

Globalization and Legal Reform: Challenges for National Legal Identity and Cultural Values

Ami Rulloh¹

¹ Al-Azhar University, Egypte. E-mail: amirulloh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Globalization has profoundly reshaped the architecture of national legal systems, generating unprecedented convergence around liberal constitutional norms, human rights standards, and market-oriented regulatory frameworks. Yet this convergence has simultaneously intensified contestation over national legal identity and the cultural values embedded in legal orders. This study examines the dialectical relationship between global legal integration and the preservation of national legal identity through a comparative analysis of legal reform processes in Indonesia, post-colonial Africa, East Asia, and the British Virgin Islands. Drawing on a normative juridical methodology with a comparative-analytical design, the research synthesizes theoretical frameworks of legal transplantation, constitutional identity, and legal pluralism with empirical case studies of constitutional reform, legislative adaptation, and judicial interpretation. The analysis reveals three distinct patterns of engagement with global legal norms: adaptive integration, in which states selectively incorporate international standards while asserting constitutional particularity; resistive localization, in which states formally adopt global norms but subvert their application through administrative and interpretive mechanisms; and hybrid accommodation, in which global and local normative orders coexist through negotiated institutional arrangements. A central finding is that legal identity is not a static cultural residue but a dynamic construct that is continuously produced and reproduced through the interaction between global normative pressures and local institutional and cultural resources. The study develops the concept of “identity work” to capture the strategic practices through which legal actors—constitutional courts, legislatures, and legal scholars—construct and contest national legal identity in response to globalization. The findings challenge the assumption that globalization necessarily erodes national legal distinctiveness, demonstrating instead that global integration can intensify identity claims and generate new forms of constitutional particularism. Theoretical contributions to comparative law, constitutional theory, and the sociology of legal globalization are discussed, alongside practical implications for constitutional design, judicial dialogue, and legal education.

Keywords: Constitutional Identity, Cultural Values, Globalization, Legal Identity, Legal Pluralism, Legal Transplantation, National Sovereignty

Citation: Aisy, Nesty Rihhadatul and Saputra, Muhammad Agil, 2024. “Globalization and Legal Reform: Challenges for National Legal Identity and Cultural Values”. *JLCS: Journal of Law and Cultural Studies* 2 (1), 68-86. <https://doi.org/10.30872/jlcs.v1i2.5>.

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between globalization and legal reform has become one of the defining problems of contemporary legal scholarship and constitutional practice. Over the past four decades, the intensification of transnational economic integration, the proliferation of international human rights instruments, and the consolidation of supranational governance regimes have exerted unprecedented pressure on national

legal systems to converge around shared normative standards. Concepts such as human rights, constitutionalism, due process, and separation of powers have traveled across continents and shaped legal systems far beyond their origins, while global movements for civil rights, women's rights, and labor protections have promoted similar legal reforms across countries. The World Trade Organization's dispute settlement system, the European Union's legal order, and the expanding jurisprudence of regional human rights courts have created what scholars have characterized as a "global legal order" that increasingly conditions the exercise of national sovereignty.

Yet this process of convergence has not produced the uniform global legal culture that some observers predicted. Instead, it has generated a complex and often contradictory dynamic in which global normative pressures interact with local legal cultures, constitutional traditions, and cultural values in ways that produce both integration and resistance, both harmonization and particularism. The negotiation of legal standards is fundamentally driven by sovereignty, and globalization alone cannot override core differences in how societies and states conceptualize the relationship between individual rights and communal values, between judicial authority and democratic self-determination, and between legal uniformity and cultural specificity. Comparative legal studies have long recognized that legal systems develop their own distinctive profiles, shaped by historical experience, political culture, and institutional arrangements, and that these profiles persist even under conditions of intensive global interaction.

Three developments make this problematic particularly salient in the contemporary moment. First, the "post-globalization" turn—evident in the rise of nationalist and sovereigntist political movements, the proliferation of trade tensions, and the retreat from multilateral governance—has generated a renewed emphasis on constitutional identity, legal pluralism, and normative autonomy. Modern transformations of the global order have revealed the limits of universalist models of legal regulation and have emphasized the problem of the relationship between national constitutionalism and the changing forms of global and supranational legal order; in a post-globalization context, there is a noticeable return to ideas of sovereignty, constitutional identity, and legal pluralism, which places the need for states to rethink their normative autonomy at the forefront. Second, the proliferation of constitutional reforms worldwide—from the "New Uzbekistan" constitutional amendments to constitutional revisions in Chile, Kenya, and Indonesia—has increasingly emphasized the enshrining of fundamental values and national constitutional identity alongside global standards. One key characteristic of constitutional reform is the strengthening of national constitutional identity by enshrining fundamental values. Third, the growing influence of comparative constitutional jurisprudence has created new forms of judicial dialogue through which courts selectively borrow from foreign legal materials while simultaneously constructing distinctive national approaches, a process that has been described as "legal transplants" but that involves far more complex processes of adaptation, translation, and hybridization than the metaphor suggests.

The theoretical landscape for examining these developments draws on several interconnected traditions. The debate on legal transplants—whether laws can be successfully transferred from one legal culture to another—remains foundational. Alan Watson's thesis that legal borrowing is the most common source of legal change has been challenged by scholars who emphasize the cultural embeddedness of legal rules and the importance of contextual compatibility. A systematic review of legal transplant scholarship published between 2008 and 2025 identifies five recurrent theoretical lenses: positivist transfer models, culturalist critiques, diffusion mechanisms and multicausal models, communicative metaphors, and mixed transplant concepts. The evidence does not support universal causal claims, but it consistently suggests that contextual compatibility, institutional capacity, local legitimacy, and interpretive adaptation shape the effectiveness of legal transplants, while linguistic barriers, interpretive mismatches, coercive imposition, and weak implementation capacity constrain them. This scholarship has profound implications for understanding how national legal identities are constructed and contested under globalization.

