International Journal of Law, Policy and Social Review
www.lawjournals.net
Online ISSN: 2664-6838
Received: 26-02-2026, Accepted: 29-03-2026, Published: 13-04-2026
Volume 8, Issue 2, 2026, Page No. 40-45

The evolution of Nature's legal rights as Earth Jurisprudence: A Global and Indian judicial perspective

Jatin Chaudhary
Asian Law College, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract
Earth Jurisprudence and Legal Rights of Nature are concepts that keep continuously expanding and emerging as our perceptions about the surrounding world evolve. The paper examines the evolution of these notions starting with their philosophical origins and spreading to decisions of the courts worldwide, and specifically, in India. It follows the transformation in the contemporary legal thought, where nature was seen as property, to be used by the human being, to a perspective where nature is a living creature, and it has its rights. The paper gives instances of other nations such as Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand where nature has been legally recognized as a person, and contrasts them with judicial developments in India, especially the legal personhood of rivers in Uttarakhand High Court. It further puts in doubt the fact that these future judgments are actually being imprinted or whether they are mostly symbolic. The paper eventually recommends the necessity of stronger institutions, community involvement and change of legal mindset to make the right of nature practical and living principles in which all beings are subjects (not only human beings) to.

Keywords: Earth jurisprudence, legal rights of nature, judicial perspective, philosophical origins

Introduction

Even the increasing environmental crises such as global warming, disappearance of biodiversity and collapsing ecosystems are pushing our legal systems to their limits. Nature has traditionally been viewed in laws primarily as a resource to be used by people, a source of goods, a source of development, the way to satisfy human needs. And yet, as we start to know how interdependent human life and nature are, it becomes apparent that we should question ourselves as to the meaning of law. This is where the concept of earth jurisprudence fits. It is founded on the assumption that, everything in nature, rivers, forests, animals, and humans belong to one and the same community and that laws and governments must express this
Association [1].

The main point of this concept is the Legal Rights of Nature. It states that nature is not a possession to be owned or an object to be exploited but a life with its rights the right to exist
and to grow and to regenerate and to evolve [2]. This has broken some of the traditional assumptions in the legal philosophy and environmental law to the extent that we are left wondering whether we should still continue to use laws to serve only human interest or consider a redefinition to serve the interests of the whole Earth community.

In the global sense, courts, law makers, and environmental groups are starting to subscribe to this view. Nature has legal personality Many countries are considering how nature can be given legal rights in which rivers, forests and ecosystem may be litigated and their rights enshrined. These developments demonstrate an increasing consciousness that states have to respond to the profound interrelatedness of life. It is no longer about the punishment of the harm to the environment but about the possibility of the environment itself to have rights and be safeguarded by the law.

This new movement in India, which is based on Earth Jurisprudence and Legal Rights of Nature, is buttressed by a robust tradition of public interest litigation, constitutional environmental protection, and progressive judicial interpretation. These developments are all signs of how the global ecological concepts can be integrated with the Indian legal traditions to make the legal system more inclusive and Earth-oriented [3].

The paper will outline the historical growth of nature in the form of legal rights developed by Earth Jurisprudence, beginning with the conceptual foundations of the idea and its global manifestation via the legal system, and then moving on to the Indian judicial case scenario to discuss how the ideas were translated, opposed, and institutionalized. Through this process, we will examine the ways in which courts have dealt with natural rights, the methods they have used to identify and uphold these rights, the gaps that still exist, and ultimately, we will provide a prospective view of how legal systems could better conform to the goal of an Earth-centered jurisprudence. Our aim is not only to document past events, but also to encourage contemplation of what needs to be done for law to benefit life as opposed to just humans.

Research Questions

1. How has the concept of Earth Jurisprudence transformed traditional legal thought from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism?
2. To what extent have Indian courts and institutions implemented the legal rights of nature, and what challenges persist?
3. What structural, philosophical, and institutional reforms are necessary to make the recognition of nature's rights practically effective?

Research Gap

Although international literature is progressively scrutinizing the recognition of nature's legal rights, there is a deficiency of research focused on the application of these principles within the Indian judicial and institutional context. Most studies concentrate on the philosophical or

comparative dimensions, overlooking the operational challenges, enforcement inadequacies, and socio-legal consequences of granting personhood to wildlife in India. This study tackles that problem by looking at how Indian courts interpret and apply nature's rights. It focuses on the gap between what the law says and what actually happens.

