
LEGAL PLURALISM: RE-ENGAGING THE NARRATIVE TO SOLVE GLOBAL PROBLEMS

Manas Divetia, BBA. LLB (Hons.), Gujarat National Law University, Gandhinagar

Arjun Chaudhary, BBA. LLB (Hons.), Gujarat National Law University, Gandhinagar

ABSTRACT

Legal pluralism incorporates the varied and intricate nature of modern societies. The authors in this paper have studied various theoretical perspectives provide ways to comprehend the interplay between law, authority, culture, and identity. These viewpoints underscore the significance of accommodating diversity and ensuring justice for all. Faced with global challenges, it is essential to acknowledge and embrace legal pluralism, while striving for inclusive and equitable legal systems that respect human rights. International organisations, such as the United Nations, promote legal pluralism by supporting diverse legal systems, providing aid, promoting cooperation, and removing obstacles. This contributes to the achievement of global objectives, the preservation of human rights, the prevention of conflict, and the advancement of sustainable development. Decentralisation and hybridization of legal frameworks can expand the issues, dimensions, and actors associated with climate justice. To avoid the double colonisation of people and nature, however, legal pluralism must be incorporated into sustainable development frameworks. Rather than endeavouring to eradicate hybridity or resolve normative conflicts, a pluralist approach to the administration of hybrid legal spaces should acknowledge and manage the normative conflicts that arise. Legal pluralism can contribute to global economic growth by recognising and integrating local and indigenous legal systems into the larger legal framework. By creating a legal system that is more inclusive, diverse, transparent, and accountable, it is possible to empower communities and advance economic equality.

Keywords: Legal Pluralism, Jurisprudence, Legal Administration, Globalisation, Sustainable Development

METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed in this paper is predominantly doctrinal and non-empirical in nature. In this study, the researchers employ a doctrinal methodology to examine and evaluate the application of legal principles to a particular legal issue or problem. Legal sources such as statutes, regulations, case laws, legal commentaries, and international research papers have been utilised by the researchers. They have conducted an exhaustive literature review on Legal Pluralism in order to develop a thorough understanding of the topic.

The researchers have used a systematic and structured approach to analyse the meaning, interpretation, and application of legal provisions and principles. They have evaluated critically the evolution of legal doctrines over time. This strategy requires careful reading, interpretation, and synthesis of legal materials in order to produce arguments that are logical and coherent.

INTRODUCTION

Legal pluralism is a notion that has grown in popularity in recent years as a means of tackling the complex legal difficulties that our global society faces. It acknowledges the existence of several legal systems within a particular culture or geographic region, and that each of these systems within a particular culture or geographic region, and that each of these systems is influence by cultural, historical and political variables. As a result, rather than imposing a single dominant legal system on all members of society, legal pluralism emphasises the significance of recognising and accommodating legal variety.

The importance of legal pluralism in today's global setting is highlighted by the increasing interconnection and diversity of nations throughout the world. The movement of people, products and ideas across borders has resulted in the formation of new types of social and economic relations, necessitating legal frameworks that can adapt and respond to varied demands and views. Simultaneously, the persisting difficulties of socioeconomic inequality, human rights violations, and environmental degradation underline the need for more inclusive and responsive legal systems to demands of marginalised populations.

Nonetheless, despite its expanding relevance, the idea of legal plurality remains controversial and difficult. Legal pluralism theory has evolved through time to reflect the many ways in which law is perceived and practised in different countries. Furthermore, putting legal pluralism into practice necessitates careful consideration of problems such as legal

compatibility, access to justice and the connection between different legal systems.

This study seeks to contribute to the ongoing debate on legal pluralism by delving into the idea and investigating its potential as a way of addressing global issues. It will draw on current literature and case studies from throughout the world to give a complete review of legal pluralism's theoretical and practical dimensions. The article will also discuss the problems and possibilities connected with legal pluralism, as well as recommendations for policymakers and practitioners attempting to adopt legal pluralism frameworks in various circumstances. This study intends to promote a more nuanced and educated view of this essential idea and its potential to contribute to a more fair and equitable global society by re-engaging the narrative around legal pluralism.

