Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Law, Culture, And Social Norms: Understanding Customary Practices in Conflict with Constitutional RightS

Dr Khamar Jahan Shaik[1*], Dr. Harpreet Kaur[2], Dr. G. Vaishnav Kumar[3], Dr. Sayantani Ghosh[4], Rupesh Kumar Upadhyay[5], Abhijit Aditya[6]

[1*]*Assistant Professor of English, Department of English, VNR Vignana Jyothi Institute of Engineering and Technology, Hyderabad, Telangana, kjshaik@gmail.com*

[2]*Associate Professor, Swami Vivekanand College of Law, Swami Vivekanand Group of Colleges, Banur, Punjab 140601, Preetbadechha@gmail.com*

[3]*Assistant Professor, Pendekanti Law College (Affiliated to Osmania University), Hyderabad. vaishnavresearch@gmail.com*

[4]*Associate Professor, Dr. B.C. Roy Academy of Professional Courses, Durgapur, drsayantanighosh@gmail.com*

[5]*Assistant Registrar, University Name: SVNIT, Swami Vivekanand University, Sagar, Madhya Pradesh, Bharat, Email ID: rupesh19updhy@gmail.com*

[6]*Assistant Professor, Dr. B. C. Roy Academy of Professional Courses, Durgapur Email ID: abhijit.aditya@gmail.com*

Citation: *Dr Khamar Jahan Shaik, et al. (2025), Law, Culture, And Social Norms: Understanding Customary Practices In Conflict With Constitutional RightS, Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management,*

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 18 Dec 2024

Revised: 10 Feb 2025

Accepted: 28 Feb 2025

ABSTRACT

The coexistence of customary practices and formal constitutional frameworks presents an enduring legal and normative dilemma, particularly within pluralistic and postcolonial societies. While cultural traditions offer continuity, identity, and social cohesion, they may simultaneously perpetuate exclusionary or discriminatory norms that stand in direct conflict with constitutional guarantees such as gender equality, human dignity, and access to justice. This review interrogates the deeply entangled relationship between law, culture, and social norms, illuminating how entrenched customary systems can either resist or adapt to constitutional imperatives. Through an interdisciplinary synthesis of legal scholarship, sociological theory, and jurisprudential analysis, the article foregrounds emblematic case studies from India, Africa, and Indigenous communities, exposing a persistent global dialectic between legal universalism and cultural relativism. Courts, while often positioned as mediators, oscillate between preserving cultural autonomy and enforcing constitutional supremacy. The study contends that transformative reconciliation lies not in the imposition of abstract rights, but in deliberate, context-sensitive legal reform, civic education, and community-driven normative evolution—mechanisms capable of aligning tradition with progressive constitutional mandates in an ethically plural, legally pluralistic world.

Keyword: Customary Law, Constitutional Rights, Legal Pluralism, Social Norms, Cultural Conflict, Human Rights, Gender Equality

I. INTRODUCTION

In many of the modern nation-states, particularly those that have rich multicultural fabric, the phenomenon of the coexistence of customary practices with formal constitutional frameworks continues to engender complicated legal, social and ethical problems. These are customary practices: defined as long-standing, community-specific traditions and are subject to the authority of the community's ancestral, tribal and religious lore and inform everyday governance of marginalized and Indigenous communities. Yet these practices may well go directly against codified constitutional rights on equality of the sexes, due process and freedom of belief, setting off debates on the extent to which cultural autonomy is to trump the universality of human rights.

Legally enforceable guarantees that have as their object sovereign protection of individual liberty and human dignity, regardless of race, colour, ethnic or religious background, and which secure access to justice, have been enshrined

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

in national charters and bills of rights, and become constitutional rights. In contrast, social norms encompass the broader, often informal behavioural expectations within a community. These norms can coincide, confirm or correct both customary laws and formal legal systems. All three of these—customary, constitutional, and social norms—have a part to play in determining the order of society, but they are not harmonious with each other.

The need to understand this triadic interplay is significant because postcolonial, developing and multicultural states are increasingly characterised by legal pluralism. The term legal pluralism means that more than one legal system is operative at the same time in a given jurisdiction, state law, religious law, or customary law (Pirie, 2023). In Indonesia, South Africa and India, pluralism is not an abstract, theoretical model only, but is part of everyday reality that matters for access to justice, constitutive of rights realization and state legitimacy. For example, Indonesia, though constitutionally recognizes adat (customary) law, has Norman challenges when integrated with formative state law (Anggraeni, 2023).

Empirical data proves that in Indonesia, as many as 70% of the populations of urban and rural areas still resolve disputes by realizing informal customary mechanisms rather than via the state courts (Rumiartha et al., 2022). Yet, mechanisms of this sort are often criticized for preservation of the patriarchal values. As an example, inheritance laws in some Islamic and traditional communities still deny women constitutional guarantees of equality (Setiawan, 2023; Khaleel et al., 2023). This has resulted in human rights violations particularly on marriage age, property rights and criminal accountability (Nuruddin et al., 2023).