Concept and Philosophy of Earth Jurisprudence

The term Earth Jurisprudence describes a paradigm-shift in how we conceive the purpose, source and orientation of law. At its heart it invites us to move away from a human-centred or anthropocentric legal framework and instead embrace an Earth-centred viewpoint—that is, one that recognises that humans are just one part of a wider Earth community, and that the wellbeing of this whole community ultimately supports the well-being of each member [4].

In simpler terms: rather than seeing nature as simply "resources for humans" or "objects to be used," Earth Jurisprudence proposes that the laws and governance systems of human societies
must reflect the laws of the living planet, and be designed so that the health, integrity and evolvability of the "Earth community" are protected.

The philosophical foundations of Earth Jurisprudence draw on multiple strands. One key insight is that many traditional societies around the world (especially Indigenous cultures) have long viewed the planet not merely as inert matter, but as a living, lawful system. From that vantage, humans are embedded within nature, not external to it. Thus, law and governance emerge from the rhythms and requirements of the wider living system. Earth Jurisprudence repackages this insight and invites modern legal systems to reconnect with it [5].

Another element is the critique of the dominant legal and social order: law has typically evolved in an era of industrial expansion and has treated nature as property, external to humanity's moral and legal community. Earth Jurisprudence challenges that legacy by arguing that the source of legitimacy for human law should not rest solely on human conventions or power structures, but should be aligned with the "Great Law" of the Earth itself—that is, the fundamental principles by which life continues, renews, adapts, evolves and sustains itself [6].

From this foundation arise several core concepts. First, the idea of the Earth Community – a term used to convey that all living and non-living beings (rivers, forests, ecosystems, species, landforms) form a network of interrelation in which each part matters. In this view, humans are one part of that community, not supreme over it. Secondly, the notion of Lawfulness of Nature – the understanding that the Earth operates according to certain patterns or principles (for example regeneration, interdependence, cycles, thresholds) and that human governance should reflect, respect and embed those patterns. Thirdly, the principle of Intrinsic Rights of Nature – meaning that nature is not simply valuable because it serves human ends, but has value in and of itself, and therefore legal frameworks need to grant rights to elements of nature, not merely regulate human behaviour toward it.

In practical terms, this philosophy suggests that our legal, economic, political and social systems must adapt in order to be consistent with ecological reality. It emphasises a shift from growth-for-human-benefit, to flourishing-for-Earth-benefit, which in turn supports human well-being. It encourages pluralism and acknowledges that customary, Indigenous and local governance systems often already embody Earth-centred thinking—thus modern law can learn and adapt from these traditions rather than ignoring them.

Emergence of Nature's Legal Rights

The rise of the concept of nature's legal rights marks a profound shift in how law conceives our relationship with the natural world. Until relatively recently, environmental law typically operated on the assumption that nature exists to be used, managed or regulated by humans — as property, as resource, or as a backdrop to development. But the movement for the legal rights of nature challenges that assumption by proposing that ecosystems, species and natural entities may themselves be rights-bearing subjects.

One of the earliest sparks for this shift came from academic work questioning the legal standing of nature. In the early 1970s, one scholar posed the provocative idea: should trees have standing? From that simple question flowed a broader critique of anthropocentric legal systems — systems in which only humans (or human entities) hold rights and nature is merely regulated. Over time, the movement grew, drawing on indigenous world-views that view humans as part of a wider Earth-community rather than masters of it, and on urgent concerns over biodiversity loss, ecosystem collapse and climate breakdown [7].

Since the beginning of the 21st century, the rights of nature have only been formally acknowledged in legal systems recently. The Ecuadorian government changed the constitution in 2008 to say that ecosystems have the right to exist, support themselves, grow, and change. This was a truly critical time. This is highly symbolic. It established a precedent that anyone could sue on behalf of the environment. Meanwhile, Bolivia enacted a law acknowledging the Rights of Mother Earth. These developments indicated that the law was shifting away the protection of human interests in nature and moving toward the recognition of the interests of
nature itself.

