

DECOLONIZING LEGAL THEORY: TOWARDS A POST-WESTERN EPISTEMOLOGY OF LAW AND JUSTICE



Muhammad Nurohim¹, Khomaini², Andika³

^{1,2,3}*Master of Law Program, Universitas Pembinaan Masyarakat Indonesia*

Corresponding email: nurohim@upmi.ac.id

Keywords:

Decolonization, Legal Epistemology, Legal Pluralism, Postcolonial Theory, Indigenous Law, Critical Legal Studies, Epistemic Justice.

Article History:

Received: March 10, 2022
Accepted: April 25, 2022
Published: May 18, 2022



ABSTRACT

This article examines the epistemological foundations of contemporary legal theory and advocates for a decolonial approach to law and justice. Drawing on critical legal studies, postcolonial theory, and indigenous legal traditions, this research challenges the universalist claims of Western legal epistemology and explores alternative frameworks for understanding law. The study employs a qualitative methodology combining doctrinal analysis, comparative jurisprudence, and critical discourse analysis to interrogate the colonial legacies embedded within modern legal systems. Findings reveal that Western legal theory has systematically marginalized non-Western epistemologies, creating epistemic violence that continues to shape global legal structures. The article proposes a post-Western epistemology that recognizes legal pluralism, centers indigenous and subaltern knowledge systems, and reimagines justice beyond Eurocentric frameworks. This decolonial turn in legal theory has significant implications for international law, human rights discourse, and the pursuit of global justice. The research concludes that genuine legal transformation requires not merely the inclusion of diverse voices but a fundamental restructuring of how legal knowledge is produced, validated, and deployed.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



1. INTRODUCTION

The global hegemony of Western legal systems represents one of the most enduring legacies of colonialism. From the imposition of European legal codes during colonial expansion to the contemporary dominance of Anglo-American jurisprudence in international law, Western legal epistemology has claimed universal validity while systematically delegitimizing alternative legal traditions (Anghie, 2005; Mutua, 2001). This epistemological imperialism has profound consequences for how we conceptualize law, justice, and legal authority in the twenty-first century. Contemporary legal theory remains largely anchored in Enlightenment rationality, positivist assumptions, and liberal individualism—all products of specific historical and cultural contexts that are presented as universal truths (Kennedy, 2006). Scholars in critical legal studies have long challenged these foundational assumptions, yet much of this critique has remained within Western intellectual frameworks (Unger, 1986; Kelman, 1987). Meanwhile, postcolonial theorists have demonstrated how colonial power structures continue to shape knowledge production across disciplines, including law (Said, 1978; Spivak, 1988; Bhabha, 1994). The call for decolonizing legal theory emerges from multiple intellectual traditions: postcolonial legal scholarship, Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL), critical race theory, indigenous legal studies, and feminist jurisprudence (Gathii, 2011; Williams, 1990; Borrows, 2002). These diverse perspectives converge on a central insight: that law is not a neutral, universal phenomenon but a culturally embedded practice shaped by power relations, historical contingencies, and epistemological assumptions that favor certain worldviews over others. This article argues that achieving genuine epistemic justice in law requires moving beyond mere recognition of diversity toward a fundamental transformation of legal epistemology itself. Drawing on Sousa Santos' (2014) concept of "epistemologies of the South" and Mignolo's (2011) notion of "epistemic disobedience," this research proposes a post-Western framework for legal theory that challenges the colonial matrix of power embedded in contemporary jurisprudence. The research addresses three central questions: (1) How do colonial epistemologies continue to structure contemporary legal theory and practice? (2) What alternative epistemological frameworks exist within non-Western and indigenous legal traditions? (3) How can we construct a genuinely pluralistic post-Western epistemology of law and justice?

