Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics 2025; 4(1): 231-241

ISSLP
Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

Original Research

Constitutionalizing Nature: Legal Innovations in the Anthropocene

Rajeev. Kumar[1], Camila. Rodríguez[2*], Diego. Álvarez[3]

[1] Department of Public Law, University of Delhi, Delhi, India
[2] Department of Law, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia
[3] Department of Political Science, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, La Paz, Bolivia

*** Corresponding author email address**: camila.rodriguez@uniandes.edu.co

Received: 2024-10-09 **Revised:** 2024-12-08 **Accepted:** 2024-12-14 **Published:** 2025-01-01

This article examines how the constitutionalization of nature is reshaping legal frameworks in response to the ecological challenges of the Anthropocene. This study employed a scientific narrative review design using a descriptive analysis method. It reviewed peer-reviewed articles, legal documents, and institutional reports published between 2019 and 2025, focusing on case studies from Ecuador, Bolivia, New Zealand, India, and Colombia. The analysis involved mapping legal innovations, evaluating procedural mechanisms, and identifying patterns in judicial and legislative reforms. The review revealed that constitutionalizing nature has led to a range of legal transformations, including granting legal personhood to rivers, embedding rights of nature in national constitutions, and developing co-governance models with indigenous communities. These innovations reflect a shift from anthropocentric to ecocentric legal reasoning and introduce new rights, duties, and enforcement mechanisms. However, the implementation of these rights faces significant institutional and interpretive challenges. Despite this, the normative power of eco-constitutionalism is influencing global legal discourse and contributing to new understandings of sovereignty and planetary governance. The constitutionalization of nature offers a transformative legal response to the ecological crises of the Anthropocene. While its success depends on effective implementation and systemic reform, it provides a compelling framework for reimagining the role of law in fostering ecological resilience and justice.

Keywords: *eco-constitutionalism, rights of nature, Anthropocene, environmental law, constitutional reform, legal personhood, planetary governance*

How to cite this article:
Kumar, R., Rodríguez, C., & Álvarez, D. (2025). Constitutionalizing Nature: Legal Innovations in the Anthropocene. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, 4*(1), 231-241. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.4.1.23

1. Introduction

The Anthropocene has emerged as a conceptual and scientific framing of a new geological epoch defined by the dominant impact of human activity on Earth's systems. Unlike the Holocene, where natural forces primarily shaped planetary dynamics, the Anthropocene recognizes human agency as a geophysical force capable of altering climate systems, biodiversity, and biogeochemical cycles. This unprecedented human influence has precipitated widespread ecological degradation, raising profound questions not only for science and policy but also for the foundations of law. The recognition of the Anthropocene confronts the traditional anthropocentric frameworks of legal reasoning and challenges their adequacy in responding to planetary boundaries and environmental collapse. As Chandler notes, the Anthropocene disrupts linear narratives of constitutional progress by unveiling

the entanglements between legal systems and ecological devastation (Chandler, 2024).

Against this backdrop, the concept of "constitutionalizing nature" has gained momentum as a transformative legal response to ecological crisis. It involves the integration of ecocentric principles into constitutional frameworks, aiming to elevate the status of nature from mere object of regulation to subject of rights. This development marks a shift from treating the environment as a passive resource to be managed toward recognizing it as an active participant in legal systems. As Epstein argues, such a transformation reflects a deeper reconfiguration of political thought, where the identity of the human species and its legal systems must be reconsidered in light of their ecological embeddedness (Epstein, 2022). Constitutionalizing nature thus represents not only a legal innovation but also a philosophical reorientation of law toward planetary stewardship.

The relevance of constitutionalizing nature lies in its potential to address the failures of traditional environmental governance. Existing legal regimes often prioritize economic growth, state sovereignty, and short-term interests over long-term ecological health. These regimes have struggled to cope with the systemic and cumulative effects of environmental harm, particularly in transboundary and intergenerational contexts. As Burdon emphasizes, legal obligations in the Anthropocene must account for the relational and temporal dimensions of ecological interdependence, which current legal instruments often overlook (Burdon, 2020). By embedding the rights of nature within constitutional texts, states can establish higher-order legal norms that constrain policy choices, empower environmental guardianship, and legitimize ecocentric claims in courts and public discourse.

This review seeks to examine the legal innovations that have emerged in response to the Anthropocene by analyzing how nature is being constitutionalized in various jurisdictions. The objective is to explore the theoretical foundations, institutional mechanisms, and comparative experiences that inform this legal transformation. Through a scientific narrative review, this study adopts a descriptive analysis method to interpret legal texts, jurisprudence, and scholarly contributions published between 2019 and 2025. This approach allows for the synthesis of diverse materials and the identification of patterns and divergences in how different legal systems are reimagining their relationship with the natural world.

