



Transnational family relations in migration contexts: British variations on European themes

SHAH, P

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://qmro.qmul.ac.uk/jspui/handle/123456789/3285>

Information about this research object was correct at the time of download; we occasionally make corrections to records, please therefore check the published record when citing. For more information contact scholarlycommunications@qmul.ac.uk

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Transnational Family Relations in Migration Contexts: British Variations on European Themes

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Prakash Shah

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

In writing this chapter¹ from near the western corner of the Eurasian landmass, it is evident that migration is involving an increasingly complex set of trans-jurisdictional activities worldwide. We have yet to come to grips with the kinds of legal navigation by individuals and families taking place across legal frontiers, although some theorists have begun to locate its place within wider phenomena of transnationalism.² Recent events evidently demonstrate the often conflictual context in which migration occurs, as well as its many dysfunctional consequences. Just before I began writing this chapter in December 2010, news came of a suicide bomb attack in Stockholm by a man who had reportedly become 'radicalized' in the English town of Luton. A number of arrests in various European countries have been taking place more or less simultaneously of men of migrant origin suspected of involvement in terror-related activities. The fairly high-intensity conflict-ridden profile of migrants and their descendants being built in Europe and elsewhere, hides a more widespread, lower-intensity conflict in which official laws are also implicated. State authorities are penalizing trans-jurisdictional legal navigation, which occurs in a wide range of settings, and often concerns families and kin networks.

It is well known that many of the major streams of post-Second World War immigration into Western Europe were followed by large-scale family reunification. By all accounts, such immigration has not stopped, but has diversified to a greater number of source countries, overlain by further, sometimes complex, processes of family reunification and formation. This

¹ The research leading to this chapter was performed within the framework of the RELIGARE project. This project received funding from the European Commission Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement number 244635.

² W.F. Menski, 'Immigration and Multiculturalism in Britain: New Issues in Research and Policy' (2002) XII *KLAPS: Bulletin of Asia-Pacific Studies* 43–66; F. von Benda-Beckmann, K. von Benda-Beckmann and A. Griffiths (eds), *Mobile People, Mobile Law: Expanding Legal Relations in a Contracting World* (Ashgate, Aldershot 2005); R. Cotterrell, 'Transnational Communities and the Concept of Law' (2008) 21(1) *Ratio Juris* 1–18; R. Ballard, 'The Dynamics of Translocal and Transjurisdictional Networks: A Diasporic Perspective' (2009) 1(2) *South Asian Diaspora* 141–66.

1 is part of the picture of 'superdiversity' in European cities conveyed by Vertovec.³ Relatively 1
2 less has been said, especially in the European literature, about the maintenance of family 2
3 relations across different countries and continents either among South–North migrants 3
4 or global diasporas, although important new writing is starting to fill the gap.⁴ The less we 4
5 inquire about the reality of globally dispersed families, the less we tend to know about the 5
6 methodological limits of our legal tools and concepts in that context. 6

7 The ostensibly contraceptive policy view from the North is that we are in control, and 7
8 should continue to closely regulate family migrants and how they arrange their legal relations. 8
9 This amounts to a denial by legislators and other legal actors of the plurality of modern Britain, 9
10 and contemporary Europe, which the leading British immigration lawyer, Ian Macdonald QC, 10
11 has referred to as ostrich-like behaviour, with one's head buried in the sand.⁵ Immigration 11
12 regulation certainly constitutes types of 'borders', now often deployed extraterritorially,⁶ 12
13 but other, mental borders are erected through legal systems as controls are imposed on the 13
14 more systemic pluralizing impact of the migrant presence, and the continuity of law within 14
15 transnational social fields,⁷ between 'here' and 'there'. Thus, attempts to freeze out legal alterity 15
16 go beyond the sections of officialdom concerned with immigration control, permeating other 16
17 areas of official behaviour. In this chapter, by discussing some evidence from Britain, I want 17
18 to nudge the reader a little more in the direction of considering these issues, concerning in 18
19 what ways and why officials and legal systems are effectively failing to do justice to migrant 19
20 families; and to take some steps towards rethinking the theoretical underpinnings of legal 20
21 systems so as to find ways to move forward, with a view to keeping policy and theory in 21
22 consonance with 'real life'. I do not, however, claim to say something completely new here. 22
23 The editor of this volume has already written about the necessity of a 'cultural jurisprudence' 23
24 as a social scientific and legal realist approach to the lives of migrants and ethnic minorities as 24
25 part of a newly required global ethic of civility.⁸ More recent writing has been grappling with 25
26 the problem of such intercultural human rights,⁹ although it may be said that we are still at the 26
27 beginnings of a new phase in legal studies. 27

28
29 ³ S. Vertovec, 'Super-diversity and its Implications' (2007) 30(6) *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29
30 1024–54. 30

31 ⁴ D. Bryceson and U. Vuorella, *The Transnational Family: New European Frontiers and* 31
32 *Global Networks* (Berg, Oxford 2002); R. Grillo (ed.), *The Family in Question: Immigrant and Ethnic* 32
33 *Minorities in Multicultural Europe* (Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2008); E. Kofman, 33
34 'Family-related Migration: A Critical Review of European Studies' (2004) 30(2) *Journal of Ethnic* 34
35 *and Migration Studies* 243–62. 35

36 ⁵ I. Macdonald, 'Preface' in P. Shah and W.F. Menski (eds), *Migration, Diasporas and Legal* 36
37 *Systems in Europe* (Routledge Cavendish, London 2006) xv–xviii. 37

38 ⁶ B. Ryan and V. Mitsilegas, *Extraterritorial Immigration Control: Legal Challenges* (Martinus 38
39 Nijhoff, Leiden 2010). 39

40 ⁷ N. Glick Schiller, 'Transborder Citizenship: An Outcome of Legal Pluralism within 40
41 Transnational Social Fields' in Benda-Beckmann, Benda-Beckmann and Griffiths (eds), *Mobile* 41
42 *People, Mobile Law*, 27–49. 42

43 ⁸ S. Juss, *Discretion and Deviation in the Administration of Immigration Control* (Sweet and 43
44 Maxwell, London 1997). 44

45 ⁹ Shah and Menski (eds), *Migration, Diasporas and Legal Systems in Europe*; R. Mehdi et al. 45
(eds), *Religion and Law in Multicultural Societies* (DJØF Publishing, Copenhagen 2008); R. Grillo et 45
al., *Legal Practice and Cultural Diversity* (Ashgate, Farnham 2009); M.-C. Foblets, J.-F. Gaudreault-

1 **The Landscape of Family-based Migration** 1

2
 3 In the north-western parts of Europe, the large-scale recruitment of southern European and 3
 4 non-European labour migrants for post-war reconstruction was followed by systematic 4
 5 recruitment stops.¹⁰ These ‘stops’ did not result in the curtailment of immigration but a 5
 6 change in its character. They led to widespread decisions among migrants to settle and 6
 7 sponsor their families, or to contract new marriages in the areas of origin of the migrants. 7
 8 Countries on the northern Mediterranean rim have more recently attracted immigrants and 8
 9 their families,¹¹ while countries to the east of the continent also appear to have new colonies 9
 10 of migrants from further east and south.¹² Refugee movements have added considerably 10
 11 to the diversity of Europe’s population and, in their shadows, a large number of irregular 11
 12 migrants have also come, irregularity often being a direct function of restrictive immigration 12
 13 policies.¹³ Although family migrants have tended to follow primary migrants, this is not 13
 14 inevitable, and families are often spread transnationally, while international commuting is 14
 15 not unknown. In recent decades, family members often accompany each other as forced 15
 16 migrants, who can find themselves detained by less than hospitable states, leading to 16
 17 a continuous stream of horror stories. Families are also sending young people ahead as 17
 18 bridgeheads for possible future immigration or merely for their safety and a better life, and 18
 19 such youngsters are often then involved in scenarios of trafficking and state paternalism to 19
 20 which they might become victims.¹⁴ Newly formed relationships are also leading to claims 20
 21 by migrants who may have entered on another basis to remain in Europe. While the race 21
 22 for talent and knowledge migrants is well underway among various countries,¹⁵ family 22
 23 members are often allowed to accompany such migrants, or their qualification to immigrate 23
 24 could partly depend on the status of a family member. 24