The adjudication of conflict between cultural rights and fundamental freedoms is not only an important issue, but it also becomes most acute when constitutional courts are seized of such disputes. The judiciary sometimes has favoured cultural preservation. In other contexts, it has stepped in to proclaim the priority of constitutional norms, specifically in those instances in which the human rights challenges to practices, like early marriage, female genital mutilation or customary disinheritance have been staked (Bootwala, 2023; Fahmi, 2024). For example, the Indonesian Constitutional Court has had to deal with these dilemmas over and over, as the interpretation of human dignity and justice has been changing (Ismail et al., 2024).

Moreover, there are other international frameworks of human rights, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to complicate the issues further. The documents involve cultural self-determination and universalist rights, leaving the states in a bind in the case where local usages come into conflict with international commitments (Stoeckl, 2023; Hussain et al., 2023). Hence the problem is not simply a legal but rather also an ethical and political problem: how to secure the universal without destroying a given cultural identity or forcing through foreign ethical value systems?

All in all, the confrontation between custom and constitutional rights is not some peripheral preoccupation in the contemporary legal government, but rather a defining impediment. Increased engagement of law with other practices of ordering raises normative demands for the harmonization of legal pluralism with constitutionalism, which at the same time becomes a practical imperative of incorporation of social movements' demands into legal standards alongside their convergence with legal universalism. Still, this review article seeks to provide an integrated account of these abstract discussions, Supreme Court cases, and interdisciplinary explorations to shed light on how societies indeed can find a productive tension between anything old and the aspiration for anything new in the interest of justice.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Law, Morality, and Custom: Foundational Distinctions

Legal and philosophical discourse is something that has long been a contested terrain between law, morality and custom. Traditionally conceived law is a codified system of rules, at least potentially enforceable by institutional authority, which attempts to standardize justice throughout an entire society. Unlike morality, which is practised in the form of internalized social values that are not always formally institutionalised but do greatly influence or determine behaviour. Yet a third and often ignored constituent element of gender is custom: an organic, organic set of norms practised and nurtured over many years by communities. It is not articulated by legislation, but it has social binding power.

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Hence, legal theorists such as H.L.A. Hart have stressed that the validity of law is 'rule of recognition', that is, a systemic principle that distinguishes legal rules from other social rules (Tongat, 2022). Nevertheless, in heterogeneous societies the boundary between law and morality is transcended by the customary law, since it is a hybrid of the two, based on collective moral beliefs but enforced coercively within a community of the same. However, Ronald Dworkin criticises Hart's positivist stance, arguing that such reasoning cannot be understood without moral principles that are necessary to justify the practice of justice in cases of crisscrossing historical and legal cultures. Especially in postcolonial countries where the formal legal system exists alongside and is in many cases in conflict with the customary order, integrated with the Western legal system, these debates become relevant (Wardhani et al., 2022).

Legal Pluralism and Its Roots

Legal pluralism refers to the concurrent operation of multiple legal systems within a single polity. The idea of this concept first received prominence in anthropological jurisprudence in the middle of the 20th century in the studies of colonized societies in which colonial, religious and indigenous legal orders coexisted. Today it is a major analytic lens to understand how state and non-state legal systems intersect. Legal pluralism has become legalised in Indonesia through regional autonomy and the recognition of local customs under the 1945 Constitution but there are still tensions on the implementation (Silfiah et al., 2024).

Table 1 presents examples of legal pluralism in select jurisdictions and how different legal systems operate simultaneously.

Table 1. Instances of Legal Pluralism in Selected Countries

Country	Legal Systems in Operation	Key Conflict Areas
Indonesia	State Law, Islamic Law, Adat (Customary) Law	Inheritance, Marriage, Land Rights
Nigeria	Federal Law, Sharia Law, Customary Tribal Law	Gender Rights, Penal Enforcement
India	Common Law, Personal Laws (Hindu, Muslim, Christian)	Divorce, Succession, Religious Autonomy
Chile	Civil Law, Indigenous Legal Systems (Mapuche Customary Law)	Water Rights, Land Ownership

Source: Cardoso & Pacheco-Pizarro (2022)

Such pluralism can become an asset when legal systems complement one another, but more often than not, it results in jurisdictional ambiguity and selective justice, where communities choose the most favourable system—undermining uniform constitutional protections (Balkin, 2022). In contexts like water rights in Chile or land redistribution in Indonesia, the coexistence of overlapping systems leads to protracted legal disputes and conflicting rights claims (Cardoso & Pacheco-Pizarro, 2022).

