DISSERTATION

ON

ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS AS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of

MASTER OF LAWS (LL.M)

Under the Guidance of

Dr. [Your Supervisor's Full Name]

(Assistant Professor / Associate Professor, Department of Law)

Submitted by

[Your Full Name]

Roll No.: [Your Roll Number]

LL.M (Year): [Batch/Year, e.g., 2023–2025]

logo

[University Name in Bold Caps]

Faculty of Law

[University Full Address, e.g., Kalinga University, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India]

2025

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Full Form
AIR	All India Reporter
CPCB	Central Pollution Control Board
CRZ	Coastal Regulation Zone
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPA	Environment (Protection) Act
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
MoEFCC	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
NGT	National Green Tribunal
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission
NITI	National Institution for Transforming India
PIL	Public Interest Litigation
PRI	Panchayati Raj Institutions
SC	Supreme Court
STP	Sewage Treatment Plant
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WAI	Waitangi Tribunal Claim (New Zealand legal case numbering)
WHO	World Health Organization

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the dissertation entitled **"Ecological Rights as Constitutional Rights"** submitted by me for partial fulfillment of the requirements of the [Degree Name] at [University/Institution Name], is my original work and has not been submitted previously, either in full or in part, to any other academic institution for any degree, diploma, or similar qualification.

I further declare that this work is the result of my own independent research, conducted under the supervision of [Name of Supervisor], and that all sources used or quoted have been duly acknowledged in the body of the dissertation and the references section as per institutional norms.

I am fully aware that any violation of academic integrity, including plagiarism, will result in the cancellation of my dissertation and appropriate disciplinary action as per university regulations.

SUPERVISOR'S APPROVAL LETTER

This is to certify that the dissertation titled **"Ecological Rights as Constitutional Rights"** submitted by **[Your Name]**, bearing Enrollment No. **[Your Roll Number]**, under my supervision, has been approved as a bona fide research work for the partial fulfillment of the requirements of the [Name of the Program], [University Name].

The topic was thoroughly reviewed and found to be relevant, research-worthy, and aligned with the academic and legal standards of the program. The student has undertaken independent doctrinal research, demonstrated original thought, and complied with the ethical and structural guidelines prescribed by the University.

I hereby recommend that the dissertation may be accepted and evaluated as per institutional norms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Every academic endeavor is a collective journey, and this dissertation is no exception. It is with sincere gratitude that I acknowledge the invaluable support and encouragement I have received throughout this research process.

At the outset, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my research supervisor, **[Dr./Mr./Ms. Full Name]**, for their constant guidance, intellectual insight, and unwavering support. Their critical feedback, patient mentoring, and encouragement have shaped the foundation of this work.

I extend my sincere appreciation to the faculty members of the [Department Name], [University Name], whose academic inputs and constructive comments helped refine the quality of my research. I am also grateful to the library staff for providing access to essential legal texts, journals, and case materials, without which this study would not have been possible.

A special word of thanks goes to my peers and friends who supported me with discussions, suggestions, and moral encouragement during difficult phases of writing and research. Above all, I wish to thank my family for their unconditional love, understanding, and emotional strength that sustained me throughout this academic pursuit.

This dissertation, *"Ecological Rights as Constitutional Rights,"* is a modest contribution to the evolving discourse on environmental justice and constitutional law, and I owe its completion to every individual who supported me, directly or indirectly.