25 All these movements have led to the indelible pluralization of European societies, especially 25
 26 given the kinds of social change brought about by the establishment of newly cohering 26
 27 communities because of the presence of families and extended kin networks. As Castles et al. 27
 28
 29

30 DesBiens and A.D. Renteln (eds), *Cultural Diversity and the Law: State Responses from Around the* 30
 31 *World* (Bruylant, Brussels 2010). 31

32 ¹⁰ W.R. Böhning, *The Migration of Workers in the United Kingdom and the European Community* 32
 33 (Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, London 1972); S. Castles and G. 33
 34 Kosack, *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe* (Oxford University Press for the 34
 35 Institute of Race Relations, London 1973); S. Collinson, *Europe and International Migration* (Pinter 35
 36 Publishers, London 1993). 36

37 ¹¹ K. Calavita, *Immigrants at the Margins: Law, Race and Exclusion in Southern Europe* 37
 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005). 37

38 ¹² P. Nyíri, *New Chinese Migrants in Europe: The Case of the Chinese Community in Hungary* 38
 39 (Ashgate, Aldershot 1999); K. Romaniszyn, ‘The Cultural Implications of International Migrations’ 39
 40 (2004) 2(146) *Polish Sociological Review* 141–59. 40

41 ¹³ B. Bogusz et al., *Irregular Migration and Human Rights: Theoretical, European and International* 41
 42 *Perspectives* (Brill, Leiden 2004). 42

43 ¹⁴ J. Bhabha, ‘Lone Travelers: Rights, Criminalization, and the Transnational Migration of 43
 44 Unaccompanied Children’ (2000) 7 *University of Chicago Law School Roundtable* 269–94. 44

45 ¹⁵ A. Shachar, ‘The Race for Talent: High Skilled Migrants and Competitive Immigration 45
 Regimes’ (2006) 81 *New York University Law Review* 101–58. 45

1 indicated, already in the 1980s, these ethnic minorities are 'here for good'.¹⁶ Their networks 1
2 have induced further immigration, often overtly on the basis of family ties, but also hidden 2
3 among the many asylum applications. It has been noted that the family has become the main 3
4 channel for legal entry into the EU.¹⁷ Comparative evidence of marriage formation indicates 4
5 a strong preference among many groups of migrants for partners in the country of origin.¹⁸ 5
6 As Ballard shows, the migration 'escalators' that kinship furnishes, particularly through ties 6
7 of descent and marriage, operate as a strengthening factor of ethnic colonies in economic 7
8 no less than cultural terms.¹⁹ This 'bottom-up' equalizing strategy, which such migration 8
9 entrepreneurs use to challenge the uneven effects of 'top-down' globalization, combined with 9
10 the pluralizing consequences of kin-based immigration, have not been entirely welcomed in 10
11 European countries. 11

12 If recent evidence of voting patterns is anything to go by, European populations have 12
13 become increasingly nervous and frustrated about the new forms of ethnic alterity in their 13
14 neighbourhoods and in the economic sphere. The events of September 11 2001 and subsequent 14
15 terror incidents in different European cities have evidently had an impact by raising tensions. 15
16 The cry about a country being 'overrun by immigrants' is often heard. To the extent that states 16
17 have pursued policies of multiculturalism – that is, either a laissez-faire attitude towards such 17
18 diverse populations or active state support for the maintenance of their cultural activities –, 18
19 such policies have also come under intense scrutiny.²⁰ In October 2010, Germany's Chancellor, 19
20 Angela Merkel, noted that multiculturalism had utterly failed, while British Prime Minister 20
21 David Cameron has, at various times, spoken of multiculturalism as a wrong-headed doctrine, 21
22 entailing a divisive right to difference. Rules requiring integration impose some sort of 22
23 obligatory subscription to majoritarian values and practices. Such pressures are very manifest 23
24 in immigration control and citizenship criteria.²¹ 24

25 Since transnational marriages are identified as a liability to the integrity of the social 25
26 formations of European national states, and of European identity more broadly, they have 26
27 become obvious targets of control, although restrictions are by no means only directed 27
28 at spouses. British official policies and practices dictate which family members are to be 28
29 recognized, sometimes leading to ridiculous situations. Once waiting for another hearing at 29
30 the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal in London's Angel, we came across a woman sponsor of 30
31 a visitor from the Punjab, her husband's deceased brother's wife, waiting to hear the outcome 31
32 32

33 _____ 33
34 ¹⁶ S. Castles, H. Booth and T. Wallace, *Here for Good: Western Europe's Ethnic Minorities* (Pluto, 34
35 London 1984). 35

36 ¹⁷ E. Kofman and V. Meeto, 'Family Migration' in *World Migration Report 2008: Managing* 36
37 *Labour Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy* (International Organization for Migration, Geneva 37
2008), 151–72. 37

38 ¹⁸ E. Beck-Gernsheim, 'Transnational Lives, Transnational Marriages: A Review of Evidence 38
39 from Migrant Communities in Europe' (2007) 7(3) *Global Networks* 271–88. 39

40 ¹⁹ Ballard, 'Dynamics of Translocal and Transjurisdictional Networks'. 40

41 ²⁰ C. Joppke, 'The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy' (2004) 41
42 55(2) *The British Journal of Sociology* 237–57; R. Grillo, 'An Excess of Alterity? Debating Difference 42
43 in a Multicultural Society' (2007) 30(6) *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 979–98. 43

44 ²¹ O. Löwenheim and O. Gazit, 'Power and Examination: A Critique of Citizenship Tests' 44
45 (2009) 40(2) *Security Dialogue* 145–67; R. van Oers, E. Ersbøll and D. Kostakopoulou (eds), *A Re-* 45
definition of Belonging? Language and Integration Tests in Europe (Martinus Nijhoff, Leiden 2010).

1 of a preliminary hearing. There was a frenzied discussion outside as it was realized that, 1
 2 because the relationship between the two women was not among those listed, the intended 2
 3 visitor did not qualify as a 'family visitor', and therefore had no right to appeal against being 3
 4 refused a visa.²² In other cases, legal policies and official practices dictate the range of eligible 4
 5 marriage partners, and when a marriage or other family relationship is considered legitimate 5
 6 or valid. These policies and practices, which often run counter to norms accepted within the 6
 7 communities concerned or the family laws of other countries, reach beyond the immigration 7
 8 control sphere, infesting a range of other official legal forums. 8

9 Assessment of family relationships of people from non-Western cultures means that they 9
 10 are subjected to an intense gaze upon their 'alien' traditions. Immigration control and other 10
 11 legal arenas thereby become the location for an Orientalist (re)construction of family norms 11
 12 of the non-Western 'other'. Such traditions are judged as being inherently deficient from a 12
 13 dominant Western perspective. A passage from a book by Prof. Jackson, also a one-time Vice 13
 14 President of the Immigration Appeal Tribunal, reveals one such construction: 14

15
 16 There is undoubtedly a problem connected with marriage in immigration 16
 17 terms. Marriage offers to young men and women a way of radically improving 17
 18 their economic standard of living and no doubt in some cases an opportunity 18
 19 for financial gain by those who by virtue of tradition have it in their power 19
 20 to offer it. This is especially so where arranged marriages are the norm and 20
 21 where children (particularly daughters) continue to marry as they are directed 21
 22 by their parents.²³ 22

