

COMPARING LAW

Bert Demarsin & Danny Pieters



Amsterdam
University
Press

| **OWL PRESS** |
LEGAL

CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	11
PART I – LAW COMPARISON.....	13
CHAPTER 1. What is law comparison?.....	15
1. The concept of law comparison.....	15
2. Scientific discipline or method?.....	16
3. Types of law comparison.....	17
4. Relations with contiguous domains of law and science.....	19
CHAPTER 2. Why law comparison?.....	25
1. Multiple functions of law comparison.....	25
2. Immediate goals and functions of law comparison.....	27
3. Intermediate goals and functions of law comparison.....	29
4. Remote goals and functions of law comparison.....	34
CHAPTER 3. How to compare law.....	39
1. Methods of law comparison.....	39
2. Phases of law comparison.....	40
3. Other points of attention.....	52
4. Modesty and courage.....	58
CHAPTER 4. How to group countries.....	59
1. Legal families.....	59
2. Legal transplants.....	67
3. Unitary and federal states.....	69
4. Monism and dualism.....	69

PART II – EXPLORING SOME KEY JURISDICTIONS	73
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	75
CHAPTER 1. Belgium	77
1. Historical background.....	77
2. Organization of the state and sources of law.....	78
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	82
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	84
5. Organization of the court system.....	85
6. Influences.....	86
CHAPTER 2. The Netherlands	87
1. Historical background.....	87
2. Organization of the state and sources of law.....	88
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	93
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	95
5. Organization of the court system.....	96
6. Influences.....	98
CHAPTER 3. France	101
1. Historical background.....	101
2. Organization of the state and sources of law.....	102
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	109
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	110
5. Organization of the court system.....	111
6. Influences.....	114
CHAPTER 4. Germany	117
1. Historical background.....	117
2. Organization of the state and sources of law.....	118
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	123
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	123
5. Organization of the court system.....	124
6. Influences.....	126

CHAPTER 5. United Kingdom	129
1. Historical background.....	129
2. Organization of the state and sources of law	132
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	138
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	140
5. Organization of the court system.....	141
6. Influences.....	145
CHAPTER 6. United States of America	147
1. Historical background.....	147
2. Organization of the state and sources of law	149
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	153
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	156
5. Organization of the court system.....	157
6. Influences.....	159
CHAPTER 7. Russia	161
1. Historical background.....	161
2. Organization of the state and sources of law	162
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	166
4. Organization of the court system.....	168
5. Influences.....	169
CHAPTER 8. China	173
1. Historical background.....	173
2. Organization of the state and sources of law	175
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	179
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	180
5. Organization of the court system.....	182
6. Influences.....	182
CHAPTER 9. Japan	185
1. Historical background.....	185
2. Organization of the state and sources of law	187
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	190
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	191
5. Organization of the court system.....	192
6. Influences.....	193

CHAPTER 10. Brazil	195
1. Historical background.....	195
2. Organization of the state and sources of law.....	196
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	201
4. Characteristics of the legal system.....	202
5. Organization of the court system.....	203
6. Influences.....	205
CHAPTER 11. India	207
1. Historical background.....	207
2. Organization of the state and sources of law.....	210
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	212
4. Organization of the court system.....	215
5. Influences.....	215
CHAPTER 12. Israel	219
1. Historical background.....	219
2. Organization of the state and sources of law.....	221
3. Hierarchy of the sources of law.....	224
4. Organization of the court system.....	227
5. Influences.....	230
CHAPTER 13. Islamic law	235
1. Religion and law.....	235
2. Sources of law.....	237
3. Relation to international law.....	240
4. Organization of the court system.....	241
5. Relation to secular law.....	242
CHAPTER 14. African law	245
1. Layers of law.....	245
2. Traditional African law.....	246
3. The religious layer.....	248
4. The colonial layer.....	249
5. The law after independence.....	250
6. Legal pluralism.....	251

PART III – SELECTED TOPICS	257
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	259
CHAPTER 1. Forms of state and authority	261
1. Democracy, human rights and the rule of law.....	262
2. Centralism, deconcentration, decentralization and federalism.....	265
3. Head of state, government, representation and mutual relations.....	270
4. Judges.....	272
5. Constitutions.....	274
CHAPTER 2. Persons and family	279
1. Purpose and outline.....	279
2. Person, personality, status and capacity.....	280
3. Vertical family bonds.....	288
4. Horizontal family bonds.....	292
CHAPTER 3. Obligations and liability	299
1. Purpose and outline.....	299
2. Liability in tort.....	301
3. Contract law	309
BIBLIOGRAPHY	319
1. General works of reference	319
2. Basic material on key jurisdictions.....	323
3. Basic material on selected topics.....	329

PREFACE

In this textbook, we provide an introduction to comparative law or, as we prefer to call it, law comparison. We have divided the introduction into three parts. In the first part, we focus on law comparison as a method and as a scientific discipline. In the second part, we introduce the reader to a dozen important legal systems. In the third part, we submit a number of specific areas of private law and public law to an elementary comparative study. Let us explain briefly how we will go about this.