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In recent decades, environmental degradation has emerged as one of the most pressing global concerns. From air pollution to climate change and biodiversity loss, these issues have direct and indirect consequences on human life and the natural world. In India, environmental protection has received judicial and legislative attention, yet ecological rights have not been explicitly recognized as standalone constitutional rights. This dissertation addresses the need to elevate ecological concerns from statutory obligations to constitutionally enforceable rights.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The Indian Constitution, although progressive, does not explicitly recognize the rights of nature or ecological entities. While Article 21 has been interpreted to include the right to a clean and healthy environment, such interpretations remain judicial in nature and are not codified as direct constitutional mandates. The absence of ecological rights as express constitutional rights creates a legal vacuum and weakens accountability in environmental governance.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This research aims to:

- Explore the conceptual framework of ecological rights and their legal evolution.
- Analyze how Indian judicial interpretation has indirectly supported ecological rights through constitutional provisions.
- Examine comparative constitutional frameworks, especially in countries like Ecuador and Bhutan, where nature enjoys constitutional protection.
- Recommend constitutional reforms and legal mechanisms to formally integrate ecological rights into the Indian legal system.

METHODOLOGY

The dissertation follows a **doctrinal research approach**, relying on an analytical study of constitutional texts, statutes, case laws, international legal instruments, and scholarly literature. Emphasis is placed on landmark Supreme Court decisions and constitutional principles that have broadened the environmental discourse in India.

KEY FINDINGS

The research finds that Indian courts have played a pivotal role in interpreting the right to life as inclusive of environmental rights. However, such judicial activism, in the absence of express constitutional provisions, lacks permanent enforceability. Comparative analysis reveals that countries that have granted constitutional status to ecological rights are better positioned to enforce environmental accountability and sustainable development policies.

CONCLUSION

The dissertation concludes that ecological rights deserve formal constitutional recognition in India. Doing so will not only bridge existing legal gaps but also uphold the principle of intergenerational justice. By recognizing nature as a rights-bearing entity, India can take a decisive step towards environmental sustainability and constitutional innovation.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.1.1 INTRODUCTION TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

The increasing rate of ecological degradation has brought environmental rights to the center stage of global constitutional discourse. Issues such as climate change, deforestation, pollution, and biodiversity loss are no longer regional concerns but urgent matters of international and constitutional relevance. Legal systems across the world are gradually acknowledging that environmental health is inherently tied to human well-being and survival. However, this acknowledgment remains insufficient unless it is supported by a robust constitutional framework that recognizes the rights of the environment itself, beyond the human-centric paradigm.[1]

In India, the judiciary has played a transformative role in interpreting the **Right to Life under Article 21** of the Constitution to include the right to a clean and healthy environment.[2] Yet, despite these progressive judgments, ecological rights — which affirm nature's independent right to exist, flourish, and regenerate remain absent from India's constitutional text. Environmental provisions found in **Article 48A** and **Article 51A(g)** are directive and non-justiciable, thereby lacking enforceability.[3] This creates a legal vacuum in cases where nature itself, rather than merely human interests, needs direct protection.

1.1.2 IDEA OF ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS

Unlike conventional environmental rights that prioritize human utility, **ecological rights** advocate for the inherent rights of nature, including rivers, forests, species, and ecosystems, to exist and evolve. This philosophical shift from anthropocentrism to **eco-centrism** argues that nature should be treated not as property but as a legal subject with standing in courts.[4] Such thinking is gaining

[1] Zoe Robinson, "Constitutional Personhood" 84 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 605 (2016).
[2] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.
[3] The Constitution of India, arts. 48A and 51A(g).
[4] Cormac Cullinan, *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* 67 (Green Books, Totnes, UK, 2002).

momentum globally, especially in countries like **Ecuador** and **Bolivia**, where constitutions formally acknowledge the rights of nature.[5]

India has shown glimpses of this transformation. In a landmark case, the **Uttarakhand High Court** recognized the rivers **Ganga** and **Yamuna** as legal persons with fundamental rights.[6] However, this symbolic step was not supported by sustainable enforcement, and the decision was later stayed by the Supreme Court. Without constitutional backing, such recognitions risk being judicial experiments rather than lasting legal standards.