The same methods started to be applied by courts and governments across the world. Indeed, in 2017, the Whanganui River in New Zealand was legally granted personhood. This implies
that the river is entitled to represent itself in court and present its claims through appointed guardians [8]. In the US and elsewhere, local and municipal governments established rights of nature laws recognizing that lakes, woodlands, and ecosystems can be legal persons rather than regulated objects. These are examples of how the idea is not merely a theory but is already being applied in courts and in other contexts [9].

This movement stresses three key aspects of the legal rights of nature: first, the switch between object and subject - nature as property to nature as the rights-holder. Second, the concept that natural objects may be given legal personality or may have custodians represent them in court. Third, the emphasis lies on natural rights, including the rights to exist, flourish, reproduce, and develop, as opposed to mere human rights to use or dominate nature. Fourth, the understanding that safeguarding the rights of nature is aligned with human interests: healthy ecosystems generate human life, a law that safeguards nature therefore aids people.

Global Developments

International Environmental and Judicial Perspectives

The notion that nature may possess legal rights has gained significant global traction in recent years. Most legal systems globally are beginning to treat ecosystems, rivers, trees, and other natural entities as an entity that is entitled a legal protection, rather than an object that people can control. This move will not change all and everyone, but it already indicates a paradigm shift in the perception of the natural world by the law and the government.

Constitutional and statutory change is one of the most noticeable developments. Some countries have amended their constitutions or enacted laws to recognise that nature has rights — to exist, renew and flourish. Legal personhood has been granted to rivers, lakes and even portions of the sea in some jurisdictions. These legal innovations change the way courts handle environmental harm: rather than simply protecting human interests (such as a person's right to clean water), they begin to ask whether the ecosystem itself has been injured and whether a legal remedy is appropriate on behalf of nature [10].

In the judicial arena, courts are increasingly willing to entertain claims on behalf of nature — or at least to recognise the concept of nature's rights in principle. Judges are asking new questions: Can a river be represented in court through guardians? Can the interests of an ecosystem be asserted alongside human interests? What remedies will restore the vitality of an ecosystem rather than simply compensate a harmed human party? These judicial processes are still developing, but they mark a clear departure from classical environmental law which treated nature as a "thing" rather than a rights-bearer.

Internationally, although there is no single treaty that yet comprehensively recognises rights of nature, the movement is influencing global environmental governance. Reports, policy frameworks and advocacy around "ecocentric" governance show that law is gradually responding to planetary scale crises—climate change, biodiversity collapse, ecosystem degradation—by rethinking the anthropocentric foundations of many legal systems. The idea of nature's rights is increasingly appearing in discussions of sustainable development, global biodiversity frameworks and regional legal reforms

Another important dimension is the spread and adaptation of these ideas. Legal recognition of nature's rights has not been confined to one region of the world; it appears both in the Global South and the Global North. Local and regional governments, cities, and indigenous communities are some of the first to use it. This spread shows that nature's legal rights are being put into action in many legal systems and cultural contexts. But since situations are subject to change, the approaches change as well. A number of countries only acknowledge a right to nature whereas others provide it with full legal personality and others make use of guardianship models. The next problem is implementation of these rights, the principles of granting standing, the hierarchy of two sets of rights (human against nature), and the adaptation of the legal institutions to this new order.

Hoarding in Judicial Processes.

The judiciary has been a strong tool that transformed the concept of the rights of nature into a reality and a practical one. Courts in the world are no longer viewing cases involving the environment as mere human wrangles on the issue of pollution or property. They are instead starting to realize that the nature can have rights, and that the task of the judicial system is to make the ecology right again, not the human one.

Among the most significant changes has been the change in the view of the judges about what is legal standing- who is entitled to take a case to the court. In the past, only those who were personally affected or an organization could file a case. However, according to the rights of nature approach, courts are permitting natural entities, such as rivers, forests or ecosystems, to have guardians or trustees. This implies that although no human may be injured in the hands of an individual, still nature can speak in court. It has been shifted no longer on human interests but now on the welfare of the whole ecosystem- whether it has been harmed, whether its regenerative capacity has been interfered with, whether it should be given legal protection.