The paper is structured into several sections. Following this introduction, the next section provides the theoretical foundations of eco-constitutionalism, tracing its evolution from traditional environmental law and its philosophical underpinnings. The third section explores comparative constitutional innovations, focusing on selected countries that have recognized the rights of nature or integrated ecological principles into their constitutional frameworks. The fourth section discusses the legal and institutional challenges associated with implementing these reforms, including tensions with anthropocentric legal traditions and enforcement difficulties. The fifth section considers the broader implications for global environmental governance and the potential for transnational legal diffusion. The paper concludes with reflections on future directions and the normative significance of constitutionalizing nature in the Anthropocene.

2. Methodology

This scientific narrative review adopted a descriptive analysis method to explore the emergence and development of legal innovations related to the constitutionalization of nature in the context of the Anthropocene. The study focused on examining theoretical frameworks, comparative legal examples, and institutional mechanisms that have contributed to a shift from anthropocentric legal systems to more ecologically inclusive constitutional arrangements. The objective was to provide a comprehensive understanding of how various legal systems have reimagined the role of nature within their constitutional frameworks and to identify the practical implications, limitations, and transformative potentials of these developments.

The narrative review design was chosen to allow for an in-depth exploration of diverse yet interconnected sources of knowledge across disciplines including constitutional law, environmental jurisprudence, political ecology, and ecological ethics. A narrative format offered the flexibility to integrate conceptual insights with case-based analysis and thematic reflections, which are essential for understanding the complex and evolving nature of constitutional

environmental innovations. The descriptive analysis approach enabled the identification and interpretation of patterns, trends, and theoretical debates, rather than quantifying data, making it suitable for a topic that spans legal philosophy, comparative constitutional law, and global environmental governance.

To ensure the relevance and currency of the reviewed materials, a structured search was conducted using academic databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, HeinOnline, and Google Scholar. The search was restricted to peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, legal documents, and institutional reports published between 2019 and 2025. Keywords included "constitutional rights of nature," "eco-constitutionalism," "environmental constitutionalism," "Anthropocene and law," "legal personhood of nature," and "ecological jurisprudence." Legal texts from jurisdictions such as Ecuador, Bolivia, Colombia, New Zealand, India, and Uganda were also retrieved from official government archives and legal databases to analyze primary constitutional content and jurisprudential developments.

The inclusion criteria prioritized scholarly works and legal documents that addressed constitutional innovations explicitly oriented toward ecological protection, rights of nature, or ecocentric legal theory. Preference was given to literature that engaged with theoretical, doctrinal, or case law dimensions of eco-constitutionalism, particularly in the Global South where many of the most significant legal innovations have emerged. Exclusion criteria involved works that focused exclusively on conventional environmental law without a constitutional or rights-based perspective, as well as literature published prior to 2019 unless deemed foundational or cited within more recent peer-reviewed sources.

The selected materials were analyzed using a descriptive and interpretive approach, allowing the study to map key themes, legal mechanisms, and institutional pathways through which the rights of nature have been embedded in constitutional frameworks. The analysis was carried out in a three-stage process. First, the reviewed materials were classified according to conceptual orientation (e.g., theoretical frameworks, case law analysis, normative critiques). Second, country-level legal innovations were comparatively reviewed to highlight jurisdictional similarities and differences in the constitutional recognition of nature. Finally, the practical challenges and future implications of eco-constitutionalism were synthesized from both empirical observations and theoretical critiques present in the literature.

Particular attention was paid to legal and philosophical tensions between anthropocentric constitutional doctrines and emerging ecocentric norms. Additionally, the role of courts, indigenous epistemologies, and transnational influences was explored to understand how legal innovation in the Anthropocene has been shaped by broader socio-political and ecological contexts. This method allowed for a rich, contextualized account of constitutionalizing nature as a legal and normative project, bridging doctrinal analysis with broader interdisciplinary discourse.

3. Theoretical Foundations: From Environmental Law to Eco-Constitutionalism

Traditional environmental law has played a crucial role in regulating human impacts on nature, primarily through statutes, treaties, and regulatory instruments. However, these frameworks are largely anthropocentric, focusing on controlling pollution, conserving resources, and managing risks in ways that prioritize human welfare and economic development. They often adopt a reactive and compartmentalized approach, treating environmental harm as a series of isolated incidents rather than as symptoms of systemic ecological disruption. As Liljeblad observes, such laws are inadequate in the Anthropocene, where legal education and doctrine must evolve to address the complexity and urgency of planetary change (Liljeblad, 2022). Environmental law's foundations in human-centered values and instrumental rationality limit its ability to respond to the existential risks posed by global ecological instability.

In response to these limitations, the rights of nature have emerged as a transformative legal paradigm. This concept posits that ecosystems, species, and natural entities possess inherent rights to exist, flourish, and regenerate independently of their utility to humans. The recognition of these rights challenges the property-based logic of environmental governance and asserts a legal status for non-human beings. As Hunter notes, this shift requires moving beyond the state-centric logic of international environmental law and toward

frameworks that recognize nature as a legal subject with standing in courts and governance processes (Hunter, 2022). The rights of nature concept has been institutionalized in several national and subnational legal systems, where rivers, forests, and even entire ecosystems have been granted personhood or constitutional protection.