23
 24 The remarkable part of this passage is not the fact that non-Western marriages are cast as 24
 25 'traditional', presumably as opposed to modern, Western marriages, nor any inaccuracy in 25
 26 its description of the former. Rather, it is the impulse to their problematization *because* of their 26
 27 different nature and dynamics. Neither is the relevance of this kind of statement reduced 27
 28 because others in positions of power construct their own accounts justifying the derisory 28
 29 treatment of non-Western family relations. Take the following statement in a case concerning 29
 30 the recognition of Hindu law adoptions in India decided by the Asylum and Immigration 30
 31 Tribunal: 31

32
 33 Nobody is entitled to say 'I have adopted (or been adopted) according to my 33
 34 rules; therefore you are obliged to recognise the adoption as entirely valid 34
 35 under your rules'. Unless an Indian adoption can be found to be subject to the 35
 36 same requirements and the same intentions, and to have the same effects as an 36
 37 adoption in the United Kingdom, there would appear to be no reason why it 37
 38 should be treated as though it were a United Kingdom adoption. And if it is 38
 39 not to be treated in general as a United Kingdom adoption, there is no reason 39
 40 why it should be treated as a United Kingdom adoption for the purposes of 40
 41 the Immigration Rules. The truth of the matter is that adoption means different 41
 42 42

43
 44 ²² See the Immigration Appeals (Family Visitor) (No. 2) Regulations 2000, SI 2000 No. 2446, 44
 45 at para. 2(2). 45

²³ D. Jackson, *Immigration: Law and Practice* (Sweet and Maxwell, London 1996) 396.

1 things in different countries. The fact that the same word is used does not mean 1
2 that the effects are, or ought to be, the same.²⁴ 2
3 3
4 Again, the problem with differences in the ways of formalizing family relationships and in 4
5 their effects militates against their recognition, as if every culture should be a carbon copy of 5
6 Western norm patterns. Evidently, there will be a variety of such discourses. Notwithstanding 6
7 that variety, we find a widespread replication of negativity towards non-Western families in 7
8 British and other Western legal systems. Further, whatever instrumentalities may lie behind a 8
9 particular policy, legal restrictions are often enough premised on this negativity. Read as the 9
10 Western framing of the other through the former's own experience, 'legal Orientalism' plays a 10
11 key role in shaping policy towards transnational family migrants.²⁵ The much bigger question 11
12 entailed by the quoted statement is whether family forms arising in different cultural contexts 12
13 should indeed be treated as equivalent to a category existing within Western law or whether, 13
14 because they are indeed set within a different cultural framework, they ought to be recognized 14
15 as different, known as such, *and* be given recognition in their own right. My own view is that 15
16 the latter option is the better one and offers the greatest scope for pluralism.²⁶ 16
17 17
18 18
19 19

20 Whom to Marry 20

21 21
22 Individuals also encounter pulls in other directions in these complex transnational conflicts 22
23 within legal pluralism.²⁷ European countries are obliged to ensure respect for family life. 23
24 This is significantly the result of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and 24
25 specifically its Articles 8 (respect for private and family life) and 12 (right to marry and found 25
26 a family). Various instruments agreed at EU level also oblige some minimal respect for the 26
27 family lives of third country nationals. Although the UK remains reluctant to sign up to these, 27
28 minimal recognition of family unity is found in immigration legislation and rules. Not least 28
29 29

30 _____ 30
31 ²⁴ *SK ('Adoption' not recognised in the UK) India* (2006) UKAIT 00068. This case is discussed in 31
32 more detail in P. Shah, 'Transnational Hindu Law Adoptions: Recognition and Treatment in Britain' 32
33 (2009) 5(2) *International Journal of Law in Context* 107–30. In the event, the adopters won their appeal 33
34 against refusal of a dependent visa to the child, not under the adoption rules or by using human 34
35 rights and discrimination arguments, but under the rule allowing admission of relatives whose 35
36 exclusion is considered undesirable because of compassionate circumstances. 35

36 ²⁵ On this reading of Orientalism, see S.N. Balagangadhara and M. Keppens, 36
37 'Reconceptualising the Postcolonial Project: Beyond the Strictures and Structures of Orientalism' 37
38 (2009) 11(1) *Interventions* 50–68. For the legal application of Orientalism, see T. Ruskola, 'Legal 38
39 Orientalism' (2002) 101(1) *Michigan Law Review* 179–234. 39

40 ²⁶ This option goes beyond that of mere translation, which is flagged up by W.F. Menski, 40
41 *Comparative Law in a Global Context: The Legal Systems of Asia and Africa* (Cambridge University 41
42 Press, Cambridge 2006) 67. For a problematization of the loss in transplantation of the Islamic 42
43 legal institution of *mahr* in the courts of four Western countries, see P. Fournier, *Muslim Marriage* 42
43 *in Western Courts: Lost in Transplantation* (Ashgate, Farnham 2010). Fournier's book thus provokes 43
44 thinking about the analogies between translation and transplantation. 44

45 ²⁷ For 'legal pluralism in conflict', see M. Chiba, 'Other Phases of Legal Pluralism in the 45
Contemporary World' (1998) 11(3) *Ratio Juris* 228–45. 45

1 among them are the national recognition of ECHR norms and the availability of appeals and 1
 2 judicial review to contest the non-recognition of family unity by officials. EU free movement 2
 3 rules, adopted through Italian pressure in the 1960s, before immigration became the hot 3
 4 potato that it now is, continue to confer the widest recognition of family unity, justified earlier 4
 5 on economic grounds, and now also on human rights grounds.²⁸ The economic justification for 5
 6 family unity used by the European Court of Justice has not found appeal beyond the EU free 6
 7 movement context, an illustration of how the ground shifts depending on what types of family 7
 8 one is dealing with. There obviously remains a key tension between national and EU systems 8
 9 of regulation, a tension that shows up especially when third country nationals lay claim to 9
 10 EU rights of family unity. However, this discussion presupposes that we are speaking in a 10
 11 context where there is a basic recognition of family unity, although now increasingly hedged 11
 12 about by different restrictions. In contrast, some labour importing Asian states have remained 12
 13 resistant to recognizing a right of family unity for migrants to avoid the kinds of secondary 13
 14 immigration flows that Europe has experienced. In some countries, such as Turkey and 14
 15 Bangladesh, immigrating spouses of nationals are not necessarily given the right to work, an 15
 16 issue that is also relevant in British immigration decision making when considering whether 16
 17 married life is viable elsewhere. 17

18 While agreeing that the Convention was engaged in immigration cases, the European 18
 19 Court of Human Rights in the *Abdulaziz* case declined to hold that a state was obliged by 19
 20 Article 8 alone to allow a couple to reside in the state of their choosing, stating, 20

21
 22 The Court observes that the present proceedings do not relate to immigrants 22
 23 who already had a family which they left behind in another country until they 23
 24 had achieved settled status in the United Kingdom. It was only after becoming 24
 25 settled in the United Kingdom, as single persons, that the applicants contracted 25
 26 marriage ... The duty imposed by Article 8 cannot be considered as extending 26
 27 to a general obligation on the part of a Contracting State to respect the choice by 27
 28 married couples of the country of their matrimonial residence and to accept the 28
 29 non-national spouses for settlement in that country.²⁹ 29

30
 31 Therefore, unless an element of discrimination can be shown to have been present (as the 31
 32 applicants in that case were able to establish), or the non-viability of family life elsewhere can 32
 33 be shown, the Convention's right to family life does not go very far to respect the residence 33
 34 choices of spouses. The lower level of protection offered to families by the Court underlines 34
 35 the minimal relevance of the ECHR in restraining states' ability to control spouse entry and 35
 36 residence, and has subsequently been criticized as a failure of the European human rights 36
 37 protection system.³⁰ 37

38
 39
 40 ²⁸ Contrast, for example, Case C-370/90 *R v Immigration Appeal Tribunal Ex p Secretary of State* 40
 41 *for the Home Department* [1992] ECR I-4265 with Case C-60/00 *Carpenter v Secretary of State for the* 41
 42 *Home Department* [2002] ECR I-6279. 42

43 ²⁹ *Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v UK* (1985) 7 EHRR 471 [68]. 43

44 ³⁰ See the special issue (2009) 11(3) *European Journal of Migration and Law*, especially the 44
 45 articles by De Hart and Farahat, on the shortcomings of the European Court of Human Rights 45
 jurisprudence in the field of family migration.