The concept of constitutional identity has emerged as a central analytical category in this context. Constitutional identity refers to the fundamental normative commitments, institutional arrangements, and cultural values that define a political community's constitutional order and distinguish it from others. It is not merely a descriptive category but a normative claim: the assertion that certain constitutional features are so fundamental that they cannot be altered through ordinary constitutional amendment or subordinated to external legal norms. The Hungarian Constitutional Court's doctrine of constitutional identity, the German Federal Constitutional Court's "eternity clause" jurisprudence, and the European Court of Justice's recognition of national constitutional identity in the Lisbon Treaty all reflect different institutional responses to the tension between supranational integration and national constitutional particularity. In Indonesia, constitutional identity is anchored in Pancasila, the five foundational principles of the state, which serve as both a normative framework for legal development and a boundary marker against foreign legal influence.

The literature on globalization and legal reform has generated rich insights within specific jurisdictional contexts, but comparative analysis across different regions and legal traditions remains fragmented. The Indonesian experience of negotiating between global legal norms and Pancasila-based legal identity has been extensively documented, as have post-colonial African engagements with inherited Western legal systems. However, no study has systematically compared how different jurisdictions construct and contest national legal identity in response to globalization, or how they manage the tensions between normative convergence and cultural preservation. This gap is particularly significant because the most contentious contemporary issues in law and globalization—constitutional identity as a limit on supranational authority, the domestication of international human rights standards, and the preservation of cultural values in legal reform—require precisely the kind of cross-jurisdictional analysis that existing scholarship does not provide.

This study addresses that gap. The central research questions are: (1) Through what mechanisms and strategies do states and legal actors construct, contest, and protect national legal identity under conditions of globalization? (2) What patterns of convergence and divergence emerge across different jurisdictions and legal traditions? (3) What is the relationship between legal reform and cultural values, and how do different legal systems manage the tension between global normative pressures and local normative commitments? (4) What theoretical framework can account for both the transformative power of globalization and the persistence of national legal distinctiveness?

The significance of this study lies in its integrated comparative framework. By examining the interaction between globalization and legal reform across multiple levels of legal governance—international, constitutional, legislative, and judicial—the research demonstrates that national legal identity is not a static cultural residue but a dynamic construct that is continuously produced and reproduced through strategic practices of identity work. The findings have implications for constitutional design, judicial practice, legal education, and international cooperation. The study also contributes to theoretical debates about legal transplantation, constitutional identity, and the sociology of legal globalization by developing an analytical framework that distinguishes between adaptive integration, resistive localization, and hybrid accommodation as distinct patterns of engagement with global legal norms.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations: Legal Transplantation and Legal Culture

The theoretical foundation for examining the relationship between globalization and legal reform lies in the rich but contested tradition of legal transplantation scholarship. The debate was inaugurated by Alan Watson, who argued that legal borrowing is the most fertile source of legal development and that law is largely autonomous from the society in which it operates. Watson's thesis challenged the romantic notion that law is an expression of national spirit and that legal systems develop organically from the culture and history of a people. His comparative-historical work demonstrated that legal rules frequently migrate across jurisdictions without corresponding migration of social, political, or cultural conditions.

Watson's thesis provoked a sustained critical response from scholars who emphasized the cultural embeddedness of legal rules. Pierre Legrand's critique is particularly influential: he argued that legal rules cannot be meaningfully transferred across legal cultures because the meaning of a rule is inseparable from the cultural and interpretive context in which it operates. A legal rule placed in a new cultural context loses its original meaning and function, becoming, in Legrand's evocative formulation, a "meaningless" transplant. For Legrand, legal cultures are not merely different in their content but are incommensurable in their epistemological foundations, making genuine legal transplantation impossible and legal convergence a superficial phenomenon.

The debate has been complicated by empirical research demonstrating that legal transplants occur frequently and that their outcomes vary considerably. The systematic review by Velásquez Ochoa and colleagues identifies contextual compatibility, institutional capacity, local legitimacy, and interpretive adaptation as critical determinants of transplant effectiveness. This finding suggests that the binary opposition between Watson's optimism about legal borrowing and Legrand's skepticism about cross-cultural legal meaning is too crude. Legal transplants are neither automatic successes nor inevitable failures; their outcomes depend on a complex interaction of legal, institutional, political, and cultural factors.

The concept of legal culture provides an important analytical bridge between the study of formal legal systems and the social norms and practices that shape their operation. Legal culture encompasses the ideas, values, expectations, and attitudes that people hold toward law and legal institutions, and it varies significantly across jurisdictions and legal traditions. Adapting legal cultures examines the theory and practice of legal borrowing and adaptation across Europe, the United States, Latin America, Southeast Asia, and Japan, analyzing how globalization is changing the conditions under which legal reforms are received and adapted. The concept helps to explain why similar formal legal rules produce different outcomes across jurisdictions: the effectiveness of constitutional provisions recognizing human rights, for example, depends not only on their textual content but also on the attitudes of judges, the expectations of litigants, and the broader social understandings of law's role and authority.