This development is part of a broader intellectual and legal movement toward eco-constitutionalism, which seeks to integrate ecological values into the highest legal norms of society. Eco-constitutionalism involves not only the recognition of nature's rights but also the transformation of legal reasoning, institutional design, and democratic practices to align with ecological imperatives. As Toit and colleagues explain, guiding environmental law's transformation into Earth system law requires new frameworks that capture the interconnectedness and complexity of socio-ecological systems (Toit et al., 2021). Constitutionalizing nature serves as a key strategy in this transformation by embedding ecological norms into the foundational structures of governance and ensuring their primacy over conflicting legal or political interests.

The philosophical foundations of eco-constitutionalism draw on several interrelated traditions, including Earth Jurisprudence, Wild Law, and ecological constitutionalism. Earth Jurisprudence, developed by thinkers such as Thomas Berry and expanded by legal scholars, asserts that human legal systems must derive their legitimacy from alignment with the laws of nature. This perspective views the Earth as a community of beings with reciprocal rights and responsibilities, rejecting the anthropocentric separation between humans and the rest of the biosphere. As Woolley articulates, ecological law in the Anthropocene must be grounded in the recognition of relationality and the co-dependence of all forms of life (Woolley, 2020). Wild Law, as an expression of Earth Jurisprudence, promotes legal frameworks that respect the intrinsic value of non-human entities and seek to restore balance between human and ecological systems.

Eco-constitutionalism also builds on critical legal theories that question the neutrality and universality of law in its current form. As Claerhoudt notes in his review of Davies' work on ecolaw, the legality of life itself must be reinterpreted in terms of the normativity of nature, rather than human command and control (Claerhoudt, 2023). This view emphasizes the embeddedness of law within ecological systems and the need for legal pluralism that respects indigenous knowledge systems and alternative ontologies. Coombe and Jefferson similarly highlight the role of posthuman rights struggles in Latin America, where environmentalism from below has advanced the recognition of nature's legal standing through grassroots mobilization and political ontology (Coombe & Jefferson, 2021).

The legal theorization of the Anthropocene thus requires a paradigm shift that repositions law not as a tool of human domination over nature but as a means of harmonizing human societies with the broader web of life. As Mai suggests, re-imagining law for the Anthropocene involves confronting the "question of possibilities," where normative innovation is essential to navigate unprecedented ecological challenges (Mai, 2022). Similarly, Kapartziani calls for reimagining legal consciousness to respond to the ecological crisis, emphasizing the need for transformative legal imaginaries that transcend anthropocentric rationalities (Kapartziani, 2024).

By anchoring legal innovation in the moral and scientific recognition of the Earth as a dynamic and interdependent system, eco-constitutionalism presents a foundational shift in how law is conceived and practiced. It demands not only technical reforms but also a reorientation of legal culture, values, and institutions. The theoretical foundations explored in this section set the stage for examining how these ideas are being translated into constitutional practice across diverse jurisdictions in the face of the Anthropocene's ethical and ecological imperatives.

4. Constitutional Innovations in Comparative Perspective

The constitutionalization of nature represents one of the most profound legal transformations of the 21st century. While international environmental law has long struggled with state-centric limitations, several domestic legal systems have pioneered a new path by embedding nature's rights directly into their constitutional or statutory frameworks. These legal innovations are not merely symbolic; they challenge entrenched anthropocentric assumptions and introduce procedural and substantive norms that shift the legal order toward an ecocentric paradigm. Ecuador, Bolivia, New Zealand,

India, and Colombia offer rich case studies in how diverse jurisdictions are rethinking the relationship between law and the more-than-human world.

Ecuador is perhaps the most emblematic example of constitutional innovation in this area. In 2008, it became the first country in the world to enshrine the Rights of Nature—referred to as "Pacha Mama"—within its Constitution. Articles 71 through 74 grant nature the right to exist, persist, maintain, and regenerate its vital cycles. These rights are enforceable by any person, community, or legal entity, which marks a significant departure from the traditional requirement of legal standing based on personal harm. As Coombe and Jefferson explain, this constitutional move was deeply influenced by indigenous cosmologies and political struggles, demonstrating how non-Western ontologies can reshape dominant legal frameworks (Coombe & Jefferson, 2021). Moreover, Ecuador's judiciary has progressively interpreted these rights in concrete legal cases, such as the Vilcabamba River case, where the court ordered restoration and compensation for ecological damage inflicted on the river's ecosystem. This procedural innovation—where nature itself becomes a subject with enforceable rights—signals a powerful shift in legal reasoning and ecological governance.