1 A series of similar restrictive norms and practices have been applied across European 1
2 states to prevent members of such minorities relying on established preferences for marriage 2
3 with their kin groups based elsewhere. The UK appears to have been a pioneer in this respect. 3
4 Sachdeva documents the discriminatory immigration controls chiefly applied to South Asian 4
5 spouses, mainly husbands, in the 1980s and 1990s under the so-called 'primary purpose rule'.³¹ 5
6 That rule was finally abolished in 1997, but not before the British government had attempted, 6
7 unsuccessfully, to smuggle it into EU law. Juss further describes the application of immigration 7
8 restrictions on family members through various other methods, including questioning the 8
9 veracity of family relationships, finding problems with documentary evidence, casting doubt 9
10 on the credibility of applicants, and so on.³² Both writers demonstrate forms of 'othering' at 10
11 the appellate and judicial review stages as well as during initial decision making at visa posts 11
12 abroad. Having human rights guarantees does not therefore mean that states will not find 12
13 some room for maneuver in establishing practices that frustrate family unity or married life. 13

14 Meanwhile, reading the way it treated the factual background in the *Abdulaziz* case more 14
15 closely, it is evident that the Court thought that choosing to marry a non-national spouse 15
16 whose leave to remain in the UK had already expired, or was about to expire soon, should 16
17 have put the sponsoring wives on notice that the immigration rules would be against them. 17
18 This instruction to marry only those who have some sort of security of residence effectively 18
19 means that legal systems, including the Human Rights Court, participate in creating a 19
20 hierarchy of desirable spouses, virtually overriding the aim of Article 12 and its right to marry 20
21 and found a family, also with discriminatory consequences. As immigration lawyers know all 21
22 too well, the insinuation that one should be more careful in one's choice of spouse is not at all 22
23 unusual among officials, including some judges. In one case I was instructed on as an expert 23
24 witness in 2010, the immigration judge had held that continuing family life in Bangladesh 24
25 for the appellant and her British citizen cohabitant (with three children) would not pose 25
26 insurmountable difficulties. After all, the man who was of Afghan origin, had naturalized as 26
27 a British citizen, and had been in the UK for less than ten years!³³ The Home Office had even 27
28 proceeded to make removal directions to Bangladesh for all five family members, including 28
29 the British citizen man and the child they had together who was also a British citizen. It is no 29
30 longer enough to be a 'white' British person to establish the right of a spouse to accompany one 30
31 in the UK. In another recent instance, a British citizen woman now living in Turkey with her 31
32 Turkish citizen husband, but facing economic and adjustment difficulties there, was told that 32
33 he would not be admitted into the UK, effectively obliging the couple to remain in Turkey or 33
34 explore other possibilities. Ironically, legal admission for such a couple under free movement 34
35 rules into a European Economic Area state other than the UK would be far easier, assuming 35
36 the lack of other hurdles. 36

37 A number of schemes have been developed in recent years premising the right to family 37
38 formation or reunification upon prospective spousal entrants passing (European) language 38
39 and culture 'integration tests'. In the Netherlands (since 2006) and Germany (since 2007) 39
40 pre-entry language tests have been required for citizens of most countries intending to 40

41
42
43 ³¹ S. Sachdeva, *The Primary Purpose Rule in British Immigration Law* (Trentham Books, Stoke-
on-Trent 1993).

44 ³² Juss, *Discretion and Deviation*.

45 ³³ Appeal no. AA/02434/2009, Determination dated 19 May 2009.

1 immigrate as spouses.³⁴ British policy has caught up with these countries. From 29 November 1
 2 2010, an English language test or evidence of English language competence is required of 2
 3 spouses applying to join partners in the UK who are not nationals of European Economic 3
 4 Area countries, Switzerland, or of a country listed as being majority English speaking.³⁵ 4
 5 However, the status of the sponsoring spouse is also important, in that the rules do not apply 5
 6 to spouses of sponsors who are European Economic Area nationals, again reflecting the above- 6
 7 mentioned tension between EU free movement law and ‘domestic’ rules. These contemporary 7
 8 restrictions in several European countries are increasingly beginning to resemble immigration 8
 9 controls applied in what is now South Africa and Australia during the late nineteenth- and 9
 10 early twentieth century, when language tests were also being used to reject non-European 10
 11 immigrants. Other measures include raising the eligible age for spouse visas to be issued 11
 12 as compared to the legal age for marriage *within* the legal systems concerned, as well as the 12
 13 growing policing of marriages on the pretext of ensuring that such unions have been entered 13
 14 into by ‘free consent’, and are not a result of familial pressure and therefore not ‘forced’.³⁶ In 14
 15 fact, the UK’s requirement that both spouses be of 21 years of age was justified on the basis 15
 16 of concerns about forced marriages. This raising of the qualifying age was recently held to be 16
 17 unlawful for its ‘sledgehammer’ attempt to curb forced marriages, and therefore in breach of 17
 18 the common law, and a disproportionate interference with the Convention’s rights to family 18
 19 life and to marry.³⁷ 19

20 The freedom to marry within Britain also became the subject of restrictions eliciting a 20
 21 finding by the European Court of Human Rights, in the *O’Donoghue* case,³⁸ of a violation by 21
 22 the UK of the right to marry in Article 12. Under the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of 22
 23 Claimants, etc.) Act 2004, the UK introduced a requirement, with effect from February 2005, 23
 24 for a certificate for approval for marriage by application to the Home Office. Those who were 24
 25 not European Economic Area nationals or did not have indefinite leave to remain in the UK 25
 26 were obliged to acquire a certificate of approval upon paying a fee and submitting relevant 26
 27 documents. Only after that could they apply to a designated registrar for a licence to marry. 27
 28 Those marrying in the Anglican Church were exempt from such a requirement, while those 28
 29 who had less than three months remaining on a six-month visa did not qualify at all for a 29
 30 certificate. The scheme remained in place despite several British court judgments, including 30
 31 by the House of Lords, pronouncing it as being a violation of Article 12.³⁹ 31
 32 32

33
 34 ³⁴ K. McGauran, ‘Germany’s Immigration Amendment Act of 2007: Achieving Integration 34
 35 of Foreigners?’ (2007) 21(4) *Journal of Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Law* 295–310; Human 35
 36 Rights Watch, *The Netherlands: Discrimination in the Name of Integration* (May 2008), at [http://www.](http://www.hrw.org/legacy/backgrounder/2008/netherlands0508/) 36
 36 www.hrw.org/legacy/backgrounder/2008/netherlands0508/, accessed 31 December 2010.