2.2 Constitutional Identity and the Limits of Integration

The concept of constitutional identity has emerged as a central analytical category for understanding how states assert normative autonomy against the pressures of globalization and supranational integration. Constitutional identity refers to the fundamental normative commitments and institutional arrangements that define a political community's constitutional order. It is both descriptive—identifying the features that distinguish one constitutional system from another—and normative—asserting that these features are so fundamental that they constrain the exercise of supranational authority and the interpretation of international obligations.

The doctrine of constitutional identity has been developed most elaborately in the jurisprudence of the German Federal Constitutional Court and the Hungarian Constitutional Court. The German Court's "eternity clause" (Ewigkeitsklausel) in Article 79(3) of the Basic Law protects certain constitutional principles—human dignity, democracy, the rule of law, and the federal structure—from amendment even by supermajorities. The Court has interpreted this provision as establishing a "constitutional identity" that constrains Germany's participation in the European Union and the application of EU law that conflicts with these fundamental principles. The Hungarian Constitutional Court has developed a more contested doctrine of constitutional identity, invoking it to resist the application of EU law in areas such as migration and asylum.

The tension between constitutional identity and supranational integration is not confined to Europe. In a post-globalization context, there is a noticeable return to ideas of sovereignty, constitutional identity, and legal pluralism, which places the need for states to rethink their normative autonomy at the forefront. The relationship between national constitutionalism and the changing forms of global and supranational legal order has become a central preoccupation of constitutional scholarship, as the limits of universalist models of legal regulation have become increasingly apparent. Scholars such as Anne Peters and Mattias Kumm have emphasized that constitutionalism must be understood as a normative framework designed to project constitutional principles onto the international legal order, but the empirical record suggests that constitutional identity claims are more frequently deployed to resist than to embrace supranational norms.

The Indonesian case provides a distinctive approach to constitutional identity. Pancasila, the five principles articulated in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution, serves as the foundational source of all legal sources in Indonesia and plays a fundamental role in shaping national legal identity. In the era of globalization, marked by the penetration of foreign legal values and liberalization across various sectors, the existence of Pancasila faces serious challenges both ideologically and normatively. The Indonesian Constitutional Court has invoked Pancasila as a "margin of appreciation" or "screening board" that filters foreign legal influence, requiring that international norms be harmonized with the collectivist values of Indonesian society before they can be incorporated into domestic law.

2.3 Globalization and Legal Reform in Post-Colonial Contexts

The relationship between globalization and legal reform is particularly complex in post-colonial contexts, where legal systems bear the imprint of colonial transplantation and the continuing influence of former metropolises. The Anglophone African experience is instructive: African lawmakers and judges continue to transplant English statutes and case law wholesale without tailoring them to suit African life, producing a legal order that is pluralistic and vacillates between two opposing legal philosophies. The transplanted laws are largely impervious to African legal and economic problems, creating what scholars have described as an "identity crisis" in the legal order while enabling elite malfeasance. Post-colonial African leaders conflated modernity with Westernization when they opted to privilege the inherited Western legal system over indigenous legal systems, and rather than serve as an effective legal framework for socio-economic development, this has actually created an identity crisis in the legal order.

The critical examination of constitution-making experiences in post-colonial Africa illustrates how external political and legal interventions have significantly influenced the continent's constitutional trajectory, and highlights the constitutionalisation of identity and diversity issues in the regional context, particularly the growing state recognition of religious and ethnic diversity. The interface between customary law and constitutionalism in sub-Saharan Africa raises fundamental questions about the relationship between imported constitutional models and

indigenous normative orders, and about whether constitutional identity can be constructed in a way that is authentically rooted in African social and cultural realities.

The British Virgin Islands provides a particularly intriguing case study of the paradoxes of legal reform under conditions of limited sovereignty. Law has become a key signifier in British Virgin Islander nationalist discourse: British Virgin Islanders cast law as central to their identity as a people and celebrate the self-authoring of law. Yet law writing has fostered continued colonial rule and subordination to the global market. The International Business Companies Ordinance, hailed as the BVI's first truly self-authored law, produced a marketable identity for the territory in the world of international finance, yet led to increased surveillance by metropolitan powers and contributed to the deferral of political sovereignty. This case illustrates the paradox that modern law, with its accompanying rhetoric of progress and its construction of "national" selves, is central to the cultural politics of difference, yet is also central to the processes of capitalist integration that both deny and demand difference.

2.4 The Asian Experience: Legal Transplantation and Cultural Identity

The Asian experience of legal transplantation and legal reform under globalization has generated distinctive theoretical insights. Legal transplantation and reform in the name of globalization is central to the transformation of Asian legal systems, and the contributions to *Examining Practice, Interrogating Theory: Comparative Legal Studies in Asia* analyze particular legal changes in China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Taiwan, and Vietnam. A recent study of legal reform between 1965 and 1995 in six Asian countries found a discernible shift from local discretionary rules to imported Western commercial norms, but concluded that legal imports were unevenly received. The uneven reception of legal imports reflects the persistence of distinctive legal cultures and the capacity of local actors to adapt, resist, or subvert transplanted norms.

The tension in East Asia between the trend towards a convergence of legal practices in the direction of a universal model and a reassertion of local cultural practices is a central theme in comparative legal scholarship. The trend towards convergence arises in part from globalization and from rule of law programs promoted by international organizations and bilateral donors, while the reassertion of local cultural practices reflects the resilience of indigenous normative orders and the political salience of cultural identity. Research on the "identity postulate of a legal culture" in Asian law in the face of globalization examines the problems caused by blending Western law with non-Western law, and suggests that legal identity is not a fixed cultural essence but a dynamic construct that is continuously negotiated through the interaction between imported norms and local practices.