ANALYSIS

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON LEGAL PLURALISM AND THEIR RELEVANCE IN THE CURRENT GLOBAL CONTEXT

The Anthropological Perspective-

Legal pluralism is the acceptance of the existence of multiple legal systems within a single society or geographic region. Different scholars have proposed differing theoretical perspectives on legal pluralism over time. In this response, we will provide an overview of the main theoretical perspectives on legal pluralism and their applicability in the contemporary global context.

The Political Economy Perspective-

According to the political economy viewpoint on legal pluralism, the law is a tool of power that different groups may utilise to forward their own agendas. According to this perspective, power conflicts between diverse institutions, such as the state, the market, and civil society, have led to legal pluralism. While civil society groups may strive to employ alternative legal systems to oppose state authority, the state may attempt to impose its legal system on all members of society in order to increase its power. In the present global setting, where globalisation has led to the formation of new power dynamics and a rise in the prominence of transnational players, this point of view is relevant.

Post-Colonial Perspective-

Legal pluralism from a postcolonial viewpoint views law as colonialism's imposition on non-Western civilizations. The legal systems that are in place now are a product of the colonial era's suppression and marginalisation of non-Western cultures' legal systems. According to this viewpoint, legal pluralism may be used to regain native legal systems and subvert the dominance of western legal systems. This viewpoint is particularly relevant in the current global setting, as the effects of colonialism still permeate many countries' legal systems.

The Critical Legal Studies Perspective-

The perspective of critical legal studies on legal pluralism regards the law as a site of conflict between various social groups. According to this view, legal systems are not impartial, but are instead shaped by the interests of dominant groups. In this view, legal pluralism is a method for challenging the dominance of certain legal systems and making room for alternative legal systems that reflect the interests of marginalised groups. This viewpoint is especially pertinent in the current global context, where social inequality and the marginalisation of certain groups remain significant concerns.

Feminist Perspective -

Legal pluralism from a feminist viewpoint underlines the intersectional nature of legislation and how it impacts diverse social groupings of women. According to feminist legal pluralism, standard legal frameworks typically fall short of addressing the unique needs and concerns of women, particularly those who come from underserved regions. This point of view underlines how important it is to acknowledge and take into account alternative legal systems that are more inclusive and sensitive to the interests of women.

Human Rights Perspective-

The human rights viewpoint, which focuses on the connection between legal pluralism and human rights, is equally pertinent in the contemporary global situation. This point of view emphasises how important it is for legal systems to abide by international human rights norms and principles as well as how important it is for the acceptance of alternative legal systems to not infringe upon or violate human rights. According to this perspective, legal pluralism may be utilised to advance human rights and provide disadvantaged people better access to the court

system.

Finally, the globalisation perspective on legal pluralism emphasises how the development of new types of legal plurality has been facilitated by the interconnectivity of societies and the increasing cross-border movement of people, goods, and ideas. This viewpoint underlines the need of acknowledging and taking into account the legal systems of transnational entities, including multinational businesses and international organisations, whose legal systems may vary from those of the nation-states in which they operate.

UN'S ROLE IN GLOBAL LEGAL PLURALISM: ITS EFFECTIVENESS IN INTEGRATING LEGAL SYSTEMS

International agencies like the UN may make a substantial contribution to the promotion of legal pluralism as a strategy for resolving global concerns. Legal pluralism encourages the acknowledgment, coordination, and integration of the many legal systems that exist within a community or geographical area. The following are some ways that international groups might advance legal pluralism:

Supporting and recognizing the diversity of legal systems-

The variety of legal systems across the world may be supported and acknowledged by international groups. By encouraging the acceptance of alternative legal systems and allowing the sharing of information and experiences across legal systems, they may achieve this. For instance, the UNDP has worked with indigenous tribes to promote their legal systems and make it easier for them to be included into national legal frameworks.