The thinking of the judiciary is also changing. Judges now pose questions of a deeper kind: What are the rights of this natural being? How can it be protected? So how can it go on existing and developing? Certain courts have even gone to appreciate that nature should be left to take care of itself and not only due to the benefits that it accords to mankind. This change demonstrates that ecosystems have started being considered as dynamic systems that are alive and not objects of control.

In other places courts have gone even further to establish guardianship systems that assign surrogacy to protect the interests of natural entities or come up with new processes to protect the rights of nature. This is an extension of a bigger change that the courts do not simply decide on any case, but instead they are attempting to build systems of long-term environmental custodianship. This is leading to a more proactive environmental law that attempts to avoid harm and not only react to the harm.

But this development also has its difficulties. Legal systems have mostly been constructed on the preservation of human rights, property and economic growth. Lack of explicit law that defines and enforces rights of nature compel judges to have innovative approaches to the existing constitutional principles. The issue of balancing the competing rights of the indigenous rights, the future generations, human development and the integrity of ecosystems is a complicated issue. These problems notwithstanding, the increased participation of the judiciary is a crucial move towards an Earth-based legal order [11].

Nevertheless, the trend toward court proceedings is evident despite these problems. Courts usually issue new judgments comprising injunctions to enhance ecosystems, legal personhood of natural objects, and rehabilitation and restoration provisions instead of compensation. These decisions suggest the colossal reorientation of judicial mendicacy: they aimed to mend the world, not to pay individuals; to protect nature, not to prosecute and defend, but to conserve nature; and to grant a natural right, not a property right, to humanity.

Involvement of the Judiciary: Global and Comparative Insights

A major development in the story of nature and its rights with legal recognition globally is the courts. Citizens expect judges and courts to interpret the law rather than merely describe it. It is also telling people to transform their interactions with the environment, both constitutional courts and specialized tribunals. In this section, we discuss how

various legal jurisdictions have approached the concept of rights of nature, which patterns have begun to emerge, and what we can learn by seeing things through other perspectives.

The very first thing to know is that the legal profession is being made bigger in every corner of the earth by the courts. Increasingly, judges in various countries have commenced granting natural objects such as rivers, woods, and ecosystems status or representation directly or indirectly via guardians representing their interests. This shift implies that not every environmental lawsuit is one where individuals seek money. In some cases, it is the ecosystems struggling to remain safe. Judicial opinion is evolving. Courts now consider whether a natural species has an entitlement to survive or regenerate away, rather than merely assessing whether a person has been injured. This shift is critical as it determines who has the right to seek a case and the significance of victory [12].

The second advice is to research the precedents of other courts on the same case. Each court has a different style. Most likely, judges in a nation with a long history of strong environmental

policy will affirm individual rights or advocate new constitutional guarantees to conserve the environment. Various courts have respected the right to a safe environment, yet the same courts have denied nature as an autonomous legal entity. The contrast underlines the importance of robust environmental institutions, the nature of modern legal culture, and the willingness of judges to accept an ecocentric perspective.

Third, judicial engagement and institutional innovation are co-occurring. They have been claiming that ecosystems need parents or instituting checks and balances on natural objects. Some have insisted on stricter penalties, including fines instead of just repair bills. Those adjudications show that judges themselves are elements of environmental law in the sense that they not only adjudicate but also say how the government should do it. Thus shall we have a court enrolled as a common partner in the reform of the treatment of nature in the law.

There are downsides to the courts as well. The main point of contention is the struggle between the rights of the environment and the needs of humanity to thrive. These courts have to weigh the preservation of the ecologies against the rights of property owners, economic growth and social life. Legal and economic institutions that are grounded in human rights may struggle to embrace an Earth-centered approach. The second sphere is watching that people follow the rules. One is the consciousness of a right, another is the conscientious safeguarding of that consciousness, through the temporality of action. This information and funds to arrest individuals who have taken oaths of acting in the protection of the environment are not available in other courts.

The similarities, though, can be instructive. Strong environmental guarantees in the constitution or the lawmaking, delineating the judicial responsiveness to the rights of nature, are gained by the judicial leadership. And also in those things which pertain to nature the ecological thought is frequently called into action, that the ecological systems may be conceived by the courts as animate and moving processes, not as an abstract conglomeration of resources. The courts might have to be the first to do a better job but in most cases legislators, regulators and communities work together to achieve positive changes.