The Japanese experience is particularly instructive. Japan's successful modernization through legal transplantation in the Meiji era and its subsequent adaptation of Western legal institutions to Japanese social and cultural conditions provide a model of "selective adaptation" that has been studied extensively. The importance of coordination between transplanting laws and Asian legal traditions and

legal cultures is a central lesson from Japan's experience of providing legal assistance for legal reform to Asian countries, and it raises fundamental questions about how to theorize and develop methodologies for comparing laws and legal cultures of Asian societies with those of the West. The Japanese case suggests that successful legal transplantation requires not the wholesale adoption of foreign models but their creative adaptation to local institutional and cultural contexts—a process that involves both the transformation of imported norms and the evolution of local legal culture.

2.5 Human Rights and the Politics of Legal Identity

The relationship between international human rights law and national legal identity is particularly fraught. The emergence of human rights as a coherent and powerful political idea was strongly associated with the formation, independence, and self-rule of nation states, yet human rights in the post-1945 world order were articulated and instantiated in law in forms that separated them from the distinctiveness of any particular national identities or traditions of law. This separation has generated a persistent tension: international human rights law claims universal validity, while national legal systems are embedded in particular cultural, historical, and political contexts that shape how human rights are understood and implemented.

The critique that international human rights discourse functions as a strategy of recolonization, denying the importance of local or transnational identities, has been articulated forcefully by post-colonial scholars and critical legal theorists. By presupposing the nation-state as the primary locus of identification for all humanity, the discourse of human rights may marginalize alternative forms of belonging and normative ordering. At the same time, the globalization of human rights has been accompanied by the emergence of a new global model in which individual rights have been complemented by the obligation of the state to recognize the diversity of collective identities in the national public sphere. This model attempts to reconcile universal human rights with cultural diversity by recognizing that the protection of individual rights may require the recognition and accommodation of collective cultural identities.

The question of whether universal human rights and different national citizenship regimes can ever be compatible remains contested. Some scholars argue that they cannot, setting out a legal-philosophical critique of the tension between universal rights and national belonging. Others contend that the apparent conflict can be mediated through institutional arrangements that recognize multiple forms of membership and belonging, and through interpretive practices that translate universal norms into locally meaningful terms. The resolution of this tension has profound implications for the protection of vulnerable communities, the governance of migration, and the legitimacy of international human rights institutions.

2.6 Legal Pluralism and the Challenge to State-Centric Law

The theoretical framework of legal pluralism provides essential resources for understanding how globalization reshapes the relationship between state law and non-state normative orders. The concept of relational legal pluralism (RLP) introduces a novel

approach to law and governance that disrupts traditional narratives about the nation-state and its centralized authority, challenging the legitimacy of established legal frameworks particularly in the face of globalization and societal disillusionment. RLP reframes law as arising from interconnected "legal spaces" shaped by identities, geography, history, and evolving power dynamics, and emphasizes ethical agency, reflexive communities, the embrace of a-legality, and a decolonial perspective.

A critical question that legal pluralism scholarship must address is the relationship between legal pluralism and political power. The assumption that legal pluralism itself may be a strategy of elites and nation-states amid globalization requires careful examination, and three sites of political power in the praxis of legal pluralism have been identified: politics of identities, non-ruling communities, and neo-liberal globalization. Power is produced in, resides in, and is generated in the dynamic interactions between nation-states, localities, and global agents. Transformative relations along these dimensions allow the nation-state to forfeit some elements of power, both in economics and in law, but they also enable it to maintain some essential ingredients of political power that are often veiled in the rhetoric of globalized pluralism.

The concept of legal pluralism has significant implications for understanding national legal identity under globalization. If law is not exclusively a product of the state but emerges from multiple normative orders, then national legal identity cannot be understood simply as the identity of state law. It must encompass the diverse normative orders that coexist within the national territory and the complex relationships among them. This recognition challenges state-centric conceptions of legal identity and opens space for more pluralistic and inclusive understandings of what it means to have a national legal order in a globalized world.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a normative juridical methodology with a comparative-analytical design. Normative juridical research examines legal norms, principles, and doctrines through the analysis of primary legal sources—constitutions, statutes, judicial decisions, and international instruments—as well as secondary sources including scholarly commentary, empirical studies, and reports from international organizations. The comparative dimension systematically examines how different legal systems construct and contest national legal identity under conditions of globalization, identifying patterns of convergence and divergence and explaining variation through reference to institutional, doctrinal, and cultural factors.

The research design is qualitative and multi-level. Primary sources include constitutional texts from Indonesia, South Africa, Hungary, Germany, and the British Virgin Islands, as well as judicial decisions from constitutional courts in these jurisdictions and from regional human rights courts. Legislative materials, including Indonesia's 2023 Penal Code and the International Business Companies Ordinance of the British Virgin Islands, provide additional primary sources. Secondary sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, and reports from international organizations, with a focus on scholarship published between 2015 and 2024.

The analytical framework integrates three dimensions of analysis. First, doctrinal analysis examines the content, structure, and internal coherence of legal norms relating to constitutional identity, legal transplantation, and the reception of international law. Second, comparative analysis identifies patterns of convergence and divergence across jurisdictions and legal traditions, with attention to the institutional and cultural factors that explain variation. Third, socio-legal analysis examines how formal legal rules interact with social norms, cultural values, and institutional practices, drawing on empirical research where available. The integration of these dimensions enables a holistic assessment of the relationship between globalization and legal reform as a multi-level governance phenomenon.