Providing technical assistance and capacity building-

With the aid of the technical help and capacity building provided by international organisations, nations and communities may create and implement legal pluralism frameworks. This may be achieved by offering instruction, materials, and knowledge in fields including legal writing, conflict resolution, and institutional design. For instance, the UNODC offers nations technical support in developing and implementing legislative frameworks to fight transnational organised crime.

Encouraging dialogue and cooperation between legal systems-

International bodies may promote communication and collaboration across legal systems, establishing a respect for other legal traditions. One way they might do this is by arranging meetings, conferences, and seminars that bring together legal professionals, academics, and policymakers from diverse legal systems. For example, the UN Global Alliance for Justice Education (GAJE) brings together legal educators from various legal traditions to promote the development of a global justice's education framework.

Advocating for legal pluralism in international policy-making-

International organisations may advance legal diversity in the formulation of international policy by urging the inclusion of different legal systems in international treaties and accords. They may also push for the inclusion of legal plurality as a fundamental tenet of international human rights law. For instance, the UN Human Rights Council has urged for the development and preservation of legal diversity and highlighted the importance of it in advancing human rights.

Addressing legal barriers to achieving global goals-

International groups can handle legal challenges to achieving global goals including sustainable development, human rights, and peace and security. International institutions may help to overcome legal obstacles to achieving these goals by identifying and supporting the integration of multiple legal systems. For instance, the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) recognised the value of legal pluralism in advancing sustainable development and push for its promotion and preservation.

Providing a platform for international legal cooperation-

International organisations may address legal barriers that prevent the achievement of global goals including sustainable development, human rights, and peace and security. International institutions may help to overcome legal obstacles to achieving these goals by identifying and supporting the integration of multiple legal systems. For instance, the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) recognised the value of legal pluralism in advancing sustainable development and push for its promotion and preservation.

Promoting the rule of law-

International organisations promote the rule of law by promoting the recognition of diverse legal systems and fostering the growth of effective and accountable legal institutions. International organisations can prevent conflict, advance human rights, and support sustainable development by promoting the rule of law. The UN Rule of Law Assistance Programme, for instance, provides countries with technical assistance to strengthen their legal institutions and advance the rule of law.

Supporting the rights of indigenous peoples-

International organisations can support indigenous peoples' rights by promoting the recognition of their legal systems and facilitating their participation in decision-making processes. By recognising and promoting the integration of indigenous legal systems, international organisations can aid in the protection of the rights and interests of indigenous peoples and encourage their participation in national and international legal systems. For instance, the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues promotes the recognition and protection of the legal systems and rights of indigenous peoples.

THE POTENTIAL OF LEGAL PLURALISM TO ADDRESS ISSUES RELATED TO CLIMATE CHANGE, MIGRATION AND GLOBAL INEQUALITY

A more pluralist approach to hybrid legal environments should not attempt to conceal their hybrid nature. Due to the need to "solve" hybridity issues, conflict of laws has always been a philosophically unsatisfying subject. Each generation searches for a new method (or frequently the revival of an old method) to determine which territorially based state community's norms should apply to a dispute that, by definition, cannot be readily situated territorially and requires affiliations with multiple communities.

A pluralist paradigm recognises the inevitability of normative conflict and, rather than attempting to eliminate it, seeks to manage it through institutional structures, procedural rules, and cultural norms that may at least unite the parties involved in a common social setting. This strategy is predicated on Ludwig Wittgenstein's theory that participation in common life forms, as opposed to substantive agreement, is the primary means of obtaining agreements.