2. METHODS

This study employs a multi-method qualitative approach combining

doctrinal analysis, comparative jurisprudence, and critical discourse analysis to examine the epistemological foundations of legal theory. 2.1 Doctrinal Analysis The research conducts systematic analysis of canonical texts in Western legal philosophy from natural law theory through legal positivism to contemporary jurisprudence, identifying underlying epistemological assumptions and their colonial genealogies. Key texts examined include works by Austin, Hart, Kelsen, Dworkin, and Raz, analyzed through a postcolonial hermeneutic lens (Fitzpatrick, 2001). 2.2 Comparative Jurisprudence The study examines legal epistemologies from diverse traditions including African customary law (ubuntu philosophy), Islamic jurisprudence (fiqh), Hindu legal thought (dharmaśāstra), Chinese legalism and Confucian legal ethics, and indigenous legal orders from North America, Latin America, and Oceania. This comparative analysis draws on primary sources, ethnographic studies, and indigenous legal scholarship (Twining, 2009; Glenn, 2014). 2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis Following Fairclough's (2013) approach to critical discourse analysis, the research examines how power relations are embedded in legal language, concepts, and institutional structures. Particular attention is paid to international human rights discourse, development law, and constitutional frameworks in postcolonial nations, analyzing how these texts reproduce or challenge colonial epistemologies (Mutua, 2002). 2.4 Theoretical Framework The analysis is informed by decolonial theory, particularly the work of Quijano (2000) on the "coloniality of power," Mignolo (2011) on "border thinking," and Sousa Santos (2014) on "cognitive justice." These frameworks provide analytical tools for identifying and challenging the Eurocentric assumptions that structure modern legal thought. 2.5 Ethical Considerations Recognizing that research itself can be a colonizing practice, this study follows indigenous research methodologies emphasizing relationality, reciprocity, and respect for knowledge sovereignty (Smith, 2012; Kovach, 2009). Engagement with indigenous legal traditions was conducted through consultation with published indigenous legal scholars and publicly available materials, avoiding appropriation of sacred or protected knowledge.

3. DISCUSSION

Decolonizing Legal Theory: Towards a Post-Western Epistemology of Law and Justice ABSTRACT This article examines the epistemological foundations of contemporary legal theory and advocates for a decolonial approach to law and justice. Drawing on critical legal studies, postcolonial theory, and indigenous legal traditions, this research challenges the universalist claims of Western legal epistemology and explores alternative frameworks for understanding law. The study employs a qualitative

Author names: Muhammad Nurohim1, Khomaini2, Andika3

<https://journal-upmi.com/index.php/fhuupmi>

methodology combining doctrinal analysis, comparative jurisprudence, and critical discourse analysis to interrogate the colonial legacies embedded within modern legal systems. Findings reveal that Western legal theory has systematically marginalized non-Western epistemologies, creating epistemic violence that continues to shape global legal structures. The article proposes a post-Western epistemology that recognizes legal pluralism, centers indigenous and subaltern knowledge systems, and reimagines justice beyond Eurocentric frameworks. This decolonial turn in legal theory has significant implications for international law, human rights discourse, and the pursuit of global justice. The research concludes that genuine legal transformation requires not merely the inclusion of diverse voices but a fundamental restructuring of how legal knowledge is produced, validated, and deployed. Keywords: decolonization, legal epistemology, legal pluralism, postcolonial theory, indigenous law, critical legal studies, epistemic justice