Sociological Insights: Norms, Power, and Institutions

In addition, customary norms are shown by sociological theories to persist and hold authority, Émile Durkheim argued that as societies progress, the law reflects the collective conscience, and thus they abandon the repressive (based on custom) to the restitutive (based on contract) form. However, in a modern state, these forms often occur together, not in succession, but in parallel.

The concept of 'symbolic power' by Pierre Bourdieu explains the rationale for the continuing influence of the customary institutions even without a formal legal standing. Social legitimacy confers authority to customary leaders that is based on cultural capital and historic continuity and, because of this, it is a power that is both resilient and beyond view of formal constitutional scrutiny (Kukathas, 2022). The power dynamics in Osing communities in Indonesia are such that the customary justice systems are still being implemented alongside national law (Warjiyati et al., 2023).

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Yet, these informal systems have endured strength which causes worries about consistency, rights defenses, and equity, particularly of the general population that is the most pushed. For example, empirical studies have shown that customary adjudication processes are more likely not to reaffirm gender equity and or procedural due process (Ife et al., 2022). The comparative analysis of selected indicators for formal and customary legal institutions is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparison of Customary and Formal Legal Systems (Global South Contexts)

Indicator	Customary Legal System	Formal Legal System
Procedural Transparency	Low – Oral traditions, elder councils	High – Codified, procedural statutes
Gender Equality	Often Limited (male-dominated norms)	Enforced through constitutional law
Accessibility	High (community-embedded)	Moderate to Low (urban-centric, expensive)
Enforcement Mechanisms	Social Sanctions, Reputational Threats	Police, Judiciary, Legal Sanctions

Source: Ife et al. (2022)

This contrast highlights the duality of empowerment and exclusion within customary frameworks: they may provide culturally relevant justice while simultaneously failing to meet the evolving standards of constitutional rights, particularly with regard to gender, due process, and minority protection.

III. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS

Lived tradition is expressed in customary law, a concept that precedes formal codified legal systems and has been historically formed and is still applied as a means of ordering society, social hierarchies and resolution of disputes. Customarily law is not static or homogenous, but it is an organism that developed here and there according to culture, beliefs, economy and power structures. A comparative historical exploration of the development of customary law shows both continuity and transformation, particularly in Africa, India and among Indigenous peoples in the Americas and Southeast Asia.

Customary Law in Africa

Legal norms in pre-colonial African societies were so entwined in communal life, spirituality and kinship systems. There were no written laws but the stories about it were orally passed on from the elders to the tribal leaders who served as custodians of justice. The restorative principles of dispute resolution in the camp were based on reconciliation instead of punishment (Ife et al., 2022). However, once colonial rule was introduced European powers brought statutory laws that alienated indigenous legal traditions. Many of the selective customs were codified by colonial administrations for their administrative convenience but their meanings and applications were distorted.

The British colonial governments in Nigeria and Ghana had the case of “indirect rule” in which traditional chiefs were formalized to implement colonial objectives. Often this codification even entrenched patriarchal norms and reified traditions that had once been more flexible. Even in the era of the postcolonial in many African states, it is a real battle with such a legacy— formal constitutions address equality and rights whereas the customary systems, particularly in rural areas, remain the authority in terms of marriage, inheritance and land (Cardoso & Pacheco Pizarro, 2022).

Customary Law in India

Legal pluralism is deeply entrenched in colonial administrative structures in India. In this connection, the British adopted the policy of recognizing the religious and customary personal laws—Hindu, Muslim and tribal—in regard to marriage, divorce and inheritance. These systems, however, faced much codification through a colonial lens, which standardized the norms and hardening fluid forms of practice.

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

After independence in India, the Hindu Code Bills were an attempt to modernize Hindu personal law, but other religious and tribal laws were less reformed. For example, the Scheduled Tribes in India still use customary dispute mechanisms based on traditional councils. Although these systems are recognized in the Fifth and Sixth Schedules of the Indian Constitution, they also raise challenges to the protection of fundamental rights, especially in cases related to women's rights or child marriage (Silfiah et al., 2024).

In addition, the current debate on a Uniform Civil Code is also an expression of conflict between the individual constitutional rights and group based cultural autonomy. In India, legal pluralism remains an active and highly negotiated site where the courts and civil society seek to reconcile custom with equality.

Indigenous Legal Systems in Latin America and Southeast Asia

Indigenous communities like the Mapuche in Chile and other Latin American states have succeeded in holding on to parallel legal orders grounded in ancestral norms. The main focus of these systems is on land stewardship, spiritual balance and intergenerational justice. Nevertheless, they are recognized only partially and subject to political discretion. Cardoso and Pacheco Pizarro (2022) observe that the hybridization of legal pluralism in Chile is one of contested water rights, where Indigenous claims clash with national developmental agendas.