Mitigating Climate Crisis-

State-centric legislations appear incapable of realising the liberatory promise of human rights in a society that is becoming increasingly diverse and unequal and is threatened by climate change. The descriptive analytical instrument of legal pluralism acknowledged the presence of alternative normative and institutional systems in addition to state-based law. From the perspective of legal pluralism, the global climate disruption space experienced an outbreak of normative orders and institutional openings that resulted in the “vernacularisation of global frames, including UNFCCC laws, as well as meetings between global frames, especially through human rights.”

Inadequacies in institutional openings and global frames forced a strategic shift away from the global scale in favour of modified and hybrid frames that merged the "local" and the "global." As a result of decentralisation and hybridization, the concerns, scales, and actors involved in climate justice have expanded.

Legal Pluralism examines “norms and institutions through first-hand data, including the law, at different scales within historically situated hegemonic processes in semi-autonomous socio-ecological settings where participants form collective action frames.” Climate (and non-climate) law and policy produce institutional openings that interact with lived injustices within particular historical conflicts and political-economic contexts to produce climate justice discourses. In its place, legal pluralism envisions' multisited' categories without a singular global-local or local-global causality: not only is state-based law pluralized, but also plural norms are institutionalised and codified into law. Both procedures are capable of shifting from the co-optation of hegemonic processes by elite interests to the adoption of competing claims; the same norms can be relied upon for various legal interpretations and diverse framings that reflect different historical junctures. According to Gramsci, the law is a “historical bloc,” a “discordant ensemble of social relations,” with “truce lines” from previous conflicts in both its material basis and superstructure. In a similar manner, Merry acknowledges that mobilising actors and movements has "a temporal dimension" and that "knowledge about the world develops slowly."

Power imbalances are always prevalent between governments and people, as well as between people and nature, so long as state sovereignty is the foundation of international law. If the empirical truth of legal pluralism is not incorporated into frameworks for sustainable development, processes of encompassing or vernacularizing non-state laws and knowledges of

human-Earth connections have the potential to colonise humans and nature twice. The New Zealand model is the best example to date of how a national legal system can accomplish profound legal pluralism through the reduction of legal hierarchy. This strategy was inspired by the struggle for the rights of Indigenous Peoples, as opposed to the rights of nature. In other instances, authorities will need to devise a method to legalise nature in a manner that protects it, regardless of whether the property in question is tied to the interests of indigenous peoples.

A Legal Pluralist approach in enhancing international cooperation on migration control-

As the pace of globalisation quickens, cooperative migration controls have become the norm. There is already diversity in refugee law. Refugee law can be viewed as a hybrid of administrative law, human rights law, civil procedure, and international law, contrary to the assertions of some academicians. They argue that refugee law is unique in that it defers to national tribunals and decision-makers when determining whether or not to grant refugee status to an asylum-seeker in a territory.

The concept of legal plurality can be applied specifically and practically to refugee law. For instance, the approach of legal pluralism for refugee law may impact one's comprehension of the ongoing phenomenon of State compliance and non-compliance with international refugee law principles non-refoulement, for an example. A state's nonrefoulement compliance or lack thereof may have an effect on the norm's standing. Many individuals believe, for instance, that non-refoulement is governed by customary international law. This standing as international customary law, however, is partially based on State practise. The status of the standard can initially be questioned if State practises vary between States. However, the diversity of the law adds complexity to this query. Diversification among these legal orders and regimes may be advantageous under a legal pluralism approach where better standards are enforced by a different legal order, increasing safety for stakeholders in the process. In other words, the establishment of higher standards can strengthen the accepted norm of non-refoulement. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' (UNHCR) position is supported by the acknowledgement of the outside of the territory's scope and use of non-refoulement principles, as well as with the condition of non-refoulement outside the bounds of treaties.

As was already indicated, approaching refugee law through the principles of legal pluralism can help one understand how states behave, which may help one spot protection gaps in instances when international cooperation on migratory control is needed. An analysis of international collaboration, particularly with regard to migration management, can be done

using a legal pluralist interpretation of refugee law. In addition to providing a fresh perspective on the problems of international cooperation and migration management, this method of comprehending refugee law may help to explain conflicts between various legal systems. For instance, the prevailing narrative contends that states deploy a variety of instruments and techniques under the umbrella of migration control to prevent migrants from entering their borders and/or obtaining access to the asylum system.