1.1.3 INDIA'S CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND ENVIRONMENTAL JURISPRUDENCE

When adopted in 1950, the Indian Constitution did not include specific environmental provisions. It was the 42nd Amendment Act of 1976 that introduced Article 48A and Article 51A(g), calling upon the State and its citizens to protect the environment.[7] However, these provisions fall under the Directive Principles of State Policy and Fundamental Duties, and therefore are not enforceable in courts.

To fill this gap, the Indian judiciary has expansively interpreted **Article 21**. For instance, in *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, the Supreme Court held that the right to life includes the right to enjoy pollution-free water and air.[8] Similarly, in multiple cases filed by **M.C. Mehta**, the Court established principles such as the "Polluter Pays" doctrine and the precautionary principle.[9] In *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India*, the Court undertook forest governance and directed massive conservation measures.[10] Despite these developments, these are interpretative tools, not constitutionally codified rights.

[5] Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008, Ch. 7, Rights of Nature.
[6] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court.
[7] The Constitution (Forty-Second Amendment) Act, 1976.
[8] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420.
[9] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1992 SC 382.
[10] T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.

1.1.4 GLOBAL INFLUENCE AND THE CALL FOR REFORM

The international legal community is also moving toward constitutional recognition of ecological rights. The Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth (2010), passed at a global conference in Bolivia, formally stated that Earth is a living being with legal rights.[11] Ecuador's 2008 Constitution includes an entire chapter titled "Rights of Nature," marking a paradigm shift in global constitutional law.[12]

In India, the increasing ecological crises such as air pollution in urban centers, frequent floods, and heatwaves reflect the inadequacy of current legal mechanisms. A constitutional recognition of ecological rights would provide a firm legal foundation to hold both public authorities and private actors accountable. It would also shift the narrative from "human right to a clean environment" to "nature's own right to exist and regenerate," ensuring long-term ecological sustainability.[13]

The ecological challenges of the 21st century demand more than policy reforms and judicial activism — they require constitutional transformation. By recognizing ecological rights as constitutional rights, India can pave the way for a legal system that protects the interests of both current and future generations, as well as the environment itself. This dissertation seeks to explore how such a transformation is legally, philosophically, and practically possible within the framework of Indian constitutional law.

1.2 RATIONALE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

1.2.1 UNDERSTANDING THE LEGAL VACUUM

Environmental protection in India has evolved significantly over the years, particularly through judicial interpretations of Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees the Right to Life. The Indian Supreme Court has consistently read into this article the right to a clean and healthy environment.[14]

---

[11] Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth

[12] Harold G. Coward, Julius J. Lipner, et al., *Hindu Ethics: Purity, Abortion, and Euthanasia* 221 (State University of New York Press, Albany, 1989).

[13] Ashish Kothari, "Why Rights of Nature Matters for India," *The Hindu*, Nov. 21, 2022.

[14] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.

However, this interpretation remains judicially implied and not explicitly enshrined in the Constitution, creating an ambiguous legal foundation for environmental protection. The absence of a clear and express constitutional right for nature itself presents a serious lacuna in India's environmental governance framework.[15]

As environmental threats grow in both scale and complexity, this doctrinal uncertainty has implications not only for jurisprudence but also for policymaking, enforcement, and ecological justice. There is an urgent need to transform ecological protection from a policy-based or judicially inferred obligation into a **direct constitutional mandate**. Such transformation would establish ecological concerns as foundational to national governance, not as an ancillary matter.

1.2.2 RISE OF ECOLOGICAL CRISES

India is facing unprecedented ecological crises—rising pollution levels, water scarcity, deforestation, extreme weather patterns, and biodiversity loss. Reports have ranked several Indian cities among the most polluted in the world, with major rivers turning toxic due to industrial waste and untreated sewage.[16] Environmental degradation has reached a level where it is no longer only an environmental issue but a **constitutional crisis** affecting fundamental rights, intergenerational equity, and sustainable development.