37 ³⁵ ‘Listed’ does not mean that all countries where there may be a majority of English speakers, 37
 38 such as Nigeria or Philippines, are recognized. Only an ability to speak and understand seems to 38
 39 be required, and not any level of literacy. 39

40 ³⁶ H. Wray, ‘Moulding the Migrant Family’ (2009) 29(4) *Legal Studies* 592–618. 40

41 ³⁷ *Quila & Anor v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2010] EWCA Civ 1482. The Home 41
 42 Office has signalled its intention to appeal the case to the Supreme Court. 42

43 ³⁸ *O’Donoghue and others v the United Kingdom*, App. No. 34848/07 (ECHR, 14 December 2010) 43
 44 (*O’Donoghue*). 44

45 ³⁹ For the House of Lords judgment, see *R (on the application of Baiyai and others) v Secretary of* 45
 45 *State for the Home Department* [2008] UKHL 53, [2009] 1 AC 287 (*‘Baiyai’*).

1 Despite successive adjustments, widening the range of qualifying applicants, and 1
2 eventually eliminating the fee requirement, the scheme remained in place. The British state 2
3 was effectively saying that those not possessing the relevant leave to remain were not eligible 3
4 marriage partners, even though marriages in the Anglican Church would escape scrutiny. 4
5 Even those qualifying for a certificate would have to pay for the privilege of being granted 5
6 one, thus raising the cost of marrying. One of the applicants in *O'Donoghue* was Nigerian, and 6
7 did not have leave to remain or permission to take up employment on account on his pending 7
8 application for asylum. His intended wife was on social welfare benefits and the fees charged 8
9 were consequently unaffordable. After changes to the scheme he was eventually granted a 9
10 certificate of approval to marry. The European Court nevertheless found that the operation 10
11 of the scheme violated the couple's right to marry because of his initial ineligibility and, later, 11
12 because of the fees charged. It also found the scheme to be discriminatory in conjunction with 12
13 the right to marry and freedom of religion. 13

14 The certificate of approval scheme was rightly criticized by the European Court. Having 14
15 said that, the Court's jurisprudence has not necessarily been rigorous enough against other 15
16 state interferences in the marrying process. In *O'Donoghue* itself, the Court stated with 16
17 reference to the House of Lords judgment and previous ECHR case law: 17
18

19 It is clear from the Court's case-law and from earlier Commission decisions that 19
20 a Contracting State may properly impose reasonable conditions on the right of 20
21 a third-country national to marry in order to ascertain whether the proposed 21
22 marriage is one of convenience and, if necessary, to prevent it. Consequently, 22
23 a Contracting States will not necessarily be acting in violation of Article 12 of 23
24 the Convention if they subject marriages involving foreign nationals to scrutiny 24
25 in order to establish whether or not they are marriages of convenience ... 25
26 Such scrutiny may be exercised by requiring foreign nationals to notify the 26
27 authorities of an intended marriage and, if necessary, asking them to submit 27
28 information relevant to their immigration status and to the genuineness of the 28
29 marriage. Moreover, a requirement that a non-national planning to marry in a 29
30 Contracting State should first obtain a certificate of capacity will not necessarily 30
31 violate Article 12 of the Convention ... Consequently, the Court agrees with 31
32 the House of Lords that the requirement under section 19 of the 2004 Act that 32
33 non-EEA nationals submit an application to the Secretary of State for the Home 33
34 Department for a Certificate of Approval before being permitted to marry in the 34
35 United Kingdom is not inherently objectionable.⁴⁰ 35
36

37 While the judgment was followed with an announcement by the UK government that 37
38 the scheme was to be abolished, states could still conceivably continue to find room for 38
39 maneuvering around the somewhat loose restrictions imposed upon them by the ECHR, 39
40 penalizing migrants for their marriage choices.⁴¹ It is not unusual to encounter allegations that 40
41

42
43 ⁴⁰ *O'Donoghue*, [87]. 43

44 ⁴¹ See also *Baiai*, [20–21] for discussion of other European Court of Human Rights judgments 44
45 – *Sanders v France* (1996) 87 B-DR 160 and *Klip and Krüger v Netherlands* (1997) 91 A-DR 66 – in 45

1 a marriage is one of convenience, which sets up married persons for a potentially expensive 1
2 and time-consuming struggle through the legal process.⁴² 2

3
4
5
6 **Valid Relationships** 6
7 7

8 The almost obsessive control by European legal systems of the marriage process seems in 8
9 stark contrast to the relative flexibility for marrying in non-Western jurisdictions, where non- 9
10 state forms of marriage are often accepted as valid. Establishing the existence of marriage or 10
11 other family relationship, whether it is one conducted abroad or even in Britain, is increasingly 11
12 becoming an area of contestation. While the rules of private international law ostensibly 12
13 ensure that legal acts in one jurisdiction are afforded recognition in another, the process 13
14 of gaining such recognition is far from smooth and sometimes impossible. The ostensible 14
15 underpinning of private international law by the principle of the 'comity of nations' is 15
16 therefore often violated in practice. This is down to a number of reasons. Private international 16
17 law rules are now often premised on compliance with Western norms systems, rather than 17
18 concerned to confer recognition on relationships formalized under foreign rules. In such 18
19 instances, the comity of nations principle seems violated by the unilateral Western insistence 19
20 that 'our' norms be followed, whether this is done by laws imposed in a single jurisdiction, 20
21 like England, or through international conventions that actually hide the limited and far 21
22 from global consensus behind them. This could be seen as a contemporary form of 'legal 22
23 imperialism' as evidenced, in earlier times, by the imposition of extra-territorial jurisdictions 23
24 in non-Western countries by Western countries.⁴³ Even when it is likely that recognition could 24
25 be forthcoming, for example in the vast majority of marriage cases, the application of private 25
26 international law rules is subverted by mischievous decision making in practice. There also 26
27 remains widespread ignorance among officials of how rules in foreign jurisdictions function, 27
28 which leads to their erroneous interpretations by British officials. The default position adopted 28
29 in such circumstances is that foreign rules should look like ours, with consequent penalties 29
30 for individuals and families for following a foreign rule system. The unilateral imposition 30
31 of extra-territorial norms is well exemplified by Ramnik Shah's account of practice by visa 31
32 officials at the British High Commission in Kenya requiring evidence of marriage registration 32
33 from South Asian applicants in defiance of Kenyan rules that recognize marriages without 33
34 need for registration.⁴⁴ 34

35
36
37 which restrictions imposed by states have been upheld as showing no violation of the Convention. 37
38 The same cases feature in the Strasbourg judgment in *O'Donoghue*, [87]. 38

39 ⁴² The use of such allegations is also open in cases with an EU element after the decision 39
40 of the ECJ in Case C-109/01 *Secretary of State for the Home Department v Akrich* [2003] ECR I-9607, 40
41 [2003] 3 CMLR 26 after the UK government's suggestion that a marriage of convenience test was 41
42 necessary. 42

43 ⁴³ T. Kayaoğlu, *Legal Imperialism: Sovereignty and Extraterritoriality in Japan, the Ottoman* 43
44 *Empire, and China* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2010). 44

45 ⁴⁴ R. Shah, 'The Phenomenon of the (UK) Officially Inspired Forced Marriages' (2005) 19(3) 45
Journal of Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Law 195–8. 45

