, Divorce and Succession Laws in Kenya: Is Integration or Unification Possible?" *Journal of African Law* 40 (2):194-204.
- Crecelius, Daniel Neil. 1966. "Al-Azhar in the Revolution". *The Middle East Journal* 20 (1):31-49.
- . 1980. "The Course of Secularization in Modern Egypt", in *Islam and Development: Religion and Sociopolitical Change*, edited by J. L. Esposito and H. Askari. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 49-70.
- Creevey, Lucy. 1996. "Islam, Women and the Role of the State in Senegal". *Journal of Religion in Africa* 26 (3):268-307.
- Dane, Perry. 1991. "Maps of Sovereignty: A Meditation". *Cardozo Law Review* 12 (3-4):959-1006.
- Darian-Smith, Eve and Fitzpatrick, Peter, eds. 1999. *Laws of the Postcolonial*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Deif, Farida. 2004. *Divorced from Justice: Women's Unequal Access to Divorce in Egypt*: Human Rights Watch.
- Desai, Ashok H. and Muralidhar, S. 2000. "Public Interest Litigation: Potential and Problems", in *Supreme but Not Infallible: Essays in Honour of the Supreme Court of India*, edited by B. N. Kirpal, A. H. Desai and G. Subramaniam. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 159-192.
- Edelman, Martin. 1994. *Courts, Politics, and Culture in Israel*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Engineer, Asgharali. 1987. *The Shah Bano Controversy*. Bombay: Orient Longman.

- Favali, Lyda and Pateman, Roy. 2003. *Blood, Land, and Sex: Legal and Political Pluralism in Eritrea*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Feldblum, Meir S. 1997-1998. "Baiyot Agunah Ve-Mamzerim--Ha-Tsat Pikaron Makifa Ve-Kolelet (a Proposal for a Comprehensive Solution to the *Agunah-Mamzer* Problem)". *Diné Israel* 19:203-217.
- Firro, Kais. 1999. *The Druzes in the Jewish State: A Brief History*. Leiden: Brill.
- Friedman, Menachem. 1995. "The Structural Foundation for Religio-Political Accommodation in Israel: Fallacy and Reality", in *Israel: The First Decade of Independence*, edited by S. I. Troen and N. Lucas. Albany: State University of New York Press, 51-82.
- Ghai, Yash P. 1975. "Notes Towards a Theory of Law and Ideology: Tanzanian Perspectives". *East African Law Journal* 11 (2):143-207.
- Goffman, Daniel. 1994. "Ottoman Millets in the Early Seventeenth Century". *New Perspectives on Turkey* 11:135-158.
- Goldstein, Stephen. 1992. "Israel : A Secular or a Religious State?" *Saint Louis University Law Journal* 36 (1):143-162.
- Goswami, Samanrendra Nath. 1994. *The Principles of Baba'i Personal Law*. Dhaka: The Bangladesh Law Times.
- Gross, C. Netty. 2001. "Fighting the Curse". *The Jerusalem Report*, Aug 13, 24-25.
- Gutmann, Amy. 2003. *Identity in Democracy*. Princeton N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Hajjar, Joseph P. 1956. "La Suppression Des Tribunaux Confessionnels En Egypte: Notes D'histoire Et De Droit". *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 6:11-27.
- Hatem, Mervat F. 1992. "Economic and Political Liberation in Egypt and the Demise of State Feminism". *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 24 (2):231-251.
- Hooker, M. B. 1975. *Legal Pluralism: An Introduction to Colonial and Neo-Colonial Laws*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hussain, Syed Jaffer. 1992. "Shari'ah, Shah Bano and the Supreme Court of India". *Islamic and Comparative Law Quarterly* 12:13-33.
- Jain, Champat Rai. 2004. *Selections from the Jaina Law*. Jaipur: Jaina Vidya Samsthana.
- Kahn-Freud, Otto. 1969. "Law Reform in Kenya". *East African Law Journal* 5:54-87.
- Karpat, Kemal H. 1982. "Millets and Nationality: The Roots of the Incongruity of Nation and State in the Post-Ottoman Era", in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, edited by B. Braude and B. Lewis. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers Inc., 141-169.
- Khan, Zafarul-Islam. 2005. "Petition Against "Shariat Courts" Is Miguided ". *The Milli Gazette* (Aug 19). [cited June 2007]. Available from <http://www.milligazette.com/dailyupdate/2005/20050818.htm>.
- Kharak, Singh. 1998. *On Sikh Personal Law*. Chandigarh: Institute of Sikh Studies.

- Koenraad, Elst. 2002. *Who Is a Hindu? Hindu Revivalist Views of Animism, Buddhism, Sikhism and Other Offshoots of Hinduism*. New Delhi: Voice of India.
- Kukathas, Chandran. 1992. "Are There Any Cultural Rights?" *Political Theory* 20 (1):105-39.
- . 1998. "Liberalism and Multiculturalism: The Politics of Indifference". *Political Theory* 26 (5):686-699.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1996. "Two Models of Pluralism and Tolerance", in *Toleration: An Elusive Virtue*, edited by D. Heyd. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 81-113.
- Larson, Gerald James. 2001. *Religion and Personal Law in Secular India: A Call to Judgment*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lewis, Bernard. 1968. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lustick, Ian. 1980. *Arabs in the Jewish State: Israel's Control of a National Minority*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Mahmood, Syed Tahir. 2001. The Shari'at Courts in Modern India In *Unpublished Paper*. Delhi: (On file with the author).
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Marx, Anthony W. 1996. "Contested Citizenship: The Dynamics of Racial Identity and Social Movements ", in *Citizenship, Identity and Social History*, edited by C. Tilly. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 159-184.
- Massad, Joseph Andoni. 2001. *Colonial Effects: The Making of National Identity in Jordan*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mirow, Matthew C. 2004. *Latin American Law: A History of Private Law and Institutions in Spanish America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Mitra, Siddha Mohana. 1913. *Anglo-Indian Studies*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Molyneux, Maxine. 1991. "The Law, the State and Socialist Policies with Regard to Women: The Case of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen 1967-1990", in *Women, Islam, and the State*, edited by D. Kandiyoti. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 237-271.
- Najjar, Fauzi M. 2000. "Islamic Fundamentalism and the Intellectuals: The Case of Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd". *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 20 (2):177-200.
- Ortaylı, İİber. 2004. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Aile*. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.
- Prinsloo, M. W. 1990. "Pluralism or Unification in Family Law in South Africa". *The International and Comparative Law Journal of Southern Africa* 23 (3):324-336.
- Rawls, John. 1999. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