Government-to-government interactions have traditionally been a component of international law practise. However, the period following World War II saw the emergence of various private bodies, international entities, multinational companies, and activist communities. Then, each of these actors participates in the establishment and maintenance of norms. A sovereigntist model may not be the best way to approach the migration control thesis, which is the prevention of asylum seekers from reaching the territories of other sovereigns, but rather a legal pluralist approach, where a proper State's adherence to pertinent legalities is achieved through ongoing dialogue between State and private bodies. As described in this article, these reciprocal dialectical dialogues between State and non-State actors have the ability to facilitate norm formulation and compliance.

Economic Inequality and Legal Pluralism-

Law is thought to be a significant causal factor and is frequently applied as a "magic charm" to promote economic growth. By promoting the international movement of financial resources and investment opportunities, the changing economic landscape is given considerable attention. The ability to recognise and incorporate regional and indigenous legal systems into a larger legal framework is one of the main benefits of legal pluralism. This is crucial since many of the poorest nations and people in the globe have their own distinctive legal systems that are not regarded or recognised by the dominant legal systems imposed by colonial powers or international organisations. Legal pluralism can enable these communities to participate more fully in the global economy and defend their rights and interests by recognising and integrating these local legal systems. Customary law is a major factor in the regulation of social and economic interactions in many African nations, especially in rural areas. However, Western-style legal systems that place a higher priority on individual rights and transactions based on the free market sometimes marginalise or ignore alternative legal systems. Legal pluralism can offer a more inclusive and culturally sensitive framework for economic development that takes into account regional customs and traditions by recognising and

incorporating customary law into the legal system.

Legal Pluralism can foster greater market competition and economic equality by diversifying the legal landscape. Businesses and individuals have more options for organising their transactions and defending their rights when various legal systems coexist. As a common cause of economic inequality, this can aid in reducing the concentration of economic power in the hands of a small number of dominant actors. Large multinational firms have a substantial impact on the legal system in many nations and utilise their clout to negotiate advantageous tax and contract terms. Smaller companies and people can access other legal systems that may be more beneficial to their interests through promoting legal pluralism, levelling the playing field and fostering greater economic equality.

Legal plurality also has the benefit of encouraging accountability and transparency in the legal system. There is more opportunity for checks and balances between various legal actors when many legal systems coexist. This can aid in preventing corruption and power abuse, two important hindrances to equality and economic progress in many nations. For instance, the court in various nations is frequently the target of political influence or bribery, which results in inconsistent application of the law and diminished confidence in the legal system. Different legal systems can provide checks on one another by fostering legal pluralism, ensuring that no one actor has excessive authority or influence over the legal system. Greater accountability and transparency, which are crucial for advancing equality and economic development, can be facilitated by this.

Legal diversity, though, is hardly a panacea to the world's economic inequalities. Additionally, there are dangers and difficulties in putting legal pluralism into practise. One of the biggest dangers is that it can cause misunderstandings and disputes across various legal systems, especially if those legal systems have divergent standards or values. This can prevent investment and slow down economic growth by causing uncertainty for both individuals and corporations. Legal pluralism can lead to inequality both inside and across communities, which is another problem. For instance, if some groups have easier access to different legal systems, they might be better able to negotiate better terms in contracts or effectively defend their rights. This has the potential to make already existent disparities worse and maintain power inequities within civilizations. A high level of coordination and collaboration between various legal players, such as governments, international organizations, and local communities, is necessary for legal pluralism. In actuality, this might be challenging to accomplish, especially in nations

with weak or corrupt judicial systems. By encouraging inclusivity, diversity, openness, and accountability in the legal system, legal pluralism has the potential to address the issue of global economic inequality. Legal pluralism may empower communities and advance economic equality by levelling the playing field for people and businesses operating across international borders by recognising and incorporating local and indigenous legal systems into the larger legal framework.