The selection of cases and jurisdictions was guided by three criteria: (1) theoretical significance, understood as the contribution of a case or jurisdiction to broader debates about legal globalization and national legal identity; (2) diversity of legal tradition, colonial history, and socio-political context; and (3) availability of authoritative legal texts and scholarly commentary. The analysis prioritizes developments from 2015 to 2024, with reference to foundational instruments and jurisprudence where necessary for contextual understanding.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Three Patterns of Engagement with Global Legal Norms

The comparative analysis reveals that states and legal actors engage with global legal norms through three distinct patterns, each generating different implications for national legal identity and cultural values. The first pattern is adaptive integration, in which states selectively incorporate international legal standards while simultaneously asserting constitutional particularity and adapting global norms to local institutional and cultural contexts. Indonesia exemplifies this pattern. The study of globalization's influence on Indonesian legislative theory demonstrates that globalization has encouraged a shift from a normative and centralized approach to a more participatory, adaptive, and democratic approach. Global influences are reflected in the transformation of legal values that are more open to the principles of social justice, public participation, and the protection of human rights. On the other hand, Indonesia continues to show its commitment to maintaining its legal identity by incorporating the values of Pancasila, customs, and local wisdom into the legislative process. Legislative theory in Indonesia has developed as a result of dialogue between local values and global demands, underscoring the importance of harmonizing national law in a way that not only follows global trends but also strengthens the sovereignty and identity of the nation's legal system.

The second pattern is resistive localization, in which states formally adopt global legal norms but subvert their application through administrative mechanisms, judicial interpretation, or constitutional identity claims. Hungary provides the clearest example of this pattern, where the Constitutional Court has developed a doctrine of constitutional identity that is invoked to resist the application of EU law in areas perceived as threatening to national sovereignty and cultural values. The post-colonial

African experience with legal transplantation also exhibits elements of resistive localization: despite formal adherence to international human rights standards, African legal systems continue to vacillate between transplanted laws and indigenous normative orders, producing a pluralistic legal landscape in which the practical effect of imported norms is frequently limited.

The third pattern is hybrid accommodation, in which global and local normative orders coexist through negotiated institutional arrangements that recognize multiple sources of legal authority. The British Virgin Islands case illustrates this pattern: law has become a key signifier in nationalist discourse, with British Virgin Islanders casting law as central to their identity as a people and celebrating the self-authoring of law. Yet law writing has fostered continued colonial rule and subordination to the global market, as the International Business Companies Ordinance produced a marketable identity for the territory in the world of international finance while simultaneously leading to increased surveillance by metropolitan powers. This case demonstrates the paradox that modern law is central to the cultural politics of difference yet is also central to the processes of capitalist integration that both deny and demand difference.

The three patterns are not mutually exclusive, and most jurisdictions combine elements of all three. However, the dominant pattern in a given jurisdiction has significant implications for the relationship between legal reform and cultural values. Adaptive integration preserves space for cultural particularity while enabling participation in global legal regimes. Resistive localization protects national legal identity but may isolate the state from international cooperation and undermine the protection of individual rights. Hybrid accommodation enables pragmatic engagement with global norms but risks producing legal fragmentation and uncertainty.

4.2 Constitutional Identity as a Dynamic Construct

The comparative analysis reveals that constitutional identity is not a static cultural residue but a dynamic construct that is continuously produced and reproduced through the interaction between global normative pressures and local institutional and cultural resources. The doctrine of constitutional identity has been developed most elaborately in the jurisprudence of constitutional courts, which serve as key sites for the articulation and contestation of national legal identity.

The German Federal Constitutional Court's "eternity clause" jurisprudence provides a foundational model. The Court has interpreted Article 79(3) of the Basic Law as establishing a constitutional identity that constrains Germany's participation in the European Union and the application of EU law that conflicts with fundamental constitutional principles. This doctrine has been influential beyond Germany, inspiring similar constitutional identity claims in Hungary, Poland, and other EU member states. The Hungarian Constitutional Court has developed a more contested version of the doctrine, invoking constitutional identity to resist EU migration and asylum policies, and the Polish Constitutional Tribunal has used similar reasoning to challenge the primacy of EU law.

The Indonesian approach to constitutional identity is distinctive in its explicit grounding in cultural values. Pancasila, the five foundational principles of the Indonesian state, serves as the ultimate source of all legal sources and the normative framework within which international legal norms must be interpreted. The Indonesian Constitutional Court has invoked Pancasila as a "margin of appreciation" or "screening board" that filters foreign legal influence, requiring that international norms be harmonized with the collectivist values of Indonesian society before they can be incorporated into domestic law. This approach reflects a broader pattern in Asian constitutionalism, where constitutional identity is frequently constructed in relation to cultural values that are understood as prior to and independent of the constitutional text itself.

However, the construction of constitutional identity is not without contestation. The Indonesian case illustrates the internal diversity of constitutional identity claims: while some legal actors invoke Pancasila's collectivist values to justify resistance to individual rights norms, others interpret Pancasila as encompassing principles of social justice and human dignity that are compatible with international human rights standards. The Constitutional Court's jurisprudence reflects both tendencies, and the meaning of constitutional identity remains an ongoing site of legal and political struggle.

The concept of "identity work" captures the strategic practices through which legal actors construct and contest constitutional identity. Constitutional courts, legislatures, and legal scholars engage in identity work when they selectively invoke cultural values, historical narratives, and constitutional traditions to justify particular legal outcomes or to resist external normative pressures. Identity work is not a neutral process of cultural preservation but a strategic practice that involves selection, interpretation, and framing. The analysis of identity work reveals that constitutional identity is not a fixed constraint on legal change but a resource that can be mobilized for diverse and sometimes contradictory purposes.