Bolivia followed closely with its enactment of the Law of the Rights of Mother Earth in 2010, and later, the Framework Law on Mother Earth and Integral Development for Living Well in 2012. These laws conceptualize nature not as a passive object of regulation but as a living system with inherent rights. Bolivia's legal framework is explicitly grounded in the Andean worldview of "Pachamama" and the indigenous principle of "vivir bien" (living well), which emphasizes harmony between humans and the environment. According to Chacón, the Bolivian model foregrounds a sense of planetary responsibility by invoking both indigenous and philosophical traditions that critique the Western subject-object divide (Chacón, 2024). The legal innovations in Bolivia extend beyond rights declarations to include duties of the state and citizens to uphold ecological integrity. Administrative bodies like the Plurinational Authority of Mother Earth have been established to monitor compliance and guide policy, demonstrating an effort to institutionalize eco-constitutional values.

In New Zealand, the recognition of the Whanganui River as a legal person in 2017 marks a distinct form of eco-legal innovation through statutory law rather than constitutional amendment. The Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act recognized the river as an indivisible and living whole, granting it legal personhood and the ability to be represented by two guardians—one from the Crown and one from the Whanganui Iwi (Māori tribe). This model of co-governance bridges indigenous and state perspectives and operationalizes legal pluralism. As Arnold points out, the Whanganui settlement illustrates a hybrid legal framework that combines relational indigenous worldviews with statutory recognition, offering a precedent for future ecological personhood models (Arnold, 2022). The statute goes beyond symbolic recognition, embedding the river's values into decision-making processes and ensuring long-term guardianship.

India presents a more complex and contested example of judicial activism in recognizing the legal personhood of nature. In 2017, the Uttarakhand High Court declared the Ganges and Yamuna rivers to be legal persons with rights akin to those of human beings. The court justified its decision on the basis of parens patriae, stating that the government must act as the guardian of the rivers. However, as Woolley and Harrington note, the Indian Supreme Court stayed this judgment soon afterward, highlighting the fragility of judicially created rights in the absence of legislative or constitutional support (Woolley & Harrington, 2022). Nonetheless, the case sparked national and international debate on the possibilities and limitations of using personhood as a legal tool for ecological protection. The Indian example illustrates both the potential and the constraints of judicial innovation in the absence of broader institutional and political consensus.

Colombia has been a particularly active site of legal recognition for nature's rights through constitutional jurisprudence. In a landmark 2018 decision, the Colombian Supreme Court recognized the Amazon rainforest as a subject of rights, citing the need to combat deforestation and protect intergenerational justice. The Court invoked constitutional rights to a healthy environment, life, and health and linked them explicitly to the ecological wellbeing of the Amazon. According to Seck, this decision reflects a relational approach to legal obligations and climate justice, recognizing the

interconnectedness of ecosystems and human communities (Seck, 2021). The Court also ordered the government to develop an intergenerational pact for the life of the Amazon, demonstrating how procedural mandates can accompany declarations of rights to ensure implementation. The Colombian example showcases how courts can reinterpret existing constitutional provisions to advance ecological values, even without formal amendments.

These varied examples reveal multiple legal mechanisms through which nature's rights are being constitutionalized or embedded in high-level legal norms. Some jurisdictions have amended their constitutions, while others have passed statutory laws or relied on judicial interpretation. In each case, nature is not merely protected as a resource but acknowledged as a subject with its own dignity and legal standing. Procedurally, these innovations often involve new forms of legal standing, co-governance institutions, and the appointment of guardians or trustees. Substantively, they impose affirmative duties on the state and private actors to respect ecological integrity. As Widagdo and Anggoro argue, such mechanisms are particularly crucial in ensuring that rights do not remain symbolic but lead to enforceable obligations and ecological restoration (Widagdo & Anggoro, 2022).

Furthermore, these legal innovations reflect different cultural, philosophical, and political contexts, suggesting that eco-constitutionalism is not a one-size-fits-all model but a flexible paradigm that can be localized. In Bolivia and Ecuador, indigenous cosmologies play a central role in shaping legal concepts. In New Zealand, co-governance arrangements reflect negotiated settler-indigenous relations. In India and Colombia, activist courts have pushed the boundaries of legal doctrine to accommodate ecological realities. As Alexandra suggests, these developments represent a move toward deliberately designing legal ecosystems that respond to cultural and environmental needs in the Anthropocene (Alexandra, 2022).

Despite these differences, a common thread across jurisdictions is the effort to reposition nature within the legal order—not as an object to be managed but as a participant in legal and political life. These innovations challenge dominant legal epistemologies and offer a foundation for reimagining law as an ally of ecological resilience. The next section will explore the challenges that arise in operationalizing these ambitious legal reforms, from institutional inertia to philosophical resistance, and the role of courts, indigenous knowledge systems, and civil society in addressing these obstacles.