In Part I, we try to answer some basic questions concerning law comparison. What is law comparison and why do we prefer this terminology to comparative law? Why should we engage in law comparison? How does one go about comparing laws? How should countries be grouped together? This part of the textbook was written by Danny Pieters, with the exception of the sections on legal families and monism/dualism which were written by Bert Demarsin.

In Part II, we try to familiarize the reader with several important legal systems. We do this using a descriptive pattern that is as uniform as possible for all legal systems. First, we identify the legal system and examine its sources of law. Then we discuss the hierarchy of these sources of law and how this hierarchy is respected. Special attention is paid to the enforcement of the constitution and the relation between national law and international or supranational law. We provide an overview of the most important courts and discuss some of the peculiarities of the legal system. Each description ends with a discussion of the influence the legal system has on other legal systems and the ways in which it has itself been influenced by other legal systems. Bert Demarsin has provided descriptions of the legal systems of Belgium, the Netherlands, France, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Brazil, Japan and China; Danny Pieters was responsible for the parts on German, Russian, Indian and Israeli law, as well as the descriptions of Islamic and African law.

In Part III, we illustrate what law comparison might look like by providing some comparative reflections on selected topics from both private and public law. We examine the legal approach to the person, the family and to liability both in contract and in tort. Bert Demarsin was responsible for these excursions into private law comparison. The public law comparisons, examining the forms of government and exercise of public power, were dealt with by Danny Pieters.

While we have indicated the author of each specific part of this introductory textbook, both authors would like to emphasize that this textbook is the product of a close collaboration, and the final product can be seen as a joint result of the work of both authors who have critically examined, commented and – where necessary – adjusted the

parts written by the other. Thus, the textbook is the fruit of shared reflection. Moreover, both authors are especially grateful to the many colleagues and friends who have read (parts of) this work and given us very useful suggestions.

This textbook is not intended as the final word on law comparison, but rather as an introduction to one's own legal comparison journey: a first acquaintance which will, we hope, spark in the reader a desire to know more about law comparison and about how law varies in different jurisdictions.

Bert Demarsin

Danny Pieters

Leuven, Summer 2022

PART I

LAW
COMPARISON

GENERAL
PRINCIPLES

WHAT IS LAW COMPARISON?

1. THE CONCEPT OF LAW COMPARISON

The concept of law comparison consists of two key elements: law and comparison.

The law that is being compared may be an entire legal system (all law valid at some point in a certain place); a major part of it (e.g. family law); a limited number of legal norms (e.g. the duties of parents towards their children); or certain legal institutions or legal concepts (e.g. good faith). The diversity of legal subjects that may be subject to comparison will be examined below.

The second key element is an act: the act of comparing. Comparing entails an examination of the differences and the similarities between two or more entities.

In essence, law comparison can be described as examining the similarities and differences between two or more legal systems or components of these systems. Law comparison may have a variety of goals; we do not think it necessary to include these in the definition of what law comparison is. Even the very general addition of ‘to explain these differences and similarities’ or ‘to explain them and to evaluate them’ does not, in our opinion, provide added value and can thus be deleted from the definition. Of course, when one establishes similarities and differences between legal systems, one is highly likely to ask why these appear. However, the question is whether the methods of law comparison alone can answer all these questions, or whether we might need to appeal to other fields of expertise, such as history and sociology. The distinction between law comparison as a method and law comparison as a scientific discipline should probably be situated in this context. More will be said about all this in the following chapters.

The reader will notice that, rather unusually, we do not speak of comparative law, but instead adopt the term ‘law comparison’. Time and again, English authors have noted that the term ‘comparative law’ is somewhat misleading since comparative law is not a branch of law like family law or administrative law. Incidentally, the same misleading conceptual approach also appears in French (*droit comparé*) and in Spanish (*derecho comparado*). Instead of complaining about how the usual term is misleading, we prefer to adopt an alternative term (‘law comparison’). This alternative term is more accurate and better corresponds to the German (*Rechtsvergleichung*) and the Dutch (*rechtsvergelijking*) equivalents, which indicate clearly what we are talking about.

2. SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE OR METHOD?

Is law comparison a scientific discipline or is it ‘only’ a method? Is law comparison a fully-fledged science? Or just part of legal science? Or perhaps only an auxiliary science? Others have written extensively on these and similar questions. We agree with Kischel¹ that these questions only need answering if the answer determines the outcome of concrete research problems. However, such research problems have not yet appeared.

What is important is that law comparison uses a well-founded scientific method and that law comparison as a science has solid methodological grounds.

Comparing is not something one just does. It should be clear that the observation is objective, that what is being compared is in fact comparable and that other researchers can reach similar results based on the same facts. Comparing must be carried out in a scientifically substantiated manner, using a variety of methods related to the goals pursued.

A successful scientific comparison does not start from nothing, from a *tabula rasa*: we build on the work of others when defining the topic of our comparative research, when formulating the relevant questions, when situating them in a broader context. We must know the methodological choices that others have made, and we must be sure of the solidity of the foundations on which their research was built. The collection of all scientifically valid knowledge concerning the comparison of legal systems and components thereof can be seen as the constantly evolving science of law comparison. In this science, the knowledge acquired through the legal comparative method is of course essential, but it also includes reflection on the methods and problems of comparative research, the knowledge acquired through other scientifically valid methods and the knowledge of other scientific domains. The latter is especially important in explaining and evaluating the established similarities and differences. In this way, research in history, sociology and other similar subjects can help flesh out the science of law comparison. Law comparison can, in turn, contribute to research in law, history, sociology and other subjects and, in such cases, law comparison may be considered an auxiliary science.

All comparative research, regardless of the care with which it is performed, will be imperfect. This is due in part to the imperfections of the science of law comparison on which it is based and, in part, on constraints the researcher must accept when conducting research. We will later discuss the restrictions inherent in comparative activity. The fact that these restrictions are at the essence of law comparison arises from the almost deceptive complexity of the comparative activity. Of course, we can always build on the work of comparatists who have preceded us, both in terms of content and in terms of methods. We insist from the outset that imperfection is scientifically acceptable only if one is conscious of the restrictions one has accepted. The basic attitude of the good comparatist is modesty!

1

U. KISCHEL, *Rechtsvergleichung*, Munich, Beck, 2015, no. 55.

3. TYPES OF LAW COMPARISON

Kischel² writes that law comparison is possible and is already practised in all domains of law: we completely agree. To pretend that law comparison outside private law is of lesser importance is a stubborn misrepresentation of the facts. What is true is that in early law comparison, private law was often the object of comparative activity. Today, however, law comparison is practised both in relation to public and private law. We cannot and should not, therefore, rely exclusively on private law-oriented approaches in a general introduction to law comparison.

Though there were precursors to law comparison in Ancient Greece, modern law comparison emerged during the 19th century. The emergence of nation states with their own law and codes, the flourishing of world trade, a strong belief in progress, the simultaneous development of other comparative sciences such as comparative linguistics: all these factors are related to emerging attention to foreign law and the comparison of law in the same period. Regarding private law, the first international congress of comparative law in Paris in 1900 might be considered a milestone. The participants in the congress were not just interested in studying the recently introduced German *Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch* compared to the French *Code civil*, which was already a century old, but were also committed to the development of a *droit commun législatif*, a universal private law. Interest in law comparison continued after World War I (WWI), but the universalist ambition faded. Yet, in this same period, the ‘general principles of law recognized by civilized nations’ became a complementary source of international law (more about this later) and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, UNIDROIT, was founded. After World War II (WWII), comparatists’ attention was focused on solving methodological problems of law comparison, and law comparison expanded to the most diverse areas of law.

Law comparison has since penetrated all areas of law: from private law to public law, and from ancient areas of law to the most modern, such as IT law and environmental law. With the advent of globalization, national law and national lawmakers and practitioners are increasingly interested in what is occurring across borders. Law comparison is therefore omnipresent today.

While law comparison examines the similarities and differences between legal systems or components thereof, an obvious starting point is comparison of national law between various states. International law comparison is indeed the most prominent type of law comparison, but there are others:

- The concepts, institutions and norms of international and supranational law can be compared. For instance, the norms concerning the coordination of the social

security systems valid in the European Union might be compared to those valid in Latin America; or the protection of human rights in the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR). We will speak in this case of inter-international law comparison.