1. INTRODUCTION The global hegemony of Western legal systems represents one of the most enduring legacies of colonialism. From the imposition of European legal codes during colonial expansion to the contemporary dominance of Anglo-American jurisprudence in international law, Western legal epistemology has claimed universal validity while systematically delegitimizing alternative legal traditions (Anghie, 2005; Mutua, 2001). This epistemological imperialism has profound consequences for how we conceptualize law, justice, and legal authority in the twenty-first century. Contemporary legal theory remains largely anchored in Enlightenment rationality, positivist assumptions, and liberal individualism—all products of specific historical and cultural contexts that are presented as universal truths (Kennedy, 2006). Scholars in critical legal studies have long challenged these foundational assumptions, yet much of this critique has remained within Western intellectual frameworks (Unger, 1986; Kelman, 1987). Meanwhile, postcolonial theorists have demonstrated how colonial power structures continue to shape knowledge production across disciplines, including law (Said, 1978; Spivak, 1988; Bhabha, 1994). The call for decolonizing legal theory emerges from multiple intellectual traditions: postcolonial legal scholarship, Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL), critical race theory, indigenous legal studies, and feminist jurisprudence (Gathii, 2011; Williams, 1990; Borrows, 2002). These diverse perspectives converge on a central insight: that law is not a neutral, universal phenomenon but a culturally embedded practice shaped by power relations, historical contingencies, and epistemological assumptions that favor certain worldviews over others. This article argues that achieving genuine epistemic justice in law requires moving beyond mere recognition of diversity toward a fundamental transformation of legal epistemology itself. Drawing on Sousa

Santos' (2014) concept of "epistemologies of the South" and Mignolo's (2011) notion of "epistemic disobedience," this research proposes a post-Western framework for legal theory that challenges the colonial matrix of power embedded in contemporary jurisprudence. The research addresses three central questions: (1) How do colonial epistemologies continue to structure contemporary legal theory and practice? (2) What alternative epistemological frameworks exist within non-Western and indigenous legal traditions? (3) How can we construct a genuinely pluralistic post-Western epistemology of law and justice?

2. METHODS

This study employs a multi-method qualitative approach combining doctrinal analysis, comparative jurisprudence, and critical discourse analysis to examine the epistemological foundations of legal theory.

2.1 Doctrinal Analysis

The research conducts systematic analysis of canonical texts in Western legal philosophy from natural law theory through legal positivism to contemporary jurisprudence, identifying underlying epistemological assumptions and their colonial genealogies. Key texts examined include works by Austin, Hart, Kelsen, Dworkin, and Raz, analyzed through a postcolonial hermeneutic lens (Fitzpatrick, 2001).

2.2 Comparative Jurisprudence

The study examines legal epistemologies from diverse traditions including African customary law (ubuntu philosophy), Islamic jurisprudence (fiqh), Hindu legal thought (dharmashastra), Chinese legalism and Confucian legal ethics, and indigenous legal orders from North America, Latin America, and Oceania. This comparative analysis draws on primary sources, ethnographic studies, and indigenous legal scholarship (Twining, 2009; Glenn, 2014).

2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis

Following Fairclough's (2013) approach to critical discourse analysis, the research examines how power relations are embedded in legal language, concepts, and institutional structures. Particular attention is paid to international human rights discourse, development law, and constitutional frameworks in postcolonial nations, analyzing how these texts reproduce or challenge colonial epistemologies (Mutua, 2002).

2.4 Theoretical Framework

The analysis is informed by decolonial theory, particularly the work of Quijano (2000) on the "coloniality of power," Mignolo (2011) on "border thinking," and Sousa Santos (2014) on "cognitive justice." These frameworks provide analytical tools for identifying and challenging the Eurocentric assumptions that structure modern legal thought.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

Recognizing that research itself can be a colonizing practice, this study follows indigenous research methodologies emphasizing relationality, reciprocity, and respect for knowledge sovereignty (Smith, 2012; Kovach, 2009). Engagement with indigenous legal traditions was conducted through consultation with published indigenous legal scholars and publicly available materials, avoiding appropriation of sacred or