- Read, James S. 1972. "A Milestone in the Integration of Personal Laws: The New Law of Marriage and Divorce in Tanzania". *Journal of African Law* 16 (1):19-39.
- Rosenblum, Irit and Tal, Eve. 2004. Report on the Status of the Israeli Family 2004. Tel Aviv: The New Family Organization.
- Rubinstein, Amnon. 1967. "Law and Religion in Israel". *Israel Law Review* 2 (3):380-414.
- Safran, Nadav. 1958. "The Abolition of the Shar'i Courts in Egypt - 1, 2". *The Muslim World* 48 (1; 2):20-28; 125-135.
- Schacht, Joseph and Layish, Aharon. 1991. "Mahkama", in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, edited by C. E. Bosworth, E. V. Donzel and C. Pellat. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1-42.
- Segev, Tom and Weinstein, Arlen Neal. 1986. *1949, the First Israelis*. New York: Free Press.
- Seidman, Robert B. 1978. *The State, Law and Development*. London: Croom Helm.
- Sezgin, Yüksel. 2004a. "A Political Account for Legal Confrontation between State and Society: The Case of Israeli Legal Pluralism", in *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society*, edited by A. Sarat and P. Ewick. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 199-235.
- . 2004b. "Theorizing Formal Pluralism: Quantification of Legal Pluralism for Spatio-Temporal Analysis". *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law* 50:101-118
- Shachar, Ayelet. 2001. *Multicultural Jurisdictions: Cultural Differences and Women's Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaham, Ron. 2006. "Shopping for Legal Forums: Christians and Family Law in Modern Egypt", in *Dispensing Justice in Islam: Qadis and Their Judgements* edited by M. K. Masud, R. Peters and D. S. Powers. Leiden: Brill, 451-469.
- Shahar, Ido. 2006. *Practicing Islamic Law in a Legal Pluralistic Environment: The Changing Face of a Muslim Court in Present-Day Jerusalem*. PhD Thesis, Middle East Studies, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva.
- Shava, Menashe. 1981. "Matters of Personal Status of Israeli Citizens Not Belonging to a Recognized Religious Community". *Israel Yearbook on Human Rights* 11:238-255.
- Shenhav, Sharon. 2004. "Busting the Old Boys' Club". *The Jerusalem Post*, Dec 1, 15.
- Singerman, Diane. 2005. "Rewriting Divorce in Egypt: Reclaiming Islam, Legal Activism, and Coalition Politics", in *Remaking Muslim Politics: Pluralism, Contestation, Democratization*, edited by R. W. Hefner. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 161-188.
- Singh, Harbinder Pal. 1995. "Indian Constitution & the Sikh Personal Law ". *The Sikh Review* 43 (10):25-30.
- Smith, Donald Eugene. 1963. *India as a Secular State*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Smootha, Sammy and Jarve, Priit. 2005. *The Fate of Ethnic Democracy in Post-Communist Europe*. Budapest: Open Society Institute.
- Sonneveld, Nadia. 2007. *Reinterpretation of Kbul' in Egypt: Intellectual Disputes, the Practice of the Courts, and Everyday Life*. PhD Thesis, Leiden University, Leiden.

- Strum, Philippa. 1989. "Women and the Politics of Religion in Israel". *Human Rights Quarterly* 11 (4):483-503
- Subramanian, Narendra. 2005. "Legal Pluralism, Legal Change and Gender Inequality: Changes in Muslim Family Law in India". Paper presented at *American Sociological Association*, Aug 12, Philadelphia.
- Thomas, Abraham. 2006. "Centre, Muslim Board in Sync on Shariat Courts". *The Pioneer* (Nov 11). [cited June 2007]. Available from <http://www.hvk.org/articles/1106/64.html>.
- Thompson, Elizabeth. 2000. *Colonial Citizens: Republican Rights, Paternal Privilege, and Gender in French Syria and Lebanon*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Vanderlinden, Jacques. 1989. "Return to Legal Pluralism: Twenty Years Later". *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law* 28:149-157.
- Wadud, Amina 2005. "Citizenship and Faith", in *Women and Citizenship*, edited by M. Friedman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 170-187.
- Woods, Patricia J. 2008. *Judicial Power and National Politics: Courts and Gender in the Religious-Secular Conflict in Israel*. Albany, N.Y.: Suny Press.
- Wright, Martin. 1952. *British Colonial Constitutions, 1947*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Yiftachel, Oren. 1997. "Israeli Society and Jewish-Palestinian Reconciliation: Ethnocracy and Its Territorial Contradictions". *Middle East Journal* 51 (4): 505-519.
- . 1999. "Ethnocracy: The Politics of Judaizing Israel/Palestine". *Constellations* 6 (3):364-390
- Young, Crawford. 1994. *The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Young, Iris Marion. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.