Indian Scenario: Development of Earth Jurisprudence in India

An Indian story is a novel that is deep and changing, with the feel of earth-based law and the legal recognition of nature's rights. But in response to this throughout the years, the legal foundations of the country began to change from a more human-centered vision of environmental control to a much more open model where nature can have rights and be protected by law.

There are strong protections in India's constitution for the sake of environmental protection. Compassion for all living things is enshrined in India's constitution with the country's obligation to protect and improve the environment. These clauses established the framework for the court's view that protecting the environment is an absolute need rather than a matter of discretion. The courts have recognized that the right to life includes the right to an ecosystem that is free from pollution, clean air and water, and lush vegetation. The interdependence of human and environmental well-being was recognized by the legal system [13].

Indian courts have even been talking about nature's legal standing lately. It was a first for the Uttarakhand High Court to decide that some glaciers and rivers were legal people. People think they have rights and duties that are similar to those of a person. Because of these decisions, the rivers now act as a group of protectors with a say in court cases [14]. The Tamil Nadu High Court bench determined that the state and federal governments should recognize Mother Nature as a living creature, endowed with corresponding rights and obligations. This transition indicates that individuals no longer perceive nature merely as a resource; instead, they recognize it as something that must be conserved [15].

The reasoning process in Indian courts can be broken down into three fundamental facts. This should start with the legal creation of law that gives subjective status and representation to natural persons, such as trustees or guardians. Second, the courts may indicate that the state or the court should take the role of parents or guardians when states or other non-human beings

are unable to defend themselves. This is premised on such concepts as the theory of public trust or the parens patriae jurisdiction. The legal redress is becoming more inclusive of restoration orders, harm prevention, environmental protection, and damages compensation.

Another cause of concern is the India case however. Some of the progressive actions are quite difficult to execute because the laws are ambiguous and the institutions lack the capacity.. Even if rivers were seen as legal entities, the following examples show that there are issues with figuring out who is responsible, who is liable, and how to balance the needs of human growth with the rights of nature. Some judges have said that words alone aren't enough and that we need more concrete activities and infrastructure to make nature's rights real. Judges still want something other than what really transpired [16].

India is unusual because it has environmental rules in its constitution, a strong tradition of public interest litigation, and a growing knowledge of new ideas in nature-rights law. The Indian situation demonstrates the disparity between theoretical rights and actual rights: recognition requires the existence of institutions, competencies, and socio-political commitment.

Courts' Appearance and Judicial Reasoning

Over the past several years, the courts have begun to play a much larger role in the interpretation of nature rights. Judges no longer are simply reading laws in traditional forms; they now have to contemplate what it is that nature has rights, how such rights can be secured, and how nature could be a person in court at all. The emergence of nature into the legal process suggests a profound reorientation in judicial thinking and a transition towards more ecocentric patterns.

Court shifts in who may sue, or standing, are one factor. Previously, only directly affected individuals or groups could turn to the court to receive assistance. Yet in cases involving nature rights, there is a shift towards judges recognizing that guardians or trustees may represent objects such as rivers, forests and glaciers in court. Courts in India, including the top judicial bodies, have several times declared a river and a glacier a person and their protector. This perspective presumes that glaciers and rivers should enjoy the same rights as any other natural
object in a court of law. This change is a good example of how the law is changing to benefit corporate interests at the expense of the people [17].

There are several fundamental concepts in the legal rationale of these decisions. The former is the transformation of safeguarding human rights regarding nature to safeguarding the rights of nature. Rather than solely inquiring whether people are harmed by pollution or ecological disruption, numerous courts consider whether the ecosystem has been harmed, whether its capability of regenerating has been harmed, and whether its integrity has been violated. Second, courts are utilizing concepts such as the concept of the public trust and the concept of parens patriae, often applied to relationships between people, to articulate why we should conserve nature further and further.

To illustrate, a court can declare that the State must protect nature since nature cannot protect it itself. Instead of viewing nature as a resource, this is a shift in viewing nature as something that must be preserved. The third is that the judges are examining things ecologically. This implies that they are not merely examining the current state of ecosystems, but also in future how they will perform, how they will reproduce, how they will relate to one another, and how healthy they will be in a general sense. People are starting to question what the natural object needs to remain alive. What sorts of government and institutional safeguards are required to keep it secure? What treatment will revive it?