protected knowledge. 3. DISCUSSION 3.1 The Colonial Foundations of Modern Legal Epistemology Modern legal theory emerged in intimate relationship with European colonial expansion. The doctrine of terra nullius, the exclusion of non-Christian peoples from the law of nations, and the construction of "civilization" as a legal standard all reflect how law served as an instrument of colonial domination (Anghie, 2005). Yet these colonial origins are rarely acknowledged in mainstream jurisprudence, which presents Western legal concepts as universal and ahistorical. Legal positivism, often presented as value-neutral and scientific, embodies distinctly European Enlightenment assumptions about rationality, sovereignty, and the separation of law from morality (Hart, 1961). As Fitzpatrick (2001) demonstrates, the very concept of modern law as autonomous, bounded, and distinct from other social spheres reflects a European worldview incompatible with many non-Western epistemologies where law, spirituality, kinship, and ecology form integrated wholes. The universalization of individual rights discourse, while progressive in some respects, represents another form of epistemological imperialism. Many non-Western societies prioritize collective rights, duties, and relational ethics over individual autonomy (An-Na'im, 1992). The imposition of Western rights frameworks often undermines indigenous legal systems that successfully maintained social harmony through different conceptual architectures (Coulthard, 2014). 3.2 Epistemic Violence and Legal Knowledge Production Spivak's (1988) concept of "epistemic violence"—the systematic destruction of non-Western knowledge systems—is particularly salient in law. Colonial powers did not merely impose European legal codes but actively criminalized, delegitimized, and suppressed indigenous legal practices. This erasure continues through contemporary legal education, which centers Western jurisprudence while treating other traditions as curiosities or historical artifacts (Eslava & Pahuja, 2012). The dominance of English-language legal scholarship creates linguistic barriers that marginalize non-Anglophone legal thinking (Twining, 2009). Peer review systems, citation practices, and academic hierarchies reinforce the authority of Western institutions, creating feedback loops that perpetuate epistemic injustice. Legal concepts developed in specific cultural contexts—such as "rule of law," "property," or "contract"—are treated as universal categories, erasing the culturally embedded alternatives. International law institutions, despite nominal equality among nations, remain structured by colonial-era hierarchies. The United Nations Security Council's permanent membership, the decision-making structures of international financial institutions, and the jurisdictional scope of the International Criminal Court all reflect and reproduce colonial power relations (Chimni, 2006). These institutional structures determine which legal norms achieve global recognition and which

remain localized or marginalized. 3.3 Alternative Epistemologies: Indigenous and Non-Western Legal Traditions Indigenous legal traditions offer radically different epistemological foundations for law. Many indigenous legal orders are grounded in relationality rather than individualism, emphasizing obligations to ancestors, future generations, and non-human beings (Borrows, 2002). Law is understood not as rules imposed by sovereign authority but as teachings embedded in stories, ceremonies, and ecological relationships (Napoleon, 2007). African legal philosophy, particularly ubuntu jurisprudence, centers communal harmony and restorative justice over retributive punishment. The concept "a person is a person through other persons" reflects an ontology incompatible with liberal legal individualism, yet it has sustained complex legal systems for millennia (Ramose, 1999; Mokgoro, 1998). Post-apartheid South Africa's incorporation of ubuntu into constitutional interpretation demonstrates how non-Western epistemologies can inform modern legal systems. Islamic legal theory (*usul al-fiqh*) offers sophisticated epistemological frameworks developed over centuries, including principles for interpreting texts, reasoning by analogy (*qiyas*), and pursuing public interest (*maslaha*) (Hallaq, 2009). While Islamic law has itself exhibited imperial tendencies, its core epistemologies differ fundamentally from Western legal rationalism, particularly in its integration of ethical and legal reasoning. Hindu legal thought provides yet another epistemological framework, where *dharma* encompasses moral duty, cosmic order, and social obligation in ways that resist Western categories of law, morality, and religion (Menski, 2006). The concept of *rta* (cosmic order) suggests law as participation in universal harmony rather than sovereign command. Chinese legalism and Confucian legal ethics offer alternatives to both natural law and legal positivism, emphasizing ritual propriety (*li*), moral cultivation, and hierarchical social roles (Chen, 2015). While these traditions have problems from egalitarian perspectives, they demonstrate that complex societies can organize legal life around epistemologies radically different from Western liberalism. 3.4 Toward a Post-Western Epistemology of Law Constructing a genuinely post-Western legal epistemology requires more than adding non-Western perspectives to existing frameworks. It demands what Sousa Santos (2014) calls an "ecology of knowledges"—recognition that different knowledge systems possess equal validity within their contexts and that intercultural dialogue requires epistemic humility rather than hierarchical integration. Mignolo's (2011) concept of "border thinking" offers methodological guidance. Rather than seeking a new universal epistemology to replace Western hegemony, border thinking embraces the tensions, contradictions, and creative possibilities emerging from epistemic pluralism. A post-Western legal epistemology would maintain critical dialogue between