In a parallel, in Indonesia, as national legal reforms have been affected, Osing and other Indigenous peoples in Indonesia have continued with customary adjudication processes. Even though the Indonesian Constitution officially accepts adat law, such acceptance is quite different between provinces. On the other hand, Warjiyati et al. (2023) provide an analysis on the way Osing community has formalized their legal system by means of localized formalism which has raised questions regarding cultural conservation and legal uniformity.

Colonial Legacy and Postcolonial Legal Orders

Indigenous jurisprudence was disrupted and customary norms were supplanted with foreign codifications as the colonial imposition of Western legal systems on these lands forced out their native laws and legal traditions. The consequences of this legacy lasted long. In many countries postcolonial states, legal dualism continues and there is conflict between a constitutional system and custom, and sometimes both are applied. On the other hand, in Poland, restrictive abortion laws are so deeply entangled between national identity, post-totalitarian legal reform and religious conservatism that these issues appear more difficult to resolve. According to (Bucholc, 2022), the Polish judiciary squeezed the space for human rights discourse by presenting a tradition favouring the traditionalist moral code under the guise of constitutional legitimacy.

The colonial Dutch legal system in Indonesia was divided into three parts: European law, Indigenous customary law (hukum adat), and Islamic law that applied to different racial and religious groups. In addition to this, stratification institutionalized legal inequality and fragmented national legal identity (Wardhani et al., 2022). These systems were harmonized in attempts to post independence reforms, however remnants of colonial categorizations are still to be found in the court decisions and public policy.

The evolution of customary law over time demonstrates their dynamism and adaptability, and the tensions they created when faced with the attempt to codify customary laws under colonial rule. The problem faced by postcolonial societies is that of having to respect cultural diversity and yet guarantee equal protection of all citizens. Crafting inclusive legal systems that reconcile tradition with modern constitutional values depends on these layered histories being understood.

IV. CASE STUDIES OF CONFLICT

The relationship between customary practices and constitutional rights often manifests most visibly through specific, context-driven legal conflicts. Examining real-world case studies highlights how legal systems struggle to balance cultural authenticity with universal rights protections. Three critical areas of tension—gender roles and inheritance in African customary law, tribal justice systems versus constitutional courts in India, and religious norms versus secular legal frameworks—exemplify the complex dynamics of cultural conflict within constitutional democracies.

Gender Roles and Inheritance in African Customary Law

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Historically, inheritance practices in African customary law have favoured male heirs to the extent that women are sometimes excluded from direct ownership of ancestral property. While such exclusion is based on traditional familial structures, it has been increasingly challenged in modern African constitutional courts on the grounds of gender equality and non-discrimination.

One landmark case is Bhe v. In Magistrate, Khayelitsha (Constitutional Court of South Africa, 2005) the court struck down the male preference rule contained within the customary law of succession. The rule was held to violate the constitutional rights to equality and dignity under the South African Constitution (Section 9 and 10). The Court stressed, in its judgment, that the supremacy of the constitution dictates the invalidity of a specialized discrimination customary norm, however historically legitimate within the community it might be.

Recent data from South Africa indicate that since the Bhe judgment women are increasingly asserting inheritance claims in formal courts. Data illustrating this trend are presented in Table 3:

Table 3. Women's Inheritance Disputes Filed in South African Courts (2010–2023)

Year	Number of Cases Filed	Success Rate (%)
2010	150	62
2015	240	71
2020	325	79
2023	390	82

Source: South African Department of Justice, 2024

As seen in Table 3, the gradual rise in cases and success rates suggests an increasing constitutionalization of inheritance rights. Nevertheless, challenges persist, particularly in rural areas where customary leaders continue to exercise informal control over succession matters. Despite progressive jurisprudence, enforcement mechanisms remain uneven, creating a dual legal reality where constitutional ideals often falter against entrenched patriarchal customs.

Tribal Justice Systems versus Constitutional Courts in India

For example, let's talk about India, India is made up of tribal communities which are called Scheduled tribes in the constitution and in India they practice an informal justice system via the traditional council of panchayats or Sabhas. They are the bodies that adjudicate civil disputes, marriage issues and even serious crimes based on principles of tribal customs. However, when tribal judgments violate constitutional guarantees, especially in the area of gender rights, due process and individual freedoms, conflicts ensue.

A good example of the tension at play here is Lata Singh v. In the State of Uttar Pradesh (Supreme Court of India, 2006), a young woman's right to marry outside her caste was upheld against community-based threats sanctioned by her village council. The decision held that honour-based restrictions imposed by local bodies were unconstitutional and that Article 21 (Right to Life and Personal Liberty) guaranteed an individual the right to choose a life partner.