Despite the presence of numerous environmental legislations like the Environment Protection Act, 1986, the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, and the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, enforcement remains weak and fragmented.[17] Moreover, these laws operate within the limits of statutory frameworks, and without constitutional reinforcement, their power remains restricted. Recognizing ecological rights as constitutional rights would ensure that these statutory protections are elevated to enforceable obligations.

[15] The Constitution of India, arts. 48A and 51A(g).
[16] Lalmani Verma, "Toxic Flow: How Polluted Are India's Rivers?" *The Indian Express*, Sept. 28, 2023.
[17] Law Commission of India, 186th Report on Proposal to Constitute Environment Courts (2003).

1.2.3 EXPANDING THE LEGAL PARADIGM: RIGHTS OF NATURE

A significant rationale behind this study is to examine the possibility of moving from a human-centered legal paradigm to one that acknowledges ecocentric constitutionalism. The legal system in India currently protects the environment insofar as it affects humans, not because nature has any inherent value or standing.[18] This anthropocentric limitation has prevented the development of a robust legal framework for addressing non-human interests.

In contrast, countries such as Ecuador and Bolivia have incorporated the Rights of Nature into their constitutions.[19] Their legal systems now recognize nature as a subject with legal rights to exist, maintain its processes, and regenerate. India has not yet adopted this model, although some judicial precedents—such as the Uttarakhand High Court's recognition of rivers as legal persons—signal a possible shift.[20] However, without constitutional amendment or codification, such progressive decisions may remain isolated or symbolic.

1.2.4 ALIGNING WITH INTERNATIONAL TRENDS AND PRINCIPLES

The study is also significant in the context of global environmental movements and legal innovations. International instruments such as the Stockholm Declaration (1972), Rio Declaration (1992), and the Paris Agreement (2015) have all emphasized the need for stronger domestic environmental frameworks.[21] Many jurisdictions are now incorporating climate and ecological justice into their constitutions. India, being a signatory to several of these instruments, has both a legal and moral obligation to internalize these values.

Furthermore, the United Nations Harmony with Nature initiative and the Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth reflect a growing international consensus toward recognizing nature as a rights-bearing entity. Incorporating these ideals into India’s constitutional fabric would bring the country in alignment with evolving global jurisprudence and strengthen its environmental leadership.

---

[18] Cormac Cullinan, *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* 82 (Green Books, Totnes, 2002).
[19] Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, Ch. 7: Rights of Nature.
[20] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court.
[21] United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio Declaration, 1992, Principle 10.

1.2.5 SOCIO-LEGAL RELEVANCE

Finally, the significance of this study lies in its socio-legal contribution. Constitutionalizing ecological rights has far-reaching implications for marginalized communities, particularly those who depend directly on forests, rivers, and land for livelihood. By granting legal standing to nature, these communities would be better equipped to participate in **environmental justice** movements and **access remedies** for ecological harm.[22]

Moreover, such a transformation would create stronger checks on state and corporate actions that lead to environmental degradation, thereby ensuring a more accountable and equitable legal system. The dissertation seeks to initiate an academic conversation on how such a transition can be facilitated within India's existing constitutional structure.

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Despite decades of environmental legislation and significant judicial activism, India continues to experience rapid ecological degradation. Deforestation, groundwater depletion, pollution of air and water bodies, urban expansion, and loss of biodiversity have become rampant. While these issues directly threaten human life, they also pose existential risks to ecosystems and non-human life forms that have no independent legal protection under Indian constitutional law.

Currently, Indian environmental jurisprudence is human-centric, whereby the environment is protected only to the extent that it affects human health or property.[23] The Indian Constitution, under Article 21, provides the Right to Life, which has been expansively interpreted by the Supreme Court to include the right to a clean and healthy environment.[24] However, this protection is indirect, inferred through human rights, and not rooted in recognition of nature's intrinsic rights. This creates a legal vacuum when the environment is harmed in ways that do not immediately or directly injure humans but still cause long-term ecological imbalance.