5. Legal and Institutional Challenges

While the constitutionalization of nature has generated significant enthusiasm among legal scholars and environmental activists, the practical implementation of these reforms remains fraught with challenges. One of the most pressing difficulties lies in the operationalization of rights of nature. Even where legal texts declare nature to be a subject of rights, the absence of clear procedural pathways, institutional mandates, and enforcement mechanisms often renders these rights ineffective. As Heldeweg argues, sustainability science and law require not only normative vision but also institutional foresight and design to translate principles into practice (Heldeweg, 2021).

A major source of tension stems from the clash between ecocentric legal innovations and entrenched anthropocentric constitutional traditions. Most existing legal systems are grounded in human-centered conceptions of rights, property, and sovereignty. The introduction of nature as a rights-bearing subject disrupts these frameworks and often encounters resistance from legal professionals, policymakers, and industries accustomed to prioritizing human interests. As Epstein notes, this resistance is partly rooted in political thought that continues to view nature as external to the legal community, rather than as an integral member of the political body (Epstein, 2022). Reconciling these divergent paradigms requires not only legal reform but a broader cultural and epistemological shift.

Institutionally, the implementation of rights of nature faces jurisdictional and interpretive challenges. In federal systems, questions arise about the authority of local or subnational governments to recognize and enforce nature's rights. Courts may lack guidance on how to adjudicate ecological claims, leading to inconsistent or symbolic rulings. In India, for instance, the judicial recognition of rivers as legal persons faced immediate pushback and was stayed due to concerns over legal liability and administrative feasibility (Woolley & Harrington, 2022). This example underscores the

fragility of rights-based innovations that are not grounded in coherent institutional support.

Interpretive challenges also arise in determining the scope and content of nature's rights. Unlike human rights, which are typically framed in terms of autonomy and dignity, the rights of ecosystems may be expressed in terms of ecological integrity, restoration, or the protection of natural cycles. As Tigre and Urzola explain, this requires courts and legal institutions to adopt new forms of reasoning that account for ecological processes and scientific uncertainty (Tigre & Urzola, 2021). Without appropriate judicial training and environmental expertise, there is a risk that such rights will be misinterpreted or subordinated to more familiar anthropocentric principles.

Indigenous knowledge systems and civil society play a vital role in addressing these institutional and conceptual gaps. In Ecuador and Bolivia, indigenous movements have been instrumental in advancing the legal recognition of nature's rights and monitoring their enforcement. These movements offer alternative ontologies that challenge the Cartesian dualism embedded in Western legal traditions. As Álvarez emphasizes, the urgency of continuing to live on a damaged planet requires epistemic humility and openness to plural legal forms (Álvarez, 2023). Civil society organizations also serve as guardians and litigants, bringing cases to court, raising public awareness, and holding governments accountable. Their involvement ensures that eco-constitutional norms are not confined to legal texts but become part of lived legal and political practices.

The judiciary itself occupies a paradoxical role in the implementation of nature's rights. On the one hand, courts have served as catalysts for innovation, particularly in Colombia and India. On the other hand, their decisions often lack follow-through or face political and institutional pushback. As McKinnon observes, this dynamic reveals a deeper crisis of legitimacy and institutional coherence in addressing intergenerational and ecological justice (McKinnon, 2021). Ensuring that judicial rulings translate into concrete outcomes requires collaboration across branches of government, the empowerment of local communities, and the creation of new oversight mechanisms.

In sum, while the constitutionalization of nature holds transformative potential, it also faces serious legal and institutional obstacles. Overcoming these challenges demands not only doctrinal innovation but also systemic reform and inclusive governance. In the final sections of this paper, we turn to the implications of these developments for global environmental governance and consider the normative future of eco-constitutionalism in the Anthropocene.

6. Implications for Global Environmental Governance

The constitutionalization of nature does not merely represent a domestic legal innovation; it also resonates across the global legal and political landscape, intersecting with broader movements toward planetary governance. As states begin to recognize nature as a legal subject, these normative shifts challenge long-standing assumptions within international law and global environmental institutions. One key area of convergence is the United Nations' "Harmony with Nature" initiative, which has advocated since 2009 for a more holistic, Earth-centered worldview within law and policy. This initiative explicitly calls for the integration of the rights of nature into legal systems and international cooperation, emphasizing the need to shift from a human-centered to an ecocentric paradigm. As Epstein argues, such efforts reflect the broader ontological rethinking required in the Anthropocene, where human legal institutions must acknowledge their embeddedness in ecological systems (Epstein, 2022).

Constitutional provisions recognizing the rights of nature also interact with global sustainability frameworks such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). While the SDGs themselves are formulated in anthropocentric terms, emphasizing human well-being, poverty eradication, and economic development, the incorporation of nature's rights into national constitutions introduces a countervailing legal logic that prioritizes ecological integrity as a foundational precondition for development. As Jacob explains, the Paris Agreement and other climate-related international treaties offer only limited enforceability, often constrained by state sovereignty and political compromise (Jacob, 2020). In contrast, constitutionalizing nature embeds ecological obligations within the supreme law of a state, thereby strengthening the normative architecture for climate action and

environmental protection at both national and transnational levels.