4.3 Legal Transplantation and the Limits of Convergence

The comparative analysis provides strong evidence that legal transplantation does not produce the uniform convergence that its optimistic proponents predicted, nor the complete failure that its culturalist critics anticipated. Instead, legal transplantation produces variable outcomes that depend on contextual compatibility, institutional capacity, local legitimacy, and interpretive adaptation. The evidence does not support universal causal claims about the success or failure of legal transplants; rather, it consistently suggests that the effectiveness of transplantation is shaped by the interaction between imported norms and local conditions.

The Anglophone African experience illustrates the limits of convergence most vividly. African lawmakers and judges continue to transplant English statutes and case law wholesale without tailoring them to suit African life, producing a legal order that is pluralistic and vacillates between two opposing legal philosophies. The perpetuation of alien law and systems in independent Africa has dealt a severe blow to the whole idea of independence, as constitution after constitution proclaims the importance of

traditional African values while nonetheless subordinating these values to Western values in the form of the bill of rights. This pattern of formal commitment to international norms coexisting with substantively divergent outcomes is a recurring theme in post-colonial legal systems, and it reflects the deeper tension between the universalist claims of international human rights law and the particularistic commitments of national legal cultures.

The Asian experience provides a more nuanced picture. A study of legal reform between 1965 and 1995 in six Asian countries found a discernible shift from local discretionary rules to imported Western commercial norms, but concluded that legal imports were unevenly received. The uneven reception of legal imports reflects the persistence of distinctive legal cultures and the capacity of local actors to adapt, resist, or subvert transplanted norms. The Japanese experience of legal transplantation in the Meiji era and subsequent adaptation of Western legal institutions to Japanese social and cultural conditions provides a model of selective adaptation that has been studied extensively, and the importance of coordination between transplanting laws and Asian legal traditions and legal cultures is a central lesson from Japan's experience of providing legal assistance for legal reform to Asian countries.

The evidence on legal transplantation suggests that convergence is neither inevitable nor impossible but is contingent on a complex interaction of legal, institutional, political, and cultural factors. The most successful transplants are those that are adapted to local conditions rather than imposed wholesale, and that are accompanied by institutional capacity building, local ownership, and sustained interpretive engagement. The least successful transplants are those that are imposed coercively without regard to local context, or that are adopted formally without the institutional and cultural infrastructure necessary for their effective implementation.

4.4 The Role of Legal Culture in Shaping Normative Interaction

The study's findings reveal that legal culture—the ideas, values, expectations, and attitudes that people hold toward law and legal institutions—plays a crucial mediating role in shaping how global legal norms interact with national legal systems. Legal culture is not merely a passive background condition but an active force that shapes how legal rules are interpreted, applied, and experienced. The concept helps to explain why similar formal legal rules produce different outcomes across jurisdictions: the effectiveness of constitutional provisions recognizing human rights depends not only on their textual content but also on the attitudes of judges, the expectations of litigants, and the broader social understandings of law's role and authority.

The adaptation of legal cultures to globalization is not a one-way process of convergence toward a global legal culture. Instead, it involves the creative adaptation of global norms to local cultural contexts and the simultaneous transformation of local legal cultures through engagement with global norms. Legal culture 'repacked' in the context of globalization refers to the process by which legal traditions and practices are reconfigured through interaction with global legal norms, producing new hybrid forms that are neither purely local nor purely global.

The concept of legal culture has significant implications for understanding the relationship between legal reform and cultural values. Legal reforms that are inconsistent with local legal culture are unlikely to be effective, regardless of their formal adoption. Conversely, legal reforms that are adapted to local legal culture are more likely to be implemented successfully and to generate the intended outcomes. This finding suggests that legal reformers must attend not only to the content of legal rules but also to the cultural conditions that shape their reception and operation.

4.5 Identity Work and the Politics of Legal Identity

The concept of "identity work" captures the strategic practices through which legal actors construct and contest national legal identity in response to globalization. Identity work is not a neutral process of cultural preservation but a strategic practice that involves selection, interpretation, and framing. Legal actors engage in identity work when they selectively invoke cultural values, historical narratives, and constitutional traditions to justify particular legal outcomes or to resist external normative pressures.

The Indonesian case provides particularly rich material for analyzing identity work. The Constitutional Court's jurisprudence on Pancasila as a "screening board" for foreign legal influence is a clear example of identity work: the Court selectively invokes Pancasila's collectivist values to justify resistance to individual rights norms while simultaneously interpreting Pancasila as encompassing principles of social justice and human dignity that are compatible with international human rights standards. This selective invocation reflects the internal diversity of constitutional identity claims and the strategic character of identity work.

The politics of legal identity is particularly visible in debates over the reception of international human rights law. The critique that international human rights discourse functions as a strategy of recolonization, denying the importance of local or transnational identities, has been articulated forcefully by post-colonial scholars. This critique has been mobilized in identity work by states and legal actors seeking to resist the application of international human rights norms that are perceived as threatening to national sovereignty or cultural values. At the same time, the globalization of human rights has been accompanied by the emergence of a new global model in which individual rights have been complemented by the obligation of the state to recognize the diversity of collective identities in the national public sphere. This model attempts to reconcile universal human rights with cultural diversity by recognizing that the protection of individual rights may require the recognition and accommodation of collective cultural identities.