CHALLENGES PRESENTED BY LEGAL PLURALISM IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALISATION AND MULTICULTURALISM-

Fundamental criticism towards the concept-

Semi-autonomous social sectors have received a lot of support but also face a lot of opposition. Nearly all writings on legal pluralism, according to Woodman, presuppose that the “legal orders,” “legal systems,” or “social fields” that make up the world of legal diversity are “reasonably well identified by their own visible characteristics.” Woodman, however, disagrees with the notion that a map of legally diverse situations is possible since it is not always apparent who belongs to each social group and who does not, as well as which law would be applied in every situation. He disagrees with Vanderlinden's assertion that legal pluralism must be considered from the standpoint of the individual subject of law, saying that the “flight to the individual perhaps goes too far.” Woodman proposes that we think of laws as affecting a “population” and refer to the “legal mechanisms” at work. It is difficult to see how these problems with the idea of “semi-autonomous social fields” are resolved by substituting the word “population” for “field,” “system,” or “order.” Woodman's main claim, however, that the boundaries of each plural order are inevitably ambiguous and prone to fusion, is undeniably true and crucial to remember.

Legal pluralists have engaged in heated discussions over a number of related topics in recent decades, including whether there is anything that distinguishes a “legal” system from a non-legal form of normative ordering, whether it is worthwhile to define the term “law,” whether there is a fundamental difference between state and non-state normative orders, and whether legal pluralism is possible within a state system. Franz von Benda-Beckmann points out that “there is little agreement in the conceptualization of law, or legal pluralism, about the relations between such plurality and social organisation and interaction, beyond the threshold of the yes or no to legal pluralism” as a result.” These arguments will be investigated, as well as how they

relate to applying the concept of legal pluralism to address the specific issues brought up by this research.

Svesson's and Santos' criticism of Integrating legal systems-

Asserting that “it is the continual flow of legal perceptions, the dynamic force of pluralistic arrangement, that reshapes state law to better accommodate the cultural distinctiveness of indigenous people,” Svesson refers to such processes of continuous contact as “interlegality.” In a similar vein, Santos highlights the “porous” and “dense” interconnections that exist between various legal regimes, contending that under such circumstances, “each one loses its pure, autonomous identity and can only be defined in relation to the legal constellation of which it is a part.” Additionally, it has lately been proposed that outside factors like globalisation and political upheaval have an impact on local constellations of legal ordering, power dynamics, and legal understandings from earlier eras, whether they were colonial, socialist, or other.

Legal Pluralism encroaching the Idea of democratic multiculturalism-

Legal pluralism's political aspect is the second reason that reduces its applicability to legal change. It is obvious that the central issue in discussions of legal pluralism is how the State interacts with different legal systems. This is due to the fact that creating and enforcing laws are two of a State's fundamental duties and result from what some political theorists refer to as the “social contract” between society's citizens and the State. In stating that the “legal pluralist argument seems fundamentally to challenge our thinking about the state, if also its relationship to law, so it is a branch of political theory.” Hughes clarifies this relationship by stating that the “legal pluralist argument...seems to fundamentally challenge our thinking about the state, if also its relationship to law,” thereby establishing that it is a branch of political theory. Rather than a paradigm shift in favour of legal pluralism, he observes that traditional societies, once the epicentre of legal pluralist research, have strengthened legal positivism. It is believed that this is the result of the new ruling elites' pursuit of rapid structural reform, international financing, rapid development, and adherence to the liberal capitalist paradigm of the state. The problem with this is that, while not all states are totalitarian, they all contain the seeds of totalitarianism because it is part of the state's underlying logic to attempt to diminish or eliminate any authority that competes with its own. Rouland also emphasises that acting on legal pluralism is likely to encroach upon state authority. According to Ottley and Zorn, one of the reasons why Papua New Guinea's legal system has not incorporated customary law is the belief by state entities that a customary legal system might cause harm to their society and to

the system of legislation and case law that strengthens the authority and legitimacy of the State.