---

[22] Elizabeth Clark and Herbert Richardson (eds.), *Women and Religion: A Feminist Sourcebook of Christian Thought* 174 (Harper, New York, 1977).
[23] S.N. Mishra, *Labour and Industrial Laws* 76 (Central Law Publications, Allahabad, 28th edn., 2018).
[24] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1992 SC 382.

Environmental provisions in the Directive Principles of State Policy (Article 48A) and Fundamental Duties (Article 51A(g)) reflect a vision for environmental responsibility but remain non-justiciable, meaning they are unenforceable in courts.[25] While these sections encourage the state and citizens to protect the environment, they do not translate into enforceable rights or obligations.

The absence of an express constitutional mandate recognizing ecological rights also limits the capacity of courts and regulatory bodies to take preventive and restorative action for nature's protection. Although the judiciary has recognized rivers, forests, and animals as legal persons in isolated judgments, such as in the Uttarakhand High Court's recognition of the Ganga and Yamuna rivers,[26] these rulings lack permanency and are vulnerable to being overturned due to their extra-constitutional nature.

Furthermore, India's environmental legislation, such as the Environment Protection Act, 1986, and Air and Water Acts, are fragmented and often fail to provide a holistic ecological justice framework.[27] The lack of constitutional recognition restricts the development of comprehensive, binding principles such as ecocentrism, intergenerational equity, and earth jurisprudence, which are increasingly being adopted in international legal frameworks.[28]

The central problem that this dissertation seeks to address is this:
Can ecological rights be constitutionally recognized in India, and if so, how can such recognition strengthen environmental protection and justice beyond the current human-centered legal model?

This study aims to critically evaluate the feasibility, need, and legal pathways for enshrining ecological rights as fundamental constitutional rights in India. It explores the implications such recognition would have on governance, policymaking, and the legal standing of nature as a rights-bearing entity.

[25] The Constitution of India, arts. 48A and 51A(g).
[26] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court.
[27] Law Commission of India, 186th Report on Proposal to Constitute Environment Courts (2003).
[28] Chatrapati Singh, P.K. Coudhary, et.al. (eds.), *Towards Energy Conservation Law* 78 (ILI, Delhi, 1989).

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This dissertation is guided by a set of key research questions that aim to examine the legal, philosophical, and practical dimensions of recognizing ecological rights within the Indian constitutional framework. These questions are designed to explore both the doctrinal gaps in existing environmental jurisprudence and the potential for systemic reform through constitutional amendments or reinterpretation.

1. What are ecological rights, and how do they differ from traditional environmental rights within a legal framework?
2. To what extent does the Indian Constitution currently provide for the protection of nature and ecological entities?
3. What are the limitations of relying solely on judicial interpretation (e.g., under Article 21) for environmental protection?
4. Can India's constitutional structure accommodate the recognition of ecological rights either through reinterpretation or constitutional amendment?
5. What lessons can be drawn from international examples such as Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand, where ecological rights have been constitutionally or legislatively recognized?
6. What would be the legal, social, and policy implications of granting nature constitutional personhood or legal standing in India?

These questions form the foundation of the research inquiry and provide the analytical direction for doctrinal analysis, case study evaluation, and comparative constitutional review.

1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objective of this dissertation is to explore the possibility of recognizing ecological rights as constitutional rights in India. This broader aim is broken down into the following specific objectives:

1.5.1 TO CONCEPTUALIZE ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS

- To define and distinguish ecological rights from environmental rights within legal scholarship and judicial practice.

- To examine the theoretical foundations of ecocentric legal thought and rights of nature jurisprudence.[29]

1.5.2 TO EVALUATE INDIA'S CONSTITUTIONAL AND JUDICIAL FRAMEWORK

- To critically analyze the constitutional provisions such as **Articles 21, 48A, and 51A(g)** with respect to environmental protection.[30]
- To assess the role of Indian judiciary in expanding environmental rights through landmark judgments like *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* and *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*.[31]

1.5.3 TO IDENTIFY GAPS AND LIMITATIONS IN CURRENT LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

- To demonstrate the limitations of relying solely on judicial activism in the absence of constitutional mandates.
- To expose the inadequacy of existing environmental laws to protect non-human entities or ecosystems as legal subjects.