These legal innovations also provoke a reimagining of sovereignty itself. Traditional notions of sovereignty are rooted in territorial control and the prioritization of human interests within bounded nation-states. However, as Seck suggests, the emergence of eco-constitutionalism calls for a relational understanding of sovereignty, one that acknowledges transboundary ecological interdependencies and the obligations of states not only to their citizens but to ecosystems and future generations (Seck, 2021). This reconceptualization aligns with growing international recognition of planetary stewardship as a shared responsibility, evident in the language of "common concern of humankind" and "Earth system governance." Constitutionalizing nature thus contributes to the evolution of international legal norms by articulating an ecological dimension of sovereignty that transcends borders.

Moreover, these domestic constitutional developments have the potential to influence international law through processes of transnational legal diffusion and the development of soft law. Legal scholars and practitioners are increasingly drawing on comparative constitutional models, such as those of Ecuador and Colombia, to advocate for reforms in other jurisdictions. As Tigre and Urzola observe, the 2017 Advisory Opinion by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights marked a turning point in regional environmental jurisprudence by recognizing the rights of ecosystems as essential to the realization of human rights (Tigre & Urzola, 2021). This opinion, while not binding in the same way as a treaty, exerts soft law influence by shaping the interpretive practices of national courts and international bodies. In this way, eco-constitutionalism acts as a catalyst for legal harmonization and norm convergence across different legal systems.

The symbolic and practical power of these innovations is further amplified by their alignment with broader societal movements and epistemic communities. As Arnoldussen notes, the reflexivity of contemporary legal actors enables the dissemination of new ecological legal norms across disciplinary, cultural, and geopolitical boundaries (Arnoldussen, 2023). This process is facilitated by transnational networks of lawyers, environmental activists, indigenous organizations, and scholars who work collaboratively to promote the recognition of nature's rights. The influence of these actors is evident in the growing number of cities and local governments around the world that have passed ordinances recognizing the rights of nature, even in the absence of national-level reforms.

International law itself may gradually evolve in response to these bottom-up pressures. As Chandler points out, the Anthropocene undermines the legitimacy of human-centered legal orders and calls for a reconstitution of legal authority on ecological grounds (Chandler, 2024). While formal changes to international treaties may be slow, the normative shift initiated by eco-constitutionalism is already altering the language and logic of environmental diplomacy. The increasing references to Earth system boundaries, ecological limits, and the rights of future generations in multilateral discussions indicate a growing receptivity to ecocentric legal reasoning.

Yet, the potential for global diffusion of nature's rights also depends on the adaptability of legal systems and the political will of states. As Park argues, legal systems must evolve beyond classical humanism to embrace a posthumanist labor law and governance structure that reflects the co-creative agency of humans and non-humans alike (Park, 2023). Such a transformation requires not only legal innovation but also shifts in education, governance, and societal values. Without these systemic changes, the risk remains that constitutional provisions will remain aspirational, disconnected from the realities of implementation and global cooperation.

Ultimately, the constitutionalization of nature offers a compelling framework for rethinking global environmental governance. By embedding ecological norms into the foundational legal texts of sovereign states, these innovations create legal footholds for broader transformations in international law. They contribute to a jurisprudence of planetary interdependence, one that challenges the anthropocentric and state-centric biases of existing legal orders and lays the groundwork for a more just and sustainable future.

7. Future Directions and Critical Reflections

As the legal recognition of nature continues to expand, several emerging trends point toward the future

trajectory of eco-constitutionalism. One of the most promising developments is the rise of climate constitutionalism, which integrates climate obligations and ecological limits into constitutional texts and doctrines. This trend reflects a growing recognition that climate change is not merely a policy issue but a constitutional one, implicating fundamental rights, democratic accountability, and the structure of governance itself. As Kotzé emphasizes, Earth system law represents a new legal paradigm designed to respond to the complexities of the Anthropocene by embedding environmental concerns into the very fabric of legal systems (Kotzé, 2019).

Another important direction is the incorporation of generational rights into constitutional frameworks. These rights emphasize the obligations of current generations toward future ones, ensuring that ecological degradation is not passed on as an inheritance of harm. Courts and legislators have begun to reference intergenerational justice as a principle guiding environmental governance. McKinnon's analysis of postericide and intergenerational ethics illustrates the moral urgency of recognizing future generations as legal stakeholders whose interests must be represented in present-day legal decisions (McKinnon, 2021).

Ecological democracy also represents a forward-looking horizon for legal innovation. This concept calls for the democratization of environmental decision-making processes, the inclusion of non-human interests in governance, and the expansion of participatory rights to marginalized communities and ecosystems. As Woolley and Harrington argue, ecological democracy requires reimagining governance structures in ways that are inclusive, participatory, and attuned to ecological realities (Woolley & Harrington, 2022).