- The laws of federated states can be compared within the same country. For instance, the law on education in Flanders, in the French-speaking community of Belgium and in the German community of Belgium. The laws of local authorities can also be compared. For instance, the police regulations concerning noise disturbance valid in various municipalities. When we compare law that is valid within one state, we will speak of intra-national law comparison.
- It is also possible to compare law emanating from non-public or not-purely-public entities (for instance, the law of churches, the internal regulations of trade unions or the anti-doping laws in various sports federations). Different instances of transnational law, as established in agreements or codes of conduct for multinationals, can also be compared and thus be the object of law comparison. We will speak in this case of private law comparison.
- Legal norms which operate within one and the same legal system can also be compared (for instance, one can compare the weight of penalties imposed within one legal system for different crimes; or the pension arrangements of wage-earners, the self-employed and civil servants; or the liability of parents, teachers and employers). We call this purely internal law comparison.
- It is also possible to compare law that is valid at various points in time. This intertemporal law comparison, of course, comes very close to research in legal history. Yet, in some cases, it may be more useful to have an intertemporal comparison of two relatively static pictures of law rather than engaging in fully-fledged historical research.
- Finally, a combination of the above enumerated sorts of law comparison. For instance, it is possible to compare repression, reconciliation and amnesty law following the fall of authoritarian regimes (Belgium in 1944; East Germany in 1989; South Africa in 1994). Sometimes it is useful to compare, for instance, the law of states with the law of federate entities (e.g. comparing the law on education in Flanders with that of the Netherlands).

A crucial question which arises when comparing law is whether to compare law in action or law in the books. There will of course always be tension between the two, but this tension can be of variable importance. The law as applied and experienced may sometimes deviate from (or even be completely independent of) the law as described in statute books and even in case law and legal writing. Law comparison can deal with both the law in the books, and the living law (or law in action). However, as we will see later when dealing with the methodology of law comparison, it is most important to maintain a single focus.

In other words, comparing the living law in one country with the law in the books in another is unacceptable.

In the literature, the distinction between law in the books and law in action is often linked to the distinction between dogmatic law comparison and functional law comparison. Dogmatic law comparison deals exclusively with current positive law. Functional law comparison takes a concrete problem as a starting point and examines how the living law deals with this problem. What function does law pursue? That is the central question.³ However, we are not convinced of the usefulness of this distinction and have therefore left it out of the discussion that follows.

In the comparative law literature, a distinction is also drawn between micro- and macro-law comparisons. Macro-law comparison compares entire systems of law (or even groups of legal systems) addressing a specific topic, such as legal sources, legal reasoning or procedures that deal with conflicts. The grouping of legal systems into families is another important task of macro-law comparison. Micro-law comparison focuses on certain legal institutions or norms dealing with the same phenomenon or problem. Micro-law comparison and macro-law comparison do not, however, form a dichotomy; they are the two extremes of a sliding scale. There is also constant interaction between micro-law comparison and macro-law comparison: macro-law comparison helps to carry out micro-law comparison in a sensible manner and macro-law comparison feeds the overall picture used in micro-law comparison.

Some authors link the concepts of micro-law comparison and macro-law comparison with a question which was popular in (older) literature, namely, whether law comparison is aimed primarily at establishing similarities or at discovering differences between the examined legal systems. However, seeing no benefit to this debate, we have chosen to leave it aside. Others link the distinction between micro-law comparison and macro-law comparison with the question of whether law comparison is a method or a science: micro-law comparison would then be the method and macro-law comparison the scientific discipline. This approach does not convince us either.

4. RELATIONS WITH CONTIGUOUS DOMAINS OF LAW AND SCIENCE

4.1 Law comparison vs. studying foreign law

It is often insisted that law comparison must be distinguished from the knowledge and examination of foreign law (*Auslandsrechtskunde*). Some see the study of foreign law as a first step before engaging in further examination of the similarities and differences between

3

In our teleological method of law comparison, it is not the function of law itself, but the function of the law comparison that is central.

two or more legal systems or components thereof. They see it as necessary to proper law comparison. Others emphasize the subjective character of the notion of ‘foreign law’: domestic law for some is foreign law for those from other legal orders. In their opinion, knowledge of foreign law is no different from legal knowledge as such of the law as it is valid (elsewhere). Both approaches to the relation between law comparison and the knowledge of foreign law hold some element of truth. We are however convinced that this relation is much more complex. Though it may be true that all law is ‘own’ law for some people, it remains necessary to make that law accessible to people from other legal traditions, from another country. The required translation is far from easy and demands significant comparative knowledge to translate the used concepts correctly. In other words, to describe foreign law in a scientific way, the methodology of law comparison must be respected. No knowledge of, or research into, foreign law is possible without law comparison. This law comparison element very often remains implicit, but its implicit character does not free the researcher from the demands of scientific accuracy.