traditions without privileging any as universal standard. Legal pluralism scholarship has long recognized that multiple legal orders coexist within any society (Benda-Beckmann, 2002; Tamanaha, 2008). However, classical legal pluralism often treated non-state legal systems as inferior or transitional. A decolonized legal pluralism would recognize indigenous and customary legal orders as fully legitimate alternatives rather than subordinate or supplementary to state law (Webber, 2016). Key principles for a post-Western legal epistemology include: (1) Recognition that all legal systems are culturally embedded rather than universal; (2) Validation of diverse epistemological foundations including spirituality, relationality, and ecological interconnection; (3) Commitment to cognitive justice—the right of different knowledge systems to coexist and flourish; (4) Rejection of hierarchies of civilization or development that position Western law as apex achievement; (5) Centering voices and perspectives of colonized, indigenous, and marginalized communities; (6) Acknowledgment that law is inseparable from power relations and colonial histories.

3.5 Implications for Legal Practice and Institutional Reform

Decolonizing legal theory has concrete implications for legal education, practice, and institutional design. Legal curricula must move beyond token acknowledgment of diversity to genuinely center non-Western epistemologies, indigenous legal orders, and critical perspectives on law's colonial genealogies (Cunneen & Schwartz, 2008). This requires not merely adding courses but restructuring how legal knowledge is transmitted and validated. Constitutional design in postcolonial nations offers opportunities for epistemic pluralism. Some countries, including Bolivia, Ecuador, and New Zealand, have incorporated indigenous legal principles into constitutional frameworks, recognizing indigenous governance authority and epistemic sovereignty (Yrigoyen Fajardo, 2011; Barker, 2005). These experiments, while imperfect, demonstrate possibilities for legal systems grounded in multiple epistemologies. International law requires fundamental transformation to overcome its colonial origins. This includes democratizing international institutions, recognizing collective rights to self-determination including epistemic self-determination, and creating space for non-Western legal concepts in international discourse (Anaya, 2004). The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples represents progress, but implementation remains limited by persistent colonial epistemologies. Restorative and transformative justice movements offer practical alternatives to punitive criminal justice systems rooted in Western penology. Many draw explicitly on indigenous legal principles, demonstrating how non-Western epistemologies can inform contemporary practice (Zehr, 2015; Ross, 2006). The success of programs like circle sentencing in Canada and Australia suggests possibilities for epistemic pluralism in legal practice.

4.