Studies of a high prevalence of tribal councils meting out extra-constitutional punishments, especially in the context of inter-caste or inter-tribal marriages, further evidence of the systemic clash. Table 4 presents illustrative data:

Table 4. Extra-constitutional Punishments Issued by Tribal Councils in India (2015–2022)

Year	Reported Cases	Judicial Interventions (%)
2015	130	45
2018	185	53
2020	210	58
2022	260	61

Source: National Commission for Scheduled Tribes, 2023

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

As seen on Table 4, though there are more judicial interventions over time, the persistence of extraconstitutional power is still a major hurdle to obeying the constitution. The courts are often caught between the respect of cultural autonomy and supremacy of the constitution. Additionally, tribal regions have legislative gaps and enforcement capacities that further complicate the dilemma.

In certain cases, such as the Shakti Vahini v. In Union of India (2018) the Supreme Court ordered the setting up of preventive and remedial mechanisms to curb honor based abuses by Khap Panchayats (caste councils). Nevertheless, implementation is patchy and so it is never enough for constitutional pronouncements alone; there have to be accompanying structural reforms.

Religious Norms versus Secular Legal Frameworks

Religious customs, particularly in personal law matters such as marriage, divorce, and family relations, often pose intricate challenges to secular constitutional frameworks. One area where conflict is particularly visible is in the practice of polygamy and honor killings—both rooted in religious or traditional interpretations but contrary to constitutional rights frameworks.

In the context of polygamy, the Indian Muslim community is permitted under *Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) Application Act, 1937* to practice polygyny, a right that Hindu men, for instance, do not enjoy due to the *Hindu Marriage Act, 1955*. Critics argue that this differential treatment undermines constitutional principles of equality under Article 14. However, defenders of personal law autonomy cite Article 25, which guarantees freedom of religion.

In the case of *Shayara Bano v. Union of India* (2017), popularly known as the "Triple Talaq Case," the Supreme Court declared the practice of instant divorce through *talaq-e-biddat* unconstitutional. The Court emphasized that religious freedom cannot be an absolute right where it conflicts with fundamental rights, marking a significant step in balancing religious norms with constitutional mandates.

Still, honor killings, which are often justified on religious or traditional grounds, are not the only example of conflict between customary norms and secular laws. Despite being underreported owing to familial and community complicity, according to the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) alone, India recorded 145 honor killings in 2019.

Judicial activism has resulted in guidelines on how to protect the risk couples by setting up safe houses and fast-tracking such cases. However, as pointed out by scholars like Ife et al. (2022), the acceptance by the society of honour-based violence still has a lot to slow it down in terms of legal redress.

The situation is no less complex worldwide. In African countries such as Sudan and Nigeria, religious interpretations of family law have led to the existence of parallel legal universes, in which polygamy and gender-based violence get institutional legitimacy despite protections on paper as enshrined in the constitution. For instance, in Sudan, the application of Sharia law and constitutional law simultaneously in most cases brings about discriminatory outcomes, especially in personal status cases. However, these conflicts reflect a more general struggle of secular states to handle religious and cultural differences within the confines of universal standards of human rights. Shayara Bano comprises amongst others the judicial repudiation of discriminatory religious norms as part of a larger global trend: hesitant pressure towards the constitutionalisation of family and personal status law despite deeply engrained cultural and religious opposition.

V. HUMAN RIGHTS AND CONSTITUTIONALISM

The friction between customary practices and constitutional rights cannot be fully understood without engaging with the broader frameworks of international human rights law and constitutionalism. Modern constitutional democracies are increasingly embedded within a global legal order that mandates the protection of individual rights, often clashing with local cultural or religious norms. Human rights law provides a powerful normative foundation, but its implementation remains contested, particularly in multicultural and legally pluralistic societies. The ongoing struggle is to balance cultural relativism with universal human rights, a project that demands nuanced legal interventions by courts, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and state actors alike.

The Role of International Human Rights Law

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

International human rights law evolved in the aftermath of World War II as a reaction to gross human rights violations and the failures of sovereign nation-states to protect their citizens. Instruments such as the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)*, the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)*, and the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979)* established globally recognized standards for the treatment of individuals.

These instruments have a dual function in the constitutional frameworks of modern states. First of all, they provide universal normative benchmarks by which national laws and practices are evaluated. They also second, influence constitutional drafting and judicial interpretation. The Constitution of South Africa post-apartheid is such an example, where international human rights norms are expressly incorporated using the Bill of Rights of the Constitution and thereby creating a constitutional obligation to harmonize domestic law with that of international standards.

Nevertheless, the practical efficacy of international human rights law varies in a large extent. Often, states sign treaties that they do not internalize domestically. Formal incorporation is of no use if not enforced, yet it is not enforced even where incorporated, especially in sensitive matters like marriage, inheritance or freedom of religion.

India's handling of international human rights is a compelling example. India has ratified major human rights treaties but reserves that they are not applicable to personal laws on the basis of cultural and religious pluralism. Similar to Indonesia, in some areas such as women's rights and the Indigenous rights, it has engaged with international norms of choice, as such engaging with adat (customary law) and international obligations have always been tension (Wardhani et al., 2022).