1 There is no doubt, meanwhile, that family law is becoming internationalized in so far as it 1
2 must reckon with legal acts in other countries because of increasing trans-jurisdictionalism. It 2
3 is worth noting the observation by Murphy that, 3
4 4
5 English family law has had to broaden its horizons in recent years to deal 5
6 adequately with the myriad of novel issues raised by migrant single adults, 6
7 migrant families and migrant children. Indeed, there can be no doubt that for 7
8 a significant minority of people either resident or domiciled in this country, 8
9 the traditional boundaries of family law (at least so far as it is taught in English 9
10 law schools) fail to accommodate or give adequate emphasis to what are now 10
11 crucial international dimensions.⁴⁵ 11
12 12
13 While Murphy is undoubtedly correct in his criticism, his general reliance on the rearrangement 13
14 of the rules of private international law as a way of solving problems is not convincing enough, 14
15 because it depends far too much on existing conceptual apparatus of private international law, 15
16 which increasingly appears outmoded, and still subject to official abuses in practice. Rather, 16
17 much new thinking seems required that takes on board the virtually limitless plurality that 17
18 now faces official legal orders. It is certainly not enough for family lawyers to remain focused, 18
19 as happens often within family law curricula, on the more trendy Western developments such 19
20 as the recognition of heterosexual cohabitantes or same-sex partnerships, which are also driving 20
21 reforms in the migration context. The champions of such developments generally tend to 21
22 remain silent on the othering of non-Western family relationships, or even perpetuate negative 22
23 Eurocentric stereotypes about them. 23
24 The limits imposed upon divorcing in plural ways provide a good instance of the manner 24
25 in which English law attempts to prevent reliance on other laws. As Pearl and Menski 25
26 have shown, English private international law and the 'domestic' laws were rewritten in 26
27 the early 1970s in order to prevent Muslims, in particular, from using extra-judicial means 27
28 of divorcing.⁴⁶ When divorcing abroad, therefore, individuals have to make sure that they 28
29 have gone through 'judicial or other proceedings'. It appears that French judges have been 29
30 sending even stronger signals about the unacceptability of Muslim divorces.⁴⁷ Meanwhile, the 30
31 practice of divorcing abroad could well have been encouraged by the ban on domestic non- 31
32 judicial divorces. In practice, the requirement of a 'proceedings' divorce abroad causes many 32
33 problems for migrants or those engaging in trans-jurisdictional behaviour, not least the non- 33
34 recognition of a divorce and therefore also a subsequent marriage. The further involvement of 34
35 the family courts also cannot be ruled out by such non-recognition as one party to the divorce 35
36 may well claim that no divorce has taken place. Recent evidence indicates the developing 36
37 practice of prosecutions for bigamy where individuals have married after believing that they 37
38 were properly divorced in another jurisdiction, and this practice may well be encouraged by 38
39 39
40 40
41 _____ 41
42 ⁴⁵ J. Murphy, *International Dimensions in Family Law* (Manchester University Press, 42
43 *Manchester 2005*) 2. 43
44 ⁴⁶ D. Pearl and W.F. Menski, *Muslim Family Law* (Sweet & Maxwell, London 1998). 44
45 ⁴⁷ H. Fulchiron, 'The French Family Judge Encounters Cultural Pluralism' in Foblets, 45
Gaudreault-DesBiens and Renteln (eds), *Cultural Diversity and the Law*, 613–34.

1 one of the parties to the divorce who wants to penalize the other.⁴⁸ It is not altogether evident 1
2 what public benefit accrues from such prosecutions, especially in cases where the divorcing 2
3 party or parties have followed foreign rules correctly and believe themselves to be validly 3
4 remarried. Such prosecutions also appear to progress despite the well-established principle 4
5 that English and Scottish domiciliaries do not even have the capacity to contract polygamous 5
6 marriages.⁴⁹ If anything, this is further evidence of officials disregarding such legal principles 6
7 to 'teach immigrants a lesson' through the criminal courts. 7

8 The non-recognition of remarriage after divorce comes up in other contexts too. In one case 8
9 I had to deal with as an expert witness, a Bangladeshi woman was penalized several times, 9
10 forced to go from pillar to post to secure recognition of divorce and a subsequent marriage. 10
11 Having originally come to the UK as a spouse herself, she divorced her first husband in 11
12 Bangladesh. Unlike those mentioned above, this was clearly a 'proceedings' divorce that 12
13 had gone through an official court in Bangladesh. However, advice from an Asian women's 13
14 group in London was offered to the effect that her divorce would not be recognized, and 14
15 that divorce proceedings in Britain would be started. Her former husband claimed before the 15
16 English court that he was divorced already and, having read my expert report to the same 16
17 effect, the family court judge dismissed the petition. When the woman got married to another 17
18 man in Bangladesh, and he applied for a spouse visa, the entry clearance officer doubted the 18
19 validity of the previous divorce and the matter had to be appealed. The woman was able to use 19
20 my expert report again and the marriage was recognized by an immigration judge. Still, this 20
21 case illustrates the kinds of hurdles some migrants have to go through unnecessarily in order 21
22 to secure their legal status before British legal systems. Not only does it highlight penalties 22
23 experienced because of the ignorance of those who serve the official legal system, but also the 23
24 on-the-ground unworkability of a system unless one goes through multiple hoops.⁵⁰ 24

25 Cases of transnational marriage refuse to go away, however, and in the last few years I 25
26 have been involved as an expert witness in several immigration cases concerning marriages 26
27 that took place when the spouses were not even in the same country when the marriage took 27
28 place. This often seems to occur within communities dispersed because of war or persecution 28
29 such as the Somalis. It is not unusual to see the use of proxy or telephone marriages where one 29
30 or even both spouses are not present at the marriage ceremony. Under Muslim law, and as 30
31 far as the Muslims worldwide are concerned, these are perfectly lawful arrangements, but are 31
32 quite likely to be refused by entry clearance officers upon the mere allegation that the 'marriage 32
33 does not appear to be valid'. This will then force such families into a potentially expensive 33
34 legal process to establish their right to be in the same country. The less they resemble Western 34
35 assumptions about proper marriages, the more likely it is they will end up being refused. The 35

36
37
38

39 ⁴⁸ I am grateful to Prof. Werner Menski and Dr Roger Ballard for sharing information on 39
40 recent bigamy prosecutions. 40

41 ⁴⁹ See *Hussain v Hussain* [1982] 1 All ER 369 and, for further discussion of the context and 41
42 consequences of that case, see P. Shah, 'Attitudes to Polygamy in English Law' (2003) 52 *International* 42
43 *and Comparative Law Quarterly* 359–400. 43

44 ⁵⁰ For another such case with even more bouts of struggle, see W.F. Menski, 'Dodgy Asians 44
45 or Dodgy Laws? The Story of H' (2007) 21(4) *Journal of Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Law* 45
284–94.

1 Asylum and Immigration Tribunal has, for example, stated that Shia *mut'a* or *sighē* marriages 1
2 are not to be recognized for immigration purposes.⁵¹ 2

3 The drawing of such lines, about what is and is not a proper marriage, sometimes goes to 3
4 extreme lengths. In one recent case, an entry clearance officer alleged that a Muslim *nikah* in 4
5 a mosque in Delhi did not appear to be valid because the document on which the marriage 5
6 contract was written was torn unevenly on one side although its terms were fully visible for 6
7 all to see. Presumably a page with the written contract could look torn on one side if taken 7
8 from a book of such contracts, but was significant enough for the entry clearance officer to 8
9 override the other evidence given by both parties. When the matter came to appeal, the Home 9
10 Office Presenting Officer took up the new point that Muslim marriages in India ought to be 10
11 registered and, not having been registered officially, the marriage in question was not valid. 11
12 No one could help the couple at that point – their barrister was not sure about the Indian legal 12
13 position and nor was the immigration judge. The expert report that I eventually wrote merely 13
14 stated the blindingly obvious point that Muslim marriages in India need not be registered to 14
15 be considered valid. The immigration judge at the second hearing was so furious, and rightly, 15
16 about the level of abuse in this case that he recommended that the matter be reported to the 16
17 Ombudsman. It may have helped that the Bangladeshi woman in this case, who had met her 17
18 husband on one of her trips to India, was present in the UK as a Highly Skilled Migrant, a well- 18
19 paid psychiatrist. One can also see cases from Pakistan where it is asserted that a marriage 19
20 should have been registered, in obvious disregard of Pakistani law. Pakistani *Christians* may 20
21 even be told that they should have registered their marriages under the *Muslim Family Laws* 21
22 Ordinance of 1961! 22