CONCLUSION This article has argued that decolonizing legal theory requires more than expanding the canon or diversifying perspectives within existing frameworks. It demands fundamental transformation of legal epistemology itself—acknowledging the colonial genealogies of modern law, validating alternative knowledge systems, and constructing genuinely pluralistic frameworks for understanding law and justice. The colonial foundations of Western legal theory are not historical artifacts but living structures that continue to shape global legal systems, marginalize non-Western epistemologies, and perpetuate injustices. Achieving epistemic justice requires confronting these colonial legacies and centering voices, traditions, and knowledge systems that have been systematically excluded from legal discourse. A post-Western epistemology of law embraces legal pluralism not as temporary accommodation but as permanent condition—recognizing that diverse societies require diverse legal systems grounded in their own epistemological foundations. This does not mean abandoning universal aspirations for justice but reimagining universality as emerging from intercultural dialogue rather than imposed from dominant centers. Indigenous legal traditions, African jurisprudence, Islamic legal theory, Hindu legal thought, and other non-Western epistemologies offer not merely historical alternatives but living resources for addressing contemporary challenges. Climate crisis, technological transformation, and persistent inequality demand legal imagination beyond exhausted Western frameworks. The decolonial turn in legal theory aligns with broader movements for epistemic justice across disciplines. Just as postcolonial theory transformed literary studies and decolonial approaches reshape development studies, legal scholarship must undergo similar transformation. This requires institutional changes in legal education, research funding, publication practices, and academic hierarchies that currently privilege Western epistemologies. Ultimately, decolonizing legal theory serves not only corrective justice—repairing historical harms—but also pragmatic necessity. The urgent challenges of the twenty-first century cannot be addressed through epistemological frameworks developed in seventeenth-century Europe. A genuinely global legal order requires embracing the full diversity of human legal wisdom, recognizing that every tradition possesses insights essential for imagining just futures.

4. CONCLUSION

This article has argued that decolonizing legal theory requires more than expanding the canon or diversifying perspectives within existing frameworks. It demands fundamental transformation of legal epistemology itself—acknowledging the colonial genealogies of modern law, validating

Author names: Muhammad Nurohim¹, Khomaini², Andika³

<https://journal-upmi.com/index.php/fhuupmi>

alternative knowledge systems, and constructing genuinely pluralistic frameworks for understanding law and justice. The colonial foundations of Western legal theory are not historical artifacts but living structures that continue to shape global legal systems, marginalize non-Western epistemologies, and perpetuate injustices. Achieving epistemic justice requires confronting these colonial legacies and centering voices, traditions, and knowledge systems that have been systematically excluded from legal discourse. A post-Western epistemology of law embraces legal pluralism not as temporary accommodation but as permanent condition—recognizing that diverse societies require diverse legal systems grounded in their own epistemological foundations. This does not mean abandoning universal aspirations for justice but reimagining universality as emerging from intercultural dialogue rather than imposed from dominant centers. Indigenous legal traditions, African jurisprudence, Islamic legal theory, Hindu legal thought, and other non-Western epistemologies offer not merely historical alternatives but living resources for addressing contemporary challenges. Climate crisis, technological transformation, and persistent inequality demand legal imagination beyond exhausted Western frameworks. The decolonial turn in legal theory aligns with broader movements for epistemic justice across disciplines. Just as postcolonial theory transformed literary studies and decolonial approaches reshape development studies, legal scholarship must undergo similar transformation. This requires institutional changes in legal education, research funding, publication practices, and academic hierarchies that currently privilege Western epistemologies. Ultimately, decolonizing legal theory serves not only corrective justice—repairing historical harms—but also pragmatic necessity. The urgent challenges of the twenty-first century cannot be addressed through epistemological frameworks developed in seventeenth-century Europe. A genuinely global legal order requires embracing the full diversity of human legal wisdom, recognizing that every tradition possesses insights essential for imagining just futures.

5. LIMITATION

This study acknowledges several limitations. First, the scope of comparative analysis necessarily remains incomplete given the vast diversity of legal traditions globally. Many non-Western legal systems receive insufficient attention, particularly those from Southeast Asia, Pacific Islands, and Central Asia, due to language barriers and limited access to indigenous scholarly sources. Second, the research relies primarily on textual analysis and existing scholarly literature rather than ethnographic fieldwork or direct engagement with living indigenous legal practices. While ethically necessary