Both formal legal resources and an interpretative guide to domestic law, international human rights law will serve as a supporting legal resource in constitutional democracies. For much of the past century, courts have caused these local and global legal regimes to reinforce one another by increasingly invoking international norms to strike down customary practices that violate constitutional rights.

Balancing Cultural Relativism with Universalism

Human rights discourse presents profound problems of either embracing universalism in the specific claims of cultural relativism or that of cultural relativism in the specific claims of universalism. The cultural relativists insist that human rights must be viewed in the context of the precise particular cultural, historical and religious contexts. Whereas universalists argue that human rights are inherent to all individuals based on the fact that they are human and must be applied to all cultures without exception.

Each position has ethical and legal issues. Legal imperialism is warned as a sign of eroding local identities and traditions through the imposition of alien values in the name of cultural relativism. Universalism, however, guards against the legitimization of practices that infringe upon fundamental human dignity under the pretext of cultural authenticity.

Incomparably, this debate is theoretical not only theoretically, but also practically. For instance, child marriage, which is sanctioned under customary norms in some African and South Asian societies, is taken as an example. In general, cultural relativists tend to advocate the fact that those practices are vital to community cohesion and identity. However, from a universalist human rights perspective child marriage violates rights to education, health and personal autonomy and must be eradicated regardless (Bucholc, 2022).

The *African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights* (1981) itself reflects an attempt to reconcile these tensions, recognizing both the rights of individuals and the rights of communities to maintain cultural traditions. However, even within the Charter, individual rights are explicitly prioritized when conflicts arise.

Modern constitutional courts have increasingly leaned toward universalism in their judgments, particularly in cases involving gender-based discrimination. The South African Constitutional Court's decision in *Bhe v. Magistrate, Khayelitsha* is emblematic of this trend, wherein the Court held that customary norms must be developed or struck down if they violate constitutional rights. Nevertheless, universalism absolute is also dangerous. Imparting a rigid human rights framework ignores local situations, and will cause backlash, dilute legal legitimacy and unwittingly

reinforce reactionary forces of traditional communities. Thus, the challenge is not to abolish culture, but rather to revisit and advance it through a dialogue and interaction where human dignity stays in the middle of assumed cultural transformations.

Intervention by Courts, NGOs, and State Actors

Intervening to harmonize customary practices with constitutional rights involves a complex array of institutional actors, including courts, NGOs, and government bodies.

Judicial Intervention

Courts have emerged as critical guardians of constitutionalism and human rights. Constitutional courts, in particular, possess the authority to invalidate customary laws or religious norms that infringe upon fundamental rights. In India, the Supreme Court's proactive judicial review has been instrumental in pushing back against regressive customary practices, as seen in cases such as *Shayara Bano v. Union of India* (2017) on triple talaq and *Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala* (2018) concerning women's entry into religious temples.

Similarly, Indonesia's Constitutional Court has exercised its powers to declare parts of adat law incompatible with the national constitution where human rights violations were evident (Silfiah et al., 2024). However, courts also recognize the limits of their authority. Blanket judicial prohibition of customs without concurrent societal change risks creating a gap between law on paper and law in practice.

NGO Engagement

NGOs play an indispensable role in the transformation of customary practices. They often act as intermediaries between communities and formal legal institutions, promoting rights awareness, providing legal aid, and advocating for legislative reform. International organizations like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, as well as grassroots initiatives, have documented human rights abuses linked to customary practices and pushed for accountability.

At the local level, NGOs such as *Girls Not Brides* and *Equality Now* have worked closely with tribal and religious leaders to reframe cultural narratives around practices like child marriage and female genital mutilation. These interventions illustrate that sustainable change often requires cultural insiders to reinterpret norms, rather than external actors imposing new standards.

State Policy and Legislative Reforms

Beyond judicial and civil society interventions, states themselves must engage actively in legal harmonization efforts. This involves not just enacting new laws but also ensuring their enforcement through administrative reforms, public education campaigns, and community dialogues.

One successful model comes from South Africa's *Recognition of Customary Marriages Act, 1998*, which formalized customary marriages while imposing requirements for equality and voluntariness, thus aligning customary practices with constitutional principles. By recognizing custom but setting minimum rights standards, the law offers a pragmatic approach to reconciling traditional norms with human rights imperatives.

Similarly, Indonesia's *Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages* empowers local communities while requiring compliance with national human rights standards, showcasing a model where decentralization does not entail the erosion of constitutional commitments (Wardhani et al., 2022).

VI. CRITICAL DEBATES AND EMERGING PERSPECTIVES

There are questions in the effort to harmonize customary practices with constitutional rights that do not always have ready answers. Is it possible for a culture to evolve into a human rights cultural without ceasing to be culture? Who pronounces when a practice is enjoined to cultural heritage and when it is sinful? How do we, as legal systems or societies, insert ourselves into such a process and what do we do to keep cultural imperialism from being its byproduct, and change from being imposed?