CONCLUSION

Complex and multifaceted, legal pluralism reflects the diversity and complexity of contemporary societies. The various theoretical perspectives on legal pluralism offer a variety of methods to comprehend the relationship between law, power, culture, and identity. While each perspective emphasises various aspects of legal pluralism, they all recognise the need to accommodate diversity and ensure that all members of society have access to justice. As we navigate the challenges and opportunities of the current global context, it is essential that we recognise the value of legal pluralism and work to create legal systems that are inclusive, equitable, and respectful of human rights.

International organisations, such as the United Nations, play a crucial role in promoting legal pluralism as a solution to global problems. By supporting and recognising the diversity of legal systems, providing technical assistance and capacity building, encouraging dialogue and cooperation between legal systems, advocating for legal pluralism in international policy-making, addressing legal barriers to achieving global goals, providing a platform for international legal cooperation, promoting the rule of law, and supporting the rights of indigenous peoples, international organisations can assist in overcoming obstacles to the achievement of sustainable development. Promoting legal pluralism can ultimately contribute to the preservation of human rights, the prevention of conflict, and the advancement of sustainable development.

Rather than attempting to eradicate hybridity or resolve conflicts of laws, a pluralist approach to administering hybrid legal spaces should recognise and manage the normative conflicts that arise. This requires procedural mechanisms, institutions, and practises that draw participants into a shared social space, as agreements are reached through participation in shared forms of life as opposed to agreement on substance.

Legal pluralism is required due to the inadequacies of state-centric law in addressing climate change and human rights challenges. Legal pluralism acknowledges the coexistence of multiple normative and institutional regimes, as well as the need to manage conflicts via procedural mechanisms and practises that draw participants into a shared social space. Decentralisation and hybridization of legal frameworks can expand climate justice's issues, dimensions, and actors. To avoid the double colonisation of people and nature, however, the incorporation of legal pluralism into sustainable development frameworks is crucial. The New Zealand model

illustrates how legal hierarchies can be loosened in the direction of profound legal pluralism, but the recognition of nature as a legal subject is also essential in other contexts. In an increasingly pluralistic and unequal world, legal pluralism provides a promising avenue for promoting climate justice and human rights.

Legal pluralism facilitates a nuanced comprehension of the complexities of refugee law in the context of globalisation and migration control. Legal pluralism provides a framework for understanding the tensions between State compliance and non-compliance with international refugee law norms, such as non-refoulement, by recognising the coexistence of various legal orders and legal regimes. In addition, a legal pluralist approach to refugee law enables the identification of protection gaps in international cooperation on migration control scenarios and the promotion of ongoing mutual dialectical exchanges between State and non-State entities for norm formulation and compliance. Legal pluralism ultimately offers a promising avenue for advancing the protection of refugee rights and fostering a more just and equitable global society.

Legal pluralism may contribute to global economic development by recognising and incorporating local and indigenous legal systems into the larger legal framework. By developing a more inclusive, diverse, transparent, and accountable legal system, it can empower communities and promote economic equality. However, implementing legal pluralism in practise necessitates cautious coordination and cooperation between various legal actors, and it is fraught with risks and difficulties. However, legal pluralism can provide a framework for economic development that is more culturally sensitive and diverse, taking into consideration local customs and traditions. It can also aid in the reduction of economic inequality by fostering a more competitive marketplace and providing checks and balances within the legal system. Legal pluralism can contribute significantly to the development of a more just and equitable global economic system.