Yet there remain frontiers to this evolving body of law. Certain court cases have been accused of being overly dependent upon myths or sacred beliefs. As an illustration, they exploited the sacredness of a river to become rights holders. It is a question whether to make nature a legal person a symbolic act more than a practical one because the means of repairing the problem and implementing the law remains feeble. The most common legal systems are governed by human rights, property rights, and development rights. This complicates the ways in which
courts can strike a balance between those rights and the rights of nature. They must develop reasons that are reasonable, feasible, and implementable by the organization [18].

Comparative research indicates that stronger environmental traditions and constitutional safeguards in governments are more apt to heed such arguments. Legal bodies that cite constitutional obligations to defend the environment or use broad interpretations of the right to life tend to employ methods that uphold the legal rights of nature. Courts acknowledge the significance of nature, but only with care and in a non-conferencing way not granting full legal personhood or a status that is considered a rights bearer, citing concerns about enforceability and jurisdiction [19].

Critical Analysis and Your Perspective

Such an awakening of what nature has a right to is definitely a good step towards environmental justice that may not go without its problems and contradictions. The general debate is whether human-oriented legal rights systems to benefit the human beings can be applied to benefit nonhuman beings. According to critics, human rights are in individual dignity, agency, and responsibilities: extending rights to rivers or forests begs the question of who has the right, how rights are exercised over them, and if there are social responsibilities associated with them. One pragmatic question is whether a court ruling acknowledging the status of nature as having rights is enforceable. Without proper institutions, clearanship, and political will, what is legitimized in the law may not translate into actual practice. A river can be proclaimed by the courts as a legal person but requires effective protection through guardians, monitoring systems, funding, and social buy-in. Without them, the rights are just ideas.

The second question is how the rights of nature affect social justice, property rights, and human progress. In many developing countries, especially, the pressure to exploit natural resources as a means of boosting the economy is very intense. As lawmakers and judges look to reconcile the need to preserve the environment with the rights of individuals, especially those who must
survive at the cost of natural resources. and when you get so serious about the rights of nature that you remember not to think of what the people themselves need, you may see the legal system driving away the very communities which must be taken into account in its application. This could cause issues.

I do not consider the rights-of-nature movement as a legal accommodation, but expand it as a cultural and legal revolution. Although the notion of giving living things to lifeless things and subjecting them to legal regulations such as a business or a human being will be unfamiliar and will carry a very pronounced allusion to the idea of symbolism, the enforcement of the concept will translate into a paradigm shift in terms of popular culture, government policy, and the organization of the institutional environment. To achieve a high impact, we should learn more, bring Indigenous and local people closer, and pay more attention to the ecocentric approach to our laws. This, in the Indian case, means that the legislators, jurists and regulators cannot simply declare the rights of nature, but enact systems of compliance oversight, which will enforce them and recruit the populace.

Lastly, I would suggest that the rights of nature paradigm presents an opportunity to reconsider human-nature interaction rather than another layer of legal definitions. We preserve the doorsillary state of mind when nature is perceived in the law as a resource to be mastered or repaid. But when rights-based frameworks lead people to think about nature as part of the legal community that possess

inherent value and has rights to what we do-they can assist a shift in the attitude at the root level. Evaluation will not occur when declarations are issued, but when a community begins to regard the river, forest or environment as a living member of its legal and moral kinship.

Conclusion

The idea of Earth jurisprudence has led to the development of the legal rights of nature, among the most thrilling environmental-law developments in recent years. Nature is becoming seen to receive more and more status as a subject of law, as distinctly opposed to being an object to be dealt with, and therefore supplanting the old legal order that was founded upon humanistic ideas and principles of property or possession. The cultural and institutional shift toward rivers, forests, ecosystems, species, and the web of life as objects with rights is an extension of a
doctrinal shift.

And this movement is going on in all parts of the world, and that movement is in the shape of new laws, amendments of the old laws, and decisions of the court which proclaim the inherent value of nature. At the same time, legal system entails changes to acknowledge nonhuman entities as custodians, broaden standing and provide a remedy that recovers natural integrity and not merely compensates human harm. The road in India is not any poorer. The constitutional needs, an elaborate environmental legislation framework, and an ingrained culture of challenging the projects of the law by litigation has enabled the courts to contemplate rights of nature in a new shape. But the Indian experience also educates concerning the distinction between recognition and realization, between those symbolic judgments and systems which may be imposed.