Yet, the path ahead is not without risks. One major concern is the danger of symbolic constitutionalism—legal reforms that sound transformative on paper but fail to deliver tangible outcomes in practice. As Claerhoudt observes, the normativity of nature in law must be accompanied by institutional commitment and practical enforcement, or else it risks becoming a hollow gesture (Claerhoudt, 2023). Without effective implementation, rights of nature can become another rhetorical tool that legitimizes environmental harm rather than preventing it.

Another critical issue is the balancing of human and non-human interests in law. While ecocentric reforms seek to decenter human privilege, legal systems must still navigate conflicts between ecological integrity and human needs, particularly in contexts of poverty, inequality, and development. As Álvarez argues, the ethical challenge lies in acting amidst ecological crisis without collapsing into either inaction or eco-authoritarianism (Álvarez, 2023). Law must find ways to mediate these tensions through inclusive dialogue, adaptive institutions, and shared values.

Addressing these challenges and realizing the full potential of eco-constitutionalism requires interdisciplinary collaboration and systemic legal transformation. Legal scholars, environmental scientists, indigenous leaders, and policy-makers must work together to co-create legal frameworks that are responsive to both ecological complexity and social justice. As Alexandra notes, designing legal ecosystems for the Anthropocene involves not only technical innovation but also imaginative and cultural work that reshapes our collective legal consciousness (Alexandra, 2022).

In conclusion, the future of constitutionalizing nature will depend not only on legal texts and judicial decisions but on the broader societal commitment to live within planetary boundaries and cultivate a culture of ecological care. This transformation is not merely a legal project—it is a civilizational one.

8. Conclusion

The constitutionalization of nature represents one of the most profound shifts in contemporary legal thought, signaling a departure from anthropocentric models of environmental governance and moving toward a legal framework that acknowledges the intrinsic value and agency of the natural world. As explored throughout this review, the emergence of the Anthropocene has exposed the limitations of traditional legal systems that prioritize human interests and fail to account for the systemic interdependencies between human societies and ecological systems. In response, several pioneering jurisdictions have begun to embed the rights of nature within their constitutional or statutory frameworks, setting legal and moral precedents that reconfigure the foundational principles of law.

The case studies examined—Ecuador, Bolivia, New Zealand, India, and Colombia—illustrate diverse pathways through which nature has been granted legal standing. These innovations demonstrate that it is possible to reimagine legal systems in ways that reflect relational ontologies, promote ecological justice, and protect the integrity of natural systems. Importantly, the mechanisms adopted in each country vary, from constitutional amendments to judicial rulings to co-governance statutes, reflecting the adaptability of eco-constitutionalism across political and cultural contexts. They also reveal a trend toward recognizing the importance of indigenous worldviews and knowledge systems in shaping legal norms that are more attuned to ecological realities.

Despite the normative strength of these legal transformations, significant implementation challenges remain. Conflicts with existing anthropocentric doctrines, institutional inertia, interpretive ambiguity, and political resistance all threaten to undermine the realization of nature's rights in practice. Furthermore, without the establishment of robust procedural frameworks, independent oversight bodies, and sustained public engagement, these constitutional advances risk becoming symbolic rather than substantive. Nonetheless, the very act of recognizing nature as a legal subject introduces new discursive possibilities and empowers civil society actors to advocate for more just and sustainable environmental policies.

The implications of these developments extend beyond national boundaries. As domestic legal systems experiment with eco-constitutionalism, they influence global legal consciousness and contribute to the evolution of international environmental law. The integration of ecological values into constitutional frameworks provides a foundation for reconceptualizing sovereignty, development, and intergenerational justice. This, in turn, supports the formation of a new jurisprudence—one that is capable of guiding humanity through the complexities of the Anthropocene while respecting the autonomy and dignity of non-human life.

Looking ahead, the future of eco-constitutionalism will be shaped by its ability to move from normative aspiration to institutional reality. Emerging trends such as climate constitutionalism, generational rights, and ecological democracy offer pathways for deepening and expanding the legal recognition of ecological interdependence. However, these advances must be accompanied by interdisciplinary collaboration, education, and a cultural shift toward valuing ecological well-being as a public good. The success of constitutionalizing nature ultimately depends on a societal willingness to engage in systemic legal transformation—one that redefines our obligations not only to each other but to the living systems that sustain us.

In this moment of ecological uncertainty, constitutionalizing nature stands as both a legal innovation and a moral imperative. It offers a vision of law that is not simply reactive but regenerative, not merely anthropocentric but planetary in scope. As the ecological crises of the Anthropocene intensify, this vision may prove essential to ensuring a livable future for all forms of life on Earth.

Authors' Contributions

Authors contributed equally to this article.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, ethical standards including obtaining informed consent, ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed.