23 At other times, marriages are conducted in Britain or other Western jurisdictions that do 23
24 not comply with official expectations, while people from minority communities appear to be 24
25 resorting to non-official methods of marrying, sometimes in response to official and other 25
26 constraints, such as the certificate of approval requirements discussed above. An example of 26
27 an early post-war Sikh migrant couple shows clearly how a legal system may come under 27
28 pressure to recognize married status despite non-compliance with official rules. In the *Bath* 28
29 case,⁵² the English Court of Appeal had to decide the married status of just such a couple 29
30 years later, the husband having died, and the surviving wife needing to establish her right to 30
31 a widow's pension through successive bouts of legal struggle. The couple had gone through 31
32 Sikh marriage rites in England, but had not fully complied with the Marriage Acts. The Court, 32
33 in its wisdom, decided to borrow the principle of presumption of marriage, then still extant 33
34 in Scottish law, to recognize their marriage.⁵³ It is reported that marriages, especially among 34
35 Muslims in the UK, will now often not go through the registration process. One solicitor who 35
36 specializes in Muslim family law casework suggests that the figure could be as high as 70 per 36
37 cent of the cases she sees. When legal problems arise, and despite cases like *Bath*, practitioners 37
38 report a heavy reluctance on the part of family court judges to accept the couples as married, 38
39 and they may have recourse to one of the *shari'a* councils in Britain instead. These cases may 39

40
41

42 ⁵¹ See LS (*Mut'a* or *sighē*) Iran [2007] UKAIT 00072. 42

43 ⁵² *Chief Adjudication Officer v Bath* [2000] 1 FCR 419, [2000] 1 FLR 8, [2000] Fam Law 91. 43

44 ⁵³ The Family Law (Scotland) Act 2006, section 3 now prevents Scottish courts using the 44
45 presumption of marriage principle to confer recognition, thus taking away a remedy often used 45
by ethnic minorities.

1 also have severe consequences in terms of custody rights of a parent.⁵⁴ The question might arise 1
 2 about the possible recognition of such marriages elsewhere than in Britain. In one asylum- 2
 3 related case, the (now) Immigration and Asylum Chamber of the Upper Tribunal wanted to 3
 4 know whether a *nikah* conducted in a mosque in east London, without any official registration, 4
 5 would be recognized in Pakistan as a proper marriage.⁵⁵ I expressed the view that in Pakistan 5
 6 such a marriage would be considered valid even if it would not in Britain, although my view 6
 7 was never communicated to the immigration judge re-hearing the case. 7

8
 9
 10
 11 **Concluding Observations** 11
 12 12

13 Despite attempts by states to restrict family-based or other forms of migration, it is bound to 13
 14 continue in different ways. Thus the issues discussed in this chapter will be of ever-growing 14
 15 salience. This means that European states face tough choices about how to move next to take 15
 16 into account the ‘superdiverse’ conditions of their societies, which have strong implications 16
 17 in terms of legal diversity also. The old methods of dealing with such diversities are failing 17
 18 and costing a lot in terms of money, ill feeling and injustice, which can rebound on the 18
 19 larger societies if care is not taken. Readjusting the old models, for example within private 19
 20 international law, to accommodate minorities and transnational communities more fairly 20
 21 could be one solution, but, while such suggestions are made from an obvious sympathy for 21
 22 the plight of parties caught in legal struggles, I am fearful that such re-jigging of old models 22
 23 simply ends up presenting the same wine in new bottles and does not help in addressing the 23
 24 underlying ideological and practical problems. The presence of transnational communities 24
 25 means that there is a collapse of the boundaries between ‘domestic’ and private international 25
 26 laws. However, that mental barriers are strongly present can be seen in the restrictions and 26
 27 blockages illustrated in the present chapter. Reading about the century-old story of Gandhi’s 27
 28 campaigns in South Africa, one comes across the ruling of the Supreme Court in 1913 that 28
 29 effectively refused to recognize all non-Christian marriages, with severe consequences for 29
 30 families seeking to reunite and leading to other legal barriers for Indian workers.⁵⁶ A century 30
 31 later we may ask why European legal systems continue to replicate such restrictions in 31
 32 more secularized forms. Contemporary interferences effectively tend to rely on long-present 32
 33 Christian presuppositions of family law including consent in marriage, the involvement of 33
 34 an intercessory to formalize marriage, restrictiveness around divorcing, and so on. However 34
 35 secularized and universalized such normative assumptions may have become, it is futile to 35
 36 deny their specific lineage, which is linked to one culture, the Western culture. That they 36
 37 37

38
 39 ⁵⁴ See *A v H* [2009] EWHC 636 (Fam), [2009] 4 All ER 641, where a father, who had married 38
 40 by *nikah*, subsequently divorced and the mother of the child, his former wife, took the child to 39
 41 Holland. The English court did not recognize custody under the Hague Convention on the Civil 40
 42 Aspects of International Child Abduction 1980 because he was held to have had no ‘parental 41
 43 responsibility’. The judge, Sir Christopher Sumner, specifically refused to apply the presumption 42
 44 of marriage on account of the short duration of the marriage, even though he had been allowed to 43
 45 register as the father of the child by officials. 44

⁵⁵ Appeal no. AA/15800/2009, Determination dated 29 July 2010. 44

⁵⁶ *Esop v Union Government (Minister of the Interior)* (1913) CPD 133. 45

- 1 derive from a specific culture entails problems of incommensurability that need to be taken 1
2 into account for the ends of inter-cultural justice. It seems that, rather than rely any longer on 2
3 the outdated concept of the 'comity of nations', we ought to try to move towards a 'comity 3
4 of peoples'. It is the presence of transnational communities that span nation-states which is 4
5 making us realize this more and more, and the implications are not restricted to the Western 5
6 legal systems only: they face all legal systems in different ways – a big global challenge. 6
7 7
8 8
9 9
- 10 **References** 10
11 11
- 12 Balagangadhara, S.N. and M. Keppens, 'Reconceptualising the Postcolonial Project: Beyond 12
13 the Strictures and Structures of Orientalism' (2009) 11(1) *Interventions* 50–68 13
14 Ballard, R., 'The Dynamics of Translocal and Transjurisdictional Networks: A Diasporic 14
15 Perspective' (2009) 1(2) *South Asian Diaspora* 141–66. 15
16 Beck-Gernsheim, E., 'Transnational Lives, Transnational Marriages: A Review of Evidence 16
17 from Migrant Communities in Europe' (2007) 7(3) *Global Networks* 271–88. 17
18 Bhabha, J., 'Lone Travelers: Rights, Criminalization, and the Transnational Migration of 18
19 Unaccompanied Children' (2000) 7 *University of Chicago Law School Roundtable* 269–94. 19
20 Bogusz, B. et al., *Irregular Migration and Human Rights: Theoretical, European and International* 20
21 *Perspectives* (Brill, Leiden 2004). 21
22 Böhning, W.R., *The Migration of Workers in the United Kingdom and the European Community* 22
23 (Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, London 1972). 23
24 Bryceson, D. and U. Vuorella, *The Transnational Family: New European Frontiers and Global* 24
25 *Networks* (Berg, Oxford 2002). 25
26 Calavita, K., *Immigrants at the Margins: Law, Race and Exclusion in Southern Europe* (Cambridge 26
27 University Press, Cambridge 2005). 27
28 Castles, S. and G. Kosack, *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe* (Oxford 28
29 University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, London 1973). 29
30 Castles, S., H. Booth and T. Wallace, *Here for Good: Western Europe's Ethnic Minorities* (Pluto, 30
31 London 1984). 31
32 Chiba, M., 'Other Phases of Legal Pluralism in the Contemporary World' (1998) 11(3) *Ratio* 32
33 *Juris* 228–45. 33
34 Collinson, S., *Europe and International Migration* (Pinter Publishers, London 1993). 34
35 Cotterrell, R., 'Transnational Communities and the Concept of Law' (2008) 21(1) *Ratio Juris* 35
36 1–18. 36
37 Foblets, M.-C., J.-F. Gaudreault-DesBiens and A.D. Renteln (eds), *Cultural Diversity and the* 37
38 *Law: State Responses from Around the World* (Bruylant, Brussels 2010). 38
39 Fournier, P., *Muslim Marriage in Western Courts: Lost in Transplantation* (Ashgate, Farnham 39
40 2010). 40
41 Fulchiron, H., 'The French Family Judge Encounters Cultural Pluralism' in M.-C. Foblets, J.F. 41
42 Gaudreault-DesBiens and A.D. Renteln (eds), *Cultural Diversity and the Law: State Responses* 42
43 *from Around the World* (Bruylant, Brussels 2010) 613–34. 43
44 Glick Schiller, N., 'Transborder Citizenship: An Outcome of Legal Pluralism within 44
45 Transnational Social Fields' in F. von Benda-Beckmann, K. von Benda-Beckmann and A. 45