More to the point, the rights of nature movement is perspectives-driven and controversial. It challenges the laws in order to be more eco-centric and reflects on how people relate to the natural world. But it also asks tough questions about bringing it to life, about ways of working to reconcile human and ecological interests and ways of transforming institutions, still programmed to think otherwise. As my insistence through the paper shall be that it is my real test, not whether people test it, but whether legal systems actually offer protections, whether guardian systems are effective, whether communities are being empowered, whether
ecosystems are being warmed by protections of the law.

Another possible path forward would be to increase the legal enforceability of the rights of nature, as well as to institutionalize, regulate, and culturalize the rights so that they can be exercised.. In India, it translates to: rights of nature are to be stated in the law, there must be clear institutions to protect them, there must be strong implementation and follow-up, communities (especially Indigenous and local stakeholders) must be engaged, and the logic of rights of nature is not an up-to-date experiment, but a principle that is extended across the system.

Lastly, there are enormous prospects of Earth jurisprudence. It can result in the law that serves alongside the living earth where people belong to a larger whole of life and law helps to maintain the well-being not only of vegetation but also of people. In that way, it will guarantee that the rights of nature are not only a concept but a certain law, which can be observed. It is not believed that the living planet is a backdrop where human activities are played out; rather it is a partner, subject, and provider in this universe in which humans and environment co-exist and perform their respective parts and purpose well. Compliance with this goal would turn the law into a way of benefiting not only man alone, but also all living creatures on Earth. We will put this great fact into our legislation and the fact that our fate is united with Mother Earth.

References

1. Thomas Berry, The Great Work: Our Way into the Future 105–122 (Bell Tower 1999).
2. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1997) 2 SCC 267.
3. Animal Welfare Board of India v. A. Nagaraja, (2014) 7 SCC 547.
4. Cormac Cullinan, Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice 23–54 (2d ed., Chelsea Green Pub. 2011).
5. Vandana Shiva, Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability, and Peace 1–22 (South End Press 2005).
6. Peter Burdon, Earth Jurisprudence and the Critique of Modern Law, 26 Austl. Feminist L.J. 77, 82–89 (2012).
7. United Nations Environment Programme, Making Peace with Nature 7–14 (UNEP 2021).
8. Jacinta Ruru, Listening to Papatūānuku: A Legal Personality for the Whanganui River, 39 VUWLR 215, 219– 232 (2018).
9. Santa Monica Municipal Code § 4.75.010 (2013).
10. David R. Boyd, The Rights of Nature: A Legal Revolution That Could Save the World 95–142 (ECW Press 2017).
11. Nicholas Robinson, Ecopersonhood and the Constitution, 13 Pace Envtl. L. Rev. 1, 15–27 (2021).
12. Mihnea Tanasescu, Rights of Nature: A Re-Examination, 70 Rev. Int'l Stud. 459, 462–475 (2020).
13. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (1987) 1 SCC 395.
14. Centre for Environmental Law, WWF-India v. Union of India, (2013) 8 SCC 234.
15. S. Moorthy, Rights of Nature and Indian Constitutionalism: Reading the Madras High Court Decision in Senthilkumar, 15 NALSAR L. Rev. 112, 118–123 (2023).
16. Shibani Ghosh, The Fragile Foundations of India's Rights-of-Nature Jurisprudence, 35 J. Envtl. L. & Pol'y 67, 73–82 (2023).
17. Shibani Ghosh, Symbolism Without Structure: India's Rights of Nature Jurisprudence, 35 J. Envtl. L. & Pol'y 67, 75–84 (2023).
18. Karen Bakker, The Limits of Rights-of-Nature Jurisprudence: When Symbolism Meets Institutions, 48 Ecology L.Q. 621, 632–645 (2021).
19. Judith Koons, Judicial Pragmatism and Rights of Nature: Navigating Symbolism, Duty, and Practical Limits, 14 Earth Juris. Rev. 95, 99–110 (2023).