References

Alexandra, J. (2022). Designer Ecosystems for the Anthropocene—Deliberately Creating Novel Ecosystems in Cultural Landscapes. *Sustainability*, *14*(7), 3952. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14073952

Álvarez, L. (2023). Entre La Parálisis Y La Acción: Un Punto De Partida Para Pensar en La Urgencia De Continuar Viviendo. *Rivista Italiana Di Filosofia Politica*(3), 77-90. https://doi.org/10.36253/rifp-2017

Arnold, B. (2022). Signs of Invisibility: Nonrecognition of Natural Environments as Persons in International and Domestic Law. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*, *36*(2), 457-475. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-022-09920-7

Arnoldussen, T. (2023). Connecting Laws to Climates: A Timely Challenge for Reflexive Lawyers. *Tilburg Law Review*, *28*(1), 38-44. https://doi.org/10.5334/tilr.338

Burdon, P. (2020). Obligations in the Anthropocene. *Law and Critique*, *31*(3), 309-328. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10978-020-09273-9

Chacón, R. (2024). Rethinking Responsibility in a Planetary Age; Or, Facing the Anthropocene With Hans Jonas and Bruno Latour. *Isonomía - Revista De Teoría Y Filosofía Del Derecho*(59). https://doi.org/10.5347/isonomia.59/2023.656

Chandler, D. (2024). The Black Anthropocene: And the End(s) of the Constitutionalizing Project. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, *15*(1), 37-55. https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2024.01.03

Claerhoudt, R. (2023). Ecolaw: Legality, Life, and the Normativity of Nature, by MargaretDavies, London: Routledge, 2022, X + 128 pp. *Review of European Comparative & International Environmental Law*, *32*(1), 169-171. https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12493

Coombe, R. J., & Jefferson, D. J. (2021). Posthuman Rights Struggles and Environmentalisms From Below in the Political Ontologies of Ecuador and Colombia. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, *12*(2), 177-204. https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2021.02.02

Epstein, S. (2022). Rights of Nature, Human Species Identity, and Political Thought in the Anthropocene. *The Anthropocene Review*, *10*(2), 415-433. https://doi.org/10.1177/20530196221078929

Heldeweg, M. A. (2021). Looking Beyond the Horizon. A Normative-Institutional Approach to Sustainability Science; Getting Onto 'The Balcony'. *E3s Web of Conferences*, *249*, 02001. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202124902001

Hunter, D. (2022). Moving Beyond State-Centrism in International Environmental Law. https://doi.org/10.3233/stal220011

Jacob, V. A. (2020). The Implementation of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, Edited by Vesselin Popovski Routledge, 2020, 316 Pp, £120 Hb, £36.99 Pb, £40.49 Ebk ISBN 9780415791236 Hb, 9780367481483 Pb, 9781315212470 Ebk. *Transnational Environmental Law*, *9*(3), 621-625. https://doi.org/10.1017/s2047102520000321

Kapartziani, C. (2024). Echoes of the Anthropocene: Reimagining Legal Consciousness in the Face of Ecological Crisis. *European Scientific Journal Esj*, *20*(35), 1. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n35p1

Kotzé, L. J. (2019). Earth System Law for the Anthropocene. *Sustainability*, *11*(23), 6796. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11236796

Liljeblad, J. (2022). Integrating the Anthropocene in Legal Education: Considerations for Asia. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, *9*(2), 207-227. https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2022.4

Mai, L. (2022). The 'Question of Possibilities' as a Leitmotif for Re-imagining Law for the 'Anthropocene'. *Global Policy*, *13*(S3), 49-59. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13109

McKinnon, C. (2021). Postericide and Intergenerational Ethics. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190881931.013.44

Park, S. (2023). Anthropocene and the Future of Labor Law: A Thesis for Constructing a Posthuman Labor Law Beyond Humanism, Toward a Symbiosis of Co-Creating Humans and Nonhumans. *Wonkwang University Legal Research Institute*, *39*(3), 125-157. https://doi.org/10.22397/wlri.2023.39.3.125

Seck, S. L. (2021). A Relational Analysis of Enterprise Obligations and Carbon Majors for Climate Justice. *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, *11*(1), 254-284. https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl/0000-0000-0000-1139

Tigre, M. A., & Urzola, N. (2021). The 2017 Inter-American Court's Advisory Opinion: Changing the Paradigm for International Environmental Law in the Anthropocene. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, *12*(1), 24-50. https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2021.01.02

Toit, L. d., Porras, G. L., & Kotzé, L. J. (2021). Guiding Environmental Law's Transformation Into Earth System Law Through the Telecoupling Framework. *European Energy and Environmental Law Review*, *30*(Issue 3), 104-113. https://doi.org/10.54648/eelr2021011

Widagdo, S., & Anggoro, S. A. (2022). Combating Ocean Debris: Marine Plastic Pollution and Waste Regulation in Indonesia. *The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*, *37*(3), 458-492. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718085-bja10093

Woolley, O. (2020). Ecological Law in the Anthropocene 1. 61-75. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003001256-8

Woolley, O., & Harrington, C. (2022). Law and Governance in the Anthropocene. *Global Policy*, *13*(S3), 5-10. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13168