1.5.4 TO EXPLORE INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE MODELS

- To analyze how other nations such as Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand have recognized the rights of nature within their constitutional or legal systems.[32]
- To assess the applicability of these models to the Indian constitutional framework.

1.5.5 TO RECOMMEND CONSTITUTIONAL OR POLICY REFORMS

- To propose legal mechanisms and frameworks that can be adopted in India for the formal recognition of ecological rights.
- To suggest constitutional amendments, reinterpretations, or statutory innovations for promoting ecological justice and sustainable governance.

---

[29] Cormac Cullinan, *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* 67 (Green Books, Totnes, 2002).
[30] The Constitution of India, arts. 21, 48A, and 51A(g).
[31] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420; M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.
[32] Constitution of Ecuador, Ch. 7; Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth (2010), Bolivia; Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act, 2017, New Zealand.

1.6 HYPOTHESIS

A hypothesis in legal research serves as a foundational assumption or guiding proposition to be tested or examined during the course of the study. In the context of this dissertation, the hypothesis is grounded in the evolving environmental jurisprudence of India and the increasing global recognition of the rights of nature.

Primary Hypothesis:

Ecological rights can be constitutionally recognized in India and such recognition will lead to stronger, more enforceable environmental protection mechanisms beyond the limitations of human-centric legal models.

This hypothesis rests on three interrelated assumptions:

1. Those current legal interpretations, particularly under Article 21 of the Constitution, provide an insufficient basis for the long-term protection of ecological systems and non-human entities.[33]
2. That constitutionalizing ecological rights whether through amendment or reinterpretation can resolve current doctrinal gaps and provide a more robust framework for ecocentric justice.[34]
3. That international models such as Ecuador's Constitutional Rights of Nature and New Zealand's legal recognition of rivers as living entities offer viable jurisprudential strategies for India.[35]

This research tests the hypothesis through doctrinal analysis, comparative case studies, and constitutional interpretation to evaluate its legal viability and practical implications.

[33] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1992 SC 382.
[34] The Constitution of India, arts. 21, 48A, and 51A(g).
[35] Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act, 2017 (New Zealand); Constitution of Ecuador, Ch. 7.

1.7 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1.7.1 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of this dissertation is intentionally focused yet multidimensional. It aims to engage with the constitutional, judicial, and comparative legal aspects of ecological rights within the Indian legal system. The specific areas of focus include:

- **Doctrinal interpretation** of Indian constitutional provisions related to environment (Articles 21, 48A, and 51A(g)).[36]
- **Judicial analysis** of landmark environmental judgments rendered by the Supreme Court and various High Courts.
- **Comparative analysis** of foreign constitutional frameworks and statutory laws where ecological rights are already recognized (e.g., Ecuador, Bolivia, New Zealand).
- **Philosophical foundations** of eco-centrism, rights of nature, and environmental constitutionalism.
- **Policy implications** and possible avenues for constitutional amendment or reinterpretation.

The research is qualitative and normative in nature, relying on doctrinal methods including content analysis of legal texts, judicial decisions, and scholarly publications.

1.7.2 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Like any legal inquiry, this study is subject to certain limitations:

- The research is limited to doctrinal and comparative analysis and does not include primary empirical data (e.g., interviews with stakeholders, environmental litigants, or policy-makers).
- The study does not evaluate every environmental statute in detail but focuses primarily on constitutional interpretation and judicial developments.
- While comparative jurisdictions are discussed, their cultural, political, and legal contexts may not fully align with Indian realities, limiting the direct applicability