While legal pluralism and semi-autonomous social fields have acquired widespread acceptance, they have also been the subject of fundamental criticism. It is necessary to address Woodman's valid concern regarding the difficulty of distinguishing the constituent elements of legally pluralistic situations. In addition, there are ongoing discussions regarding the definition of law, the distinction between state and non-state normative orders, and whether legal pluralism can coexist within a state system. Svesson and Santos emphasise the continuous interaction and permeable nature of legal order boundaries, as well as the impact of external

influences on local legal understandings. However, the political nature of legal pluralism and its potential encroachment on state authority continue to pose a significant obstacle. In societies that prioritise rapid development and assimilation to liberal capitalist state models, legal pluralism may face significant opposition. Consequently, despite the fact that legal pluralism bears promise for accommodating cultural diversity and democratic multiculturalism, its practical application requires careful consideration of these criticisms and obstacles.

REFERENCES

- 1) Anaya. (2004). *Indigenous Peoples in International Law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- 2) Benda-Beckmann, F. V. (2001, January). Legal Pluralism and Social Justice in Economic and Political Development. *IDS Bulletin*, 32(1), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2001.mp32001006.x>
- 3) Berman, P. S. (2020, September 24). *The Oxford Handbook of Global Legal Pluralism*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- 4) Berman. (2018). Global Legal Pluralism as a Normative Project. *UC Irvine Law Review*, 8, 149.
- 5) Dancer, H. (2020, December 3). Harmony with Nature: towards a new deep legal pluralism. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 53(1), 21–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2020.1845503>
- 6) Fisher, A. D. (2017, March 7). Legal Pluralism and Human Rights in the Idea of Climate Justice. *Oslo Law Review*, 2(3), 200–224. <https://doi.org/10.5617/oslaw2766>
- 7) Forsyth, M. (2009, September 1). *A Bird that Flies with Two Wings*. ANU E Press.
- 8) Fuller, C. (1994, June). Legal Anthropology,,: Legal Pluralism and Legal Thought. *Anthropology Today*, 10(3), 9. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2783478>
- 9) Ghai. (2001). Pluralism and Human Rights: A Review Article . *Human Rights Quarterly*, 23(2), 390.
- 10) Harrington. (1998). Law and Economic Development: The Evolution of Legal Systems. *International Social Science Journal*, 22(3), 329.
- 11) Kennedy, D. (1984, February). Legal Education and the Reproduction of Hierarchy: A Polemic against the System. *Michigan Law Review*, 82(4), 961. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1288698>
- 12) Maria Kyed, H. (2011, January). Introduction to the Special Issue: Legal Pluralism and International Development Interventions. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 43(63), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2011.10756655>
- 13) McCallin. (2012). Restitution and legal pluralism in contexts of displacement. *International Center for Transitional Justice*.
- 14) Nilsen, & Cox. (2013). What Would a Marxist Theory of Social Movements Look Like. *Marxism and Social Movements* , 66(1), 63–81.
- 15) OHCHR and indigenous peoples. (n.d.). OHCHR. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/indigenous->

peoples

- 16) Poon. (2020). A legal pluralist approach to migration control: Norm compliance in a globalized world. *Emory Law Scholarly Commons*, 34, 2037.
- 17) Snyder, F. (1999, December). Governing Economic Globalisation: Global Legal Pluralism and European Law. *European Law Journal*, 5(4), 334–374. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0386.00087>
- 18) *State of the World's Indigenous Peoples (SOWIP) | United Nations For Indigenous Peoples.* (n.d.). <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/publications/state-of-the-worlds-indigenous-peoples.html>
- 19) *Technical Assistance.* (n.d.). United Nations: Office on Drugs and Crime. <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/technical-assistance.html>
- 20) Turner, B. S. (2011, September). Legal Pluralism, State Sovereignty, and Citizenship. *Democracy and Security*, 7(4), 317–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17419166.2011.617596>
- 21) *UN Development Programme.* (n.d.). GAJE. Retrieved March 22, 2023, from <https://www.gaje.org/about-gaje/goals-of-gaje>