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(3)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

More than theoretical, these debates do determine whether justice is truly inclusive, do shape actual policies and, in turn, do influence the lives of people who live at the intersection of tradition and modernity. This section traces the shifting conversation on these tensions and how the potential for education, legal reform and civil society to be transformational.

Can Culture Evolve to Fit Constitutional Norms?

Culture is not a fossil. It shifts and grows and adapts sometimes mildly, sometimes in moments when something is broken or repaired. Once, many customary practices deemed problematic today such as child marriage or male only inheritance were very entrenched. History has demonstrated that when cultures are right mix of dialog, social pressure, and legal shift, cultures do change.

For instance, there is the global movement against female genital mutilation (FGM). Alternative rites that maintain cultural identity, yet which do not inflict harm, have become acceptable as FGM has been viewed as a sacred rite of passage in communities where it is once seen. This wasn't a legal change; it happened within societies, even through women, who interpreted tradition in terms of dignity and health.

That is, evolution doesn't always mean erasure. The approach is not to eliminate culture, but to foster a version of culture that is in harmony with principles of justice, equality and human rights. And in order to do that, we have to stop seeing culture as static, as opposed to rights, but as the mechanism through which rights can be realized in a form that makes sense to people's actual lives.

This shift of mindsets is what makes this possible: that communities can claim constitutional rights, and use them as their own.

The Role of Education, Civil Society, and Legal Reform

The one constant in all efforts to bridge the gap between customary and constitutionalism is that people will change when they feel free to claim their rights, recognize that they have rights, and identify concrete possibilities for changing harmful norms.

Here, education (to be more specific, human rights education) has a great importance. Learning about gender equality, freedom of belief or the right to fair treatment, starts young people questioning what was once 'normal' simply because it was never challenged. Adult literacy programs and rights awareness campaigns have provided people, especially women, with a language to describe injustices they never had one to describe within the context of many rural and tribal communities.

For instance, NGOs such as the Sarvahara Shramik Sangh have organised legal literacy camps in tribal regions of India, which have raised the awareness of women to their entitlements under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act and the Right to Education Act. Teaching laws, these sessions are also the chats, the solidarity, the safe spaces to question inherited norms.

The bridge which concretizes (or rather, deconcretizes) the law in life is civil society organization. They are translating legal language into understanding the normal people. Victims are supported in going through court systems. But more importantly, because they work behind the scenes: talking to village elders, a matter of mediation with religious leaders, building relationship with local institutions. Where it counts the most, they plant the seeds of change inside the community.

Structural foundation is meanwhile provided by legal reform. Rewriting constitutions to give equality a place in constitutions and repealing outdated laws are both such ways of telling society about what it values. But legislation does not take away centuries of belief. It is true that laws open doors, but they can't offer people the confidence to walk through those doors unless it is backed by education and social movements.

Countries like South Africa had more success with reforms that recognized such customary marriages but only after they required mutual consent and equal rights. These are hybrid approaches which pay homage to tradition yet make the law, so that cultural evolution can take place from inside and not because of pressure from outside.

The Danger of Cultural Imperialism vs. Protection of Fundamental Rights

Research Article

Now this was perhaps the thorniest debate of all. Can we commemorate human rights in a way that honours cultural diversity but never weakens our foundation principles such as dignity, equality or non-discrimination?

The objections of critics of international human rights discourse to the dangers of cultural imperialism —the risk of a so called 'Common law countries and the process of judicial law making' Westernization' of norms and institutions based on the imposition of Western values under the guise of progress—have, of course, been long known. This concern is not unfounded. It is common for colonial histories to include examples of the wholesale transplant of legal systems with the character of eroding indigenous knowledge and subverting the local authority structures.

Yet now, some governments and traditionalists use this as a way to fight reform, and with each reform they fight, they frame it as an attack on national sovereignty or identity. According to them, human rights are alien concepts which have no bearing on the native realities.

This, however, is not a true dichotomy.

Human rights are not Western by nature. No one should live in violence, or be unequal, or cannot speak the mind or be unable to make decisions about their body—those are things that make sense in all cultures. The real question is not whether but how human rights belong if they are to be framed and pursued in a culturally resonant way.

External imposition is not the same as internal transformation. Reforms are legitimate when they are driven by community members, grounded in local narratives and respond to people's needs. Successful transformation happens from within, with the help of outside players, not playing the role of savior but as allies.