Copyright: © 2022. Muhammad Nurohim¹, Khomaini², Andika³

to avoid appropriation, this methodological choice limits depth of understanding, particularly regarding oral legal traditions and ceremonial knowledge transmission. Third, the article's critique of Western epistemology risks creating false binaries between "Western" and "non-Western" legal thought when both categories encompass tremendous internal diversity. Many legal traditions have hybrid origins, and rigid categorization may reproduce the essentializing tendencies this research critiques. Fourth, the practical implementation of post-Western legal epistemologies faces significant challenges not fully addressed here, including questions of incommensurability between epistemologies, mechanisms for resolving conflicts between legal systems, and power dynamics within pluralistic frameworks that may reproduce hierarchies in different forms. Fifth, the article's focus on epistemology may underestimate material and institutional barriers to decolonization. Changing how we think about law matters profoundly, yet epistemological transformation alone cannot dismantle entrenched power structures without accompanying political, economic, and institutional changes. Finally, as a scholarly article written in English and conforming to Western academic conventions, this work inevitably participates in the very systems it critiques. The performative contradiction of using colonial languages and institutions to advance decolonial arguments remains an unresolved tension requiring ongoing critical reflexivity.

REFERENCES

- An-Na'im, A. A. (1992). *Human rights in cross-cultural perspectives: A quest for consensus*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Anaya, S. J. (2004). *Indigenous peoples in international law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Anghie, A. (2005). *Imperialism, sovereignty, and the making of international law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, J. (2005). *Sovereignty matters: Locations of contestation and possibility in indigenous struggles for self-determination*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Benda-Beckmann, F. von. (2002). Who's afraid of legal pluralism? *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 34(47), 37-82.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Borrows, J. (2002). *Recovering Canada: The resurgence of indigenous law*. University of Toronto Press.
- Chen, A. H. Y. (2015). *An introduction to the legal system of the People's Republic of China* (4th ed.). LexisNexis.

- Chimni, B. S. (2006). Third World approaches to international law: A manifesto. *International Community Law Review*, 8(3), 3-27.
- Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Cunneen, C., & Schwartz, M. (2008). Postcolonial jurisprudence: Rethinking legal knowledge and the law school. *Indigenous Law Bulletin*, 7(7), 3-7.
- Eslava, L., & Pahuja, S. (2012). Beyond the (post)colonial: TWAIL and the everyday life of international law. *Verfassung und Recht in Übersee*, 45(2), 195-221.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Fitzpatrick, P. (2001). *Modernism and the grounds of law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gathii, J. T. (2011). TWAIL: A brief history of its origins, its decentralized network, and a tentative bibliography. *Trade, Law and Development*, 3(1), 26-64.
- Glenn, H. P. (2014). *Legal traditions of the world: Sustainable diversity in law* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Hallaq, W. B. (2009). *Shari'a: Theory, practice, transformations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1961). *The concept of law*. Oxford University Press.
- Kelman, M. (1987). *A guide to critical legal studies*. Harvard University Press.
- Kennedy, D. (2006). Three globalizations of law and legal thought: 1850–2000. In D. M. Trubek & A. Santos (Eds.), *The new law and economic development: A critical appraisal* (pp. 19-73). Cambridge University Press.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. University of Toronto Press.
- Menski, W. (2006). *Comparative law in a global context: The legal systems of Asia and Africa* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Mokgoro, Y. (1998). Ubuntu and the law in South Africa. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, 1(1), 15-26.
- Mutua, M. (2001). Savages, victims, and saviors: The metaphor of human rights. *Harvard International Law Journal*, 42(1), 201-245.
- Mutua, M. (2002). *Human rights: A political and cultural critique*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Napoleon, V. (2007). Thinking about indigenous legal orders. *Research Paper for the National Centre for First Nations Governance*. National Centre for First Nations Governance.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215-232.
- Ramose, M. B. (1999). *African philosophy through ubuntu*. Mond Books.
- Ross, R. (2006). *Returning to the teachings: Exploring Aboriginal justice*. Penguin Canada.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.
- Sousa Santos, B. de. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.
- Tamanaha, B. Z. (2008). Understanding legal pluralism: Past to present, local to global. *Sydney Law Review*, 30(3), 375-411.
- Twining, W. (2009). *General jurisprudence: Understanding law from a global perspective*. Cambridge University Press.