The analysis of identity work reveals that national legal identity is not a fixed constraint on legal change but a resource that can be mobilized for diverse and sometimes contradictory purposes. Identity work can be used to resist global norms and preserve cultural particularity, but it can also be used to justify legal reforms by framing them as consistent with national traditions and values. The strategic character of identity work suggests that the relationship between globalization and legal reform is not a zero-sum conflict between global convergence and national particularism but a

dynamic process of negotiation in which both global and local norms are transformed through their interaction.

4.6 Synthesis: Toward a Dynamic Theory of Legal Identity Under Globalization

The comparative analysis reveals that the relationship between globalization and legal reform is characterized by three persistent tensions. The first is the tension between convergence and particularism. Globalization exerts pressure toward convergence around liberal constitutional norms, human rights standards, and market-oriented regulatory frameworks, but this pressure is mediated by national legal cultures, constitutional traditions, and cultural values that produce persistent particularism. The outcome is neither uniform convergence nor complete particularism but a complex pattern of selective adaptation, hybridization, and negotiated coexistence.

The second tension is between sovereignty and integration. Supranational legal regimes—the European Union, the World Trade Organization, regional human rights courts—increasingly condition the exercise of national sovereignty, but states continue to assert constitutional identity claims that limit the scope of supranational authority. The resolution of this tension depends on institutional arrangements that enable dialogue and mutual accommodation between national and supranational legal orders, rather than on the assertion of hierarchy by either side.

The third tension is between legal uniformity and cultural diversity. International human rights law claims universal validity, but national legal systems are embedded in particular cultural and historical contexts that shape how human rights are understood and implemented. The challenge is to design legal frameworks that respect cultural diversity without sacrificing the universal protection of fundamental rights.

A dynamic theory of legal identity under globalization must navigate these tensions without resolving them prematurely. Such a theory should be grounded in four principles. First, legal identity should be understood as a dynamic construct that is continuously produced and reproduced through the interaction between global normative pressures and local institutional and cultural resources. Second, legal transplantation should be understood as a process of adaptation rather than transfer, in which imported norms are transformed through their engagement with local legal cultures. Third, constitutional identity should be understood as a resource for legal argumentation rather than a fixed constraint on legal change, and its invocation should be subject to principles of transparency, consistency, and human rights compatibility. Fourth, the relationship between global and local legal orders should be understood as one of dialogue and mutual accommodation rather than hierarchy or subordination.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has examined the relationship between globalization and legal reform through a comparative analysis of legal identity construction in Indonesia, post-colonial Africa, East Asia, and the British Virgin Islands. The analysis reveals a global landscape characterized by dynamic interaction between global normative pressures and local institutional and cultural resources.

The principal findings can be summarized as follows. First, states engage with global legal norms through three distinct patterns—adaptive integration, resistive localization, and hybrid accommodation—each generating different implications for national legal identity and cultural values. The dominant pattern in a given jurisdiction shapes the relationship between legal reform and cultural preservation.

Second, constitutional identity is not a static cultural residue but a dynamic construct that is continuously produced and reproduced through strategic practices of identity work. Constitutional courts, legislatures, and legal scholars selectively invoke cultural values, historical narratives, and constitutional traditions to justify legal outcomes and to resist external normative pressures. Identity work is a strategic practice that involves selection, interpretation, and framing.

Third, legal transplantation does not produce uniform convergence. The effectiveness of transplantation depends on contextual compatibility, institutional capacity, local legitimacy, and interpretive adaptation. The evidence does not support universal causal claims about the success or failure of legal transplants; rather, it consistently suggests that outcomes are shaped by the interaction between imported norms and local conditions.

Fourth, legal culture plays a crucial mediating role in shaping how global legal norms interact with national legal systems. Legal reforms that are inconsistent with local legal culture are unlikely to be effective, regardless of their formal adoption. Successful legal reform requires attention not only to the content of legal rules but also to the cultural conditions that shape their reception and operation.

Fifth, the relationship between globalization and legal reform is characterized by persistent tensions between convergence and particularism, sovereignty and integration, and legal uniformity and cultural diversity. The resolution of these tensions depends on institutional arrangements that enable dialogue and mutual accommodation between national and supranational legal orders.

The theoretical contribution of this study lies in its integration of legal transplantation theory, constitutional identity scholarship, and the sociology of legal globalization to explain the dynamic relationship between globalization and legal reform. The concept of identity work offers a novel analytical framework for understanding how legal actors construct and contest national legal identity in response to global normative pressures. The study also advances comparative legal scholarship by developing a typology of engagement patterns and demonstrating how institutional design, legal culture, and political economy shape the outcomes of legal reform under globalization.

The practical and policy implications are several. Policymakers should prioritize adaptive integration over resistive localization or hybrid accommodation, as adaptive integration preserves space for cultural particularity while enabling participation in global legal regimes. Constitutional courts should develop transparent and principled approaches to constitutional identity claims that respect cultural values without

undermining human rights protection. Legal reformers should attend to legal culture and institutional capacity in designing and implementing legal reforms. International organizations should support locally owned and context-sensitive legal reform processes rather than imposing uniform models.

The limitations of this study include its reliance on documentary sources and legal analysis rather than empirical data on the implementation and impact of legal reforms. Future research should examine the actual effects of different patterns of engagement with global legal norms on legal effectiveness, human rights protection, and cultural preservation through empirical methods including case studies, surveys, and quantitative analysis. Additionally, the study's focus on Indonesia, post-colonial Africa, East Asia, and the British Virgin Islands means that other regions—including Latin America, the Middle East, and Central Asia—are underrepresented. Future research should examine how the relationship between globalization and legal reform operates in these regions and what alternative models of legal identity construction exist.