The relation between law comparison and knowledge of foreign law is not unidirectional: law comparison will in principle take the knowledge of one or more foreign legal systems as a starting point. If this knowledge is wrong from the start, it undermines the law comparison itself. A particularly important, yet often underestimated, problem is the comparability with one’s own law. To avoid misrepresentations as a consequence of national bias, we recommend that the part of one’s own law relevant to the law comparison be ‘translated’ in the same way as the foreign legal systems. In other words, one’s own law becomes ‘foreign law’ in law comparison. If we do not do this, we run the risk of carrying out a comparison with glasses coloured by our own legal system. In the methodological part of this textbook, we will expand further on the dangers of this form of ethnocentrism.

4.2 Law comparison vs. legal translation and legal interpretation

Law comparison must also be distinguished from the activity of legal translation and legal interpretation. However, the relation between the two is similar to that described above between the knowledge of foreign law and law comparison. The legal interpreter or translator needs to have enough comparative knowledge to ensure that someone listening to or reading the resulting translation understands what was meant by the original speaker/author. This is an exceptionally difficult task when it is performed under time pressure. Legal dictionaries can provide some help, but do not guarantee a flawless result. It is important that the person interpreting or translating legal content masters the languages of both legal systems, not just in terms of vocabulary, but also substantively. In an ideal world, the legal interpreter or translator would be a lawyer schooled in the relevant legal systems, but this is a big expectation. And yet, one should not forget that the legal interpreter or translator plays an important role in overcoming (at least some of) the barriers produced by the diversity of the languages involved in the law comparison.

The legal interpreter, the translator and the researcher interested in foreign law thus implicitly or explicitly carry out law comparison. As previously stated, implicit law comparison should not be non-qualitative. Both implicit and explicit law comparison can be qualitatively better or worse. We strive for comparative perfection perhaps, but we are unlikely to achieve that goal. At the other end of the spectrum, however, we find what I would call ‘comparative tourism’: ‘excursions into foreign law’, isolated facts related to foreign law, often associated in a non-scientific manner, with each other or with one’s own legal system. These foreign excursions have very little to do with the method or science of law comparison. Yet they are increasingly common, even in academic circles or texts. While we insist that the comparatist must show modesty, this should not be a licence for a lack of ambition or quality.

4.3 Law comparison vs. legal philosophy, legal theory, legal sociology and legal history

Law comparison belongs to the meta-legal domain of science and is as such related to legal philosophy, legal theory, legal sociology and history of law.

Legal philosophy and legal theory involve abstract reflection on law; both occasionally rely on the results of law comparison. Conversely, law comparison sometimes functions as a benchmark for the universal validity of the theses presented by legal philosophy or legal theory.

Legal sociology examines the relation between society and law: how does law influence human behaviour and how is law influenced or determined by power relations in society? What is the reality behind the legal norms? To answer these and similar questions, it can be useful to draw on ‘variables’ from various legal systems. Here, law comparison can be extremely valuable for the legal sociologist. Legal sociology may in turn be useful for the comparatist, providing explanations for the established similarities and differences in the compared legal systems. Even at the initial stage of law comparison, legal sociology can be helpful in formulating the societal phenomenon or problems one wants to submit to comparative study in a scientifically correct way. The more law comparison focuses on what is called ‘the living law’ or ‘law in action’, the more the input of the legal sociologist is important.

Legal history and law comparison often productively cooperate but they must nevertheless be distinguished. Legal historians follow the scientific methods of historians; their results are not limited to explaining similarities and differences. That said, law comparison, in explaining established similarities and differences, may appeal to, *inter alia*, historical explanations and historical developments, and thus, to legal history.

4.4 Law comparison vs. international private law and international public law

It is self-evident that law comparison must be distinguished from branches of law such as international private law or international public law.

International private law is part of (mainly national) positive law and resolves conflicts between various legal systems by indicating the applicable law, the applicable