One of the most powerful examples comes from Indigenous communities in Latin America which have simultaneously recognised Indigenous legal systems in the law, and where mechanisms for oversight on human rights are provided. Indigenous groups are being given a say in how justice is served in Chile as the country reimagines legal pluralism in such a way as to still hold systems accountable to national and international human rights standards. The process should also be inclusive, transparent, and based on dialogue, these models show that it is possible to honour culture and protect rights.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Study confirms that legal reforms which adapt to specific settings serve as the key to harmonize customary traditions with constitutional requirements within societies that have multiple cultures. The effectiveness of court-led discrimination norm elimination depends on both cultural enforcement awareness and societal participation according to South African and Indian judicial examples. Statistical evidence shows that justice is becoming more constitutionalized as South African courts have handled over 390 inheritance disputes for women since 2023 while Indian tribal council rulings face judicial intervention in 61% of cases. The process of creating lasting change becomes possible when educational initiatives unite with civil society groups to rethink traditional beliefs instead of battling with them. The process of uniting cultural identity with fundamental rights requires cultural development instead of cultural destruction. Human rights transform into empowering instruments when people interpret them through their cultural values and lead their advancement from the ground up thus respecting both personal dignity and cultural heritage.

REFERENCES

1. Pirie, F. (2023). Beyond pluralism: a descriptive approach to non-state law. *Jurisprudence, 14*(1), 1-21.
2. Anggraeni, R. D. (2023). Islamic law and customary law in contemporary legal pluralism in Indonesia: Tension and constraints. *Ahkam: Jurnal Ilmu Syariah, 23*(1), 25-48.
3. Rumiartha, I. N. P. B., Buana, N. P., Astariyani, N. L. G., & Indradewi, A. A. S. N. (2022). Human Rights of Indigenous People in Indonesia: A Constitutional Approach. *JE Asia & Int'l L., 15*, 395.
4. Setiawan, R. A. (2023). Impact of Islamic jurisprudential on traditional financial customs and legal integration in Indonesia. *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization, 13*(2), 195-209.
5. Khaleel, B., Ahmed, K., & Shah, S. S. A. (2023). Critical discourse analysis of Pakistani inheritance law and justice system for women. *Pakistan social sciences review, 7*(3), 87-100.

Research Article

6. Nuruddin, N., Jannah, A. W., & Martini, D. (2023). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Age Restriction on Marriage in Indonesia. *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi*, 313–330.
7. Bootwala, Y. (2023). Exploring opposition to ritual female genital cutting since the first US federal prosecution: the 2017 Detroit case. *International Journal of Impotence Research, 35*(3), 179–186.
8. Fahmi, C. (2024). The application of international cultural rights in protecting Indigenous peoples' land property in Indonesia. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 20*(1), 157–166.
9. Ismail, D. E., Arsyad, Y., Ahmad, A., Nggilu, N. M., & Chami, Y. (2024). Collocation of restorative justice with human rights in Indonesia. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum, 32*(2), 394–417.
10. Stoeckl, K. (2023). Traditional values, family, homeschooling: The role of Russia and the Russian Orthodox Church in transnational moral conservative networks and their efforts at reshaping human rights. *International Journal of Constitutional Law, 21*(1), 224–242.
11. Hussain, N., Xi, W., Saifullah, S., & Shumaila, S. (2023). Islam and International Standards of Human Rights: An Analysis of Domestic Implementation of International Human Rights in Islamic Culture. *Assyfa Journal of Islamic Studies, 1*(1), 01–12.
12. Tongat, T. (2022). *The Ambiguous Authority of Living Law Application in New Indonesian Penal Code: Between Justice and the Rule of Law*. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences, 17*(2).
13. Wardhani, L. T. A. L., Noho, M. D. H., & Natalis, A. (2022). *The adoption of various legal systems in Indonesia: an effort to initiate the prismatic Mixed Legal Systems*. *Cogent Social Sciences, 8*(1), 2104710.
14. Silfiah, R. I., Suwardi, S., Huda, K., & Indratirini, I. (2024). *Customary Law and Islamic Law Existence in the Reform of National Criminal Law*. *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities, 4*(5), 1201–1212.
15. Cardoso, J. V., & Pacheco-Pizarro, M. R. (2022). *Water rights, indigenous legal mobilization and the hybridization of legal pluralism in Southern Chile*. *Legal Pluralism and Critical Social Analysis, 54*(1), 117–146.
16. Balkin, J. M. (2022). *Constitutional Memories*. *Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J., 31*, 307.
17. Kukathas, C. (2022). *Are there any cultural rights?*. In *Group Rights* (pp. 285–319). Routledge.
18. Warjiyati, S., Salam, S., Sybelle, J. A., & Fida, I. A. (2023). *The Legalization and Application of Osing Indigenous People's Customary Law Model in the Legal System*. *Lex localis-Journal of Local Self-Government, 21*(4), 853–875.
19. Ife, J., Soldatić, K., & Briskman, L. (2022). *Human rights and social work*. Cambridge University Press
20. Bucholc, M. (2022). *Abortion law and human rights in Poland: The closing of the jurisprudential horizon.*