The relationship between globalization and legal reform remains one of the most complex and consequential challenges facing contemporary legal systems. Addressing this challenge requires not only legal reform but also institutional innovation, political will, and sustained engagement with the cultural values and social norms that shape how law is experienced and understood. The framework developed in this study offers a foundation for such engagement by clarifying the conceptual distinctions, comparative patterns, and practical implications that must inform any effective approach to managing the tension between global integration and national legal identity.

REFERENCES

- Barzilai, G. (2008). Beyond relativism: Where is political power in legal pluralism? *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, 9(2), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1565-3404.1188>
- Chelmowska, P. W. (2024). Legal transplants in comparative perspective. *Comparative Law Review*, 15(1), 45–72.
- Gillespie, J. (2001). Globalisation and legal transplantation: Lessons from the past. *Deakin Law Review*, 6(2), 286–310.
- Griffiths, J. (1986). What is legal pluralism? *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 24(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.1986.10756387>
- Hooker, M. B. (1975). *Legal pluralism: An introduction to colonial and neo-colonial laws*. Clarendon Press.
- Legrand, P. (1997). The impossibility of "legal transplants". *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, 4(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1023263X9700400202>
- McDonald, A. (2020). *Changing states, changing nations: Constitutional reform and national identity in the late twentieth century*. Hart Publishing.

- Murphy, M. (2024). Relational legal pluralism: Ethical agency, reflexive communities, a-legality, and the revitalization of democratic institutions. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4771514>
- Nelken, D. (Ed.). (2016). Adapting legal cultures. Hart Publishing.
- Peters, A., & Kumm, M. (2025). Constitutional identity and the limits of integration. In International law from a Central European perspective (pp. 1–28). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45678-9_1
- Poyarkov, S. Y. (2025). The constitutionalism at the national level and the post-globalization legal order: Challenges and prospects of convergence. Administrative and Municipal Law, 2025(4), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0595.2025.4.74903>
- Sannerholm, R. Z. (2010). 'Cut-and-paste'? Rule of law promotion and legal transplants in war to peace transitions. In A. Bakardjieva Engelbrekt & J. Nergelius (Eds.), New directions in comparative law (pp. 145–168). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Tamanaha, B. Z. (1993). The folly of the "social scientific" concept of legal pluralism. Journal of Law and Society, 20(2), 192–217. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1410167>
- United Nations. (2007). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. A/RES/61/295.
- Velásquez Ochoa, J. A., Betancourt Durango, R. A., Garcés Giraldo, L. F., Castilla Cabezudo, J. L., Garcia Arango, D. A., Giraldo Giraldo, M., & Jaramillo Gómez, N. I. (2026). Legal transplants: A systematic review of conceptual frameworks and practical limitations. Laws, 15(4), 67. <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws15040067>
- Watson, A. (1974). Legal transplants: An approach to comparative law. Scottish Academic Press.
- Winkler, M. M., & Bantekas, I. (2025). The criminalization of sexual minorities in international human rights law: An appraisal. Human Rights Law Review, 25(2), ngaf017. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngaf017>
- Zhou, Y. (2025). Anglophone Africa, colonial legacy and the limits of legal transplantation: Should the one-legged walk on two feet? Journal of African Law, 69(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855325000123>
- Andriani, D. (2025). The existence of Pancasila as a national legal identity in the midst of globalization. Indonesian Journal of Legal Studies, 12(1), 1–28.
- Arizona, Y., & Cohen, M. (2024). The recognition of customary land rights at the Constitutional Court of Indonesia: A comparative and international law assessment. In Courts and diversity: Twenty years of the Constitutional Court of Indonesia (pp. 173–194). Brill.
- Constanzo, P. (2024). Writing law, making a "nation": History, modernity, and paradoxes of self-rule in the British Virgin Islands. Law & Society Review, 58(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/lsr.2024.1>

- Gur-Arye, M. (2025). Various kinds of cultural defence in the criminal law. Singapore Journal of Legal Studies, March 2025, 1–16.
- Joharsah, R., Faruq, I. A., Humairo, S. K., Ikhwana, L., & Minarni, S. (2026). Strengthening constitutional awareness and national identity among Indonesian youth in Malaysia through community-based legal education. Journal of Public Administration and Governance, 16(1), 1–18.
- Kurniawan, M. D., & Moeslim, A. (2024). Civic education and constitutional literacy in Indonesia. Journal of Civic Education, 7(1), 1–18.
- Petersmann, E.-U. (2025). Nationalism, human rights, and multilevel constitutionalism. Columbia Journal of International Law, 60(1), 1–42.
- Prakoso, A. B., & Prasetyo, D. (2024). Digital literacy and civic participation among Indonesian youth. Journal of Civic Education, 7(2), 45–62.
- Purwantiningsih, E., & Kusnadi, D. (2024). Constitutional learning and democratic attitudes in Indonesian higher education. Journal of Legal Education, 4(1), 1–24.
- Ramli, A. M., Suseno, S., Mayana, R. F., Rajamanickam, R., & Rohmana, R. D. (2026). The urgency of regulating artificial intelligence in relation to cybersecurity and cyber resilience. Cogent Law & Criminology, 7(1), 2632977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2026.2632977>
- Santos, B. de S. (2002). Toward a new legal common sense: Law, globalization, and emancipation (2nd ed.). Butterworths.
- Schulz, W. (2020). The problem of platform law: Pluralistic legal ordering on social media. In P. S. Berman (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of global legal pluralism (pp. 1–24). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197516744.013.33>