- 1 Griffiths (eds), *Mobile People, Mobile Law: Expanding Legal Relations in a Contracting World* 1
 2 (Ashgate, Aldershot 2005) 27–49. 2
- 3 Grillo, R., ‘An Excess of Alterity? Debating Difference in a Multicultural Society’ (2007) 30(6) 3
 4 *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 979–98. 4
- 5 Grillo, R. et al., *Legal Practice and Cultural Diversity* (Ashgate, Farnham 2009). 5
- 6 Grillo, R. (ed.), *The Family in Question: Immigrant and Ethnic Minorities in Multicultural Europe* 6
 7 (Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2008). 7
- 8 Human Rights Watch, *The Netherlands: Discrimination in the Name of Integration* (May 2008), at 8
 9 <http://www.hrw.org/legacy/backgrounder/2008/netherlands0508/>, accessed 31 December 9
 10 2010. 10
- 11 Jackson, D., *Immigration: Law and Practice* (Sweet and Maxwell, London 1996). 11
- 12 Joppke, C., ‘The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy’ (2004) 12
 13 55(2) *The British Journal of Sociology* 237–57. 13
- 14 Juss, S., *Discretion and Deviation in the Administration of Immigration Control* (Sweet and Maxwell, 14
 15 London 1997). 15
- 16 Kayaoğlu, T., *Legal Imperialism: Sovereignty and Extraterritoriality in Japan, the Ottoman Empire,* 16
 17 *and China* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2010). 17
- 18 Kofman, E., ‘Family-related Migration: A Critical Review of European Studies’ (2004) 30(2) 18
 19 *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 243–62. 19
- 20 Kofman, E. and V. Meeto, ‘Family Migration’ in *World Migration Report 2008: Managing Labour* 20
 21 *Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy* (International Organization for Migration, Geneva 21
 22 2008) 151–72. 22
- 23 Löwenheim, O. and O. Gazit, ‘Power and Examination: A Critique of Citizenship Tests’ (2009) 23
 24 40(2) *Security Dialogue* 145–67. 24
- 25 Macdonald, I., ‘Preface’ in P. Shah and W.F. Menski (eds), *Migration, Diasporas and Legal* 25
 26 *Systems in Europe* (Routledge Cavendish, London 2006) xv–xviii. 26
- 27 McGauran, K., ‘Germany’s Immigration Amendment Act of 2007: Achieving Integration of 27
 28 Foreigners?’ (2007) 21(4) *Journal of Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Law* 295–310. 28
- 29 Mehdi, R. et al. (eds), *Religion and Law in Multicultural Societies* (DJØF Publishing, Copenhagen 29
 30 2008). 30
- 31 Menski, W.F., *Comparative Law in a Global Context: The Legal Systems of Asia and Africa* (Cambridge 31
 32 University Press, Cambridge 2006). 32
- 33 Menski, W.F., ‘Dodgy Asians or Dodgy Laws? The Story of H’ (2007) 21(4) *Journal of Immigration,* 33
 34 *Asylum and Nationality Law* 284–94. 34
- 35 Menski, W.F., ‘Immigration and Multiculturalism in Britain: New Issues in Research and 35
 36 Policy’ (2002) XII *KIAPS: Bulletin of Asia-Pacific Studies* 43–66. 36
- 37 Murphy, J., *International Dimensions in Family Law* (Manchester University Press, Manchester 37
 38 2005). 38
- 39 Nyiri, P., *New Chinese Migrants in Europe: The Case of the Chinese Community in Hungary* 39
 40 (Ashgate, Aldershot 1999). 40
- 41 Pearl, D. and W.F. Menski, *Muslim Family Law* (Sweet & Maxwell, London 1998). 41
- 42 Romaniszyn, K., ‘The Cultural Implications of International Migrations’ (2004) 2(146) *Polish* 42
 43 *Sociological Review* 141–59. 43
- 44 Ruskola, T., ‘Legal Orientalism’ (2002) 101(1) *Michigan Law Review* 179–234. 44
 45 45

THE ASHGATE RESEARCH COMPANION TO MIGRATION LAW, THEORY AND POLICY

1	Ryan, B. and V. Mitsilegas, <i>Extraterritorial Immigration Control: Legal Challenges</i> (Martinus	1
2	Nijhoff, Leiden 2010).	2
3	Sachdeva, S., <i>The Primary Purpose Rule in British Immigration Law</i> (Trentham Books, Stoke-on-	3
4	Trent 1993).	4
5	Shachar, A., 'The Race for Talent: High Skilled Migrants and Competitive Immigration	5
6	Regimes' (2006) 81 <i>New York University Law Review</i> 101–58.	6
7	Shah, P., 'Attitudes to Polygamy in English Law' (2003) 52 <i>International and Comparative Law</i>	7
8	<i>Quarterly</i> 359–400.	8
9	Shah, P., 'Transnational Hindu Law Adoptions: Recognition and Treatment in Britain' (2009)	9
10	5(2) <i>International Journal of Law in Context</i> 107–30.	10
11	Shah, P. and W.F. Menski (eds), <i>Migration, Diasporas and Legal Systems in Europe</i> (Routledge	11
12	Cavendish, London 2006).	12
13	Shah, R., 'The Phenomenon of the (UK) Officially Inspired Forced Marriages' (2005) 19(3)	13
14	<i>Journal of Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Law</i> 195–8.	14
15	Van Oers, R., E. Ersbøll and D. Kostakopoulou (eds), <i>A Re-definition of Belonging? Language and</i>	15
16	<i>Integration Tests in Europe</i> (Martinus Nijhoff, Leiden 2010).	16
17	Vertovec, S., 'Super-diversity and its Implications' (2007) 30(6) <i>Ethnic and Racial Studies</i> 1024–	17
18	54.	18
19	Von Benda-Beckmann, F., K. von Benda-Beckmann and A. Griffiths (eds), <i>Mobile People, Mobile</i>	19
20	<i>Law: Expanding Legal Relations in a Contracting World</i> (Ashgate, Aldershot 2005).	20
21	Wray, H., 'Moulding the Migrant Family' (2009) 29(4) <i>Legal Studies</i> 592–618.	21
22		22
23		23
24		24
25		25
26		26
27		27
28		28
29		29
30		30
31		31
32		32
33		33
34		34
35		35
36		36
37		37
38		38
39		39
40		40
41		41
42		42
43		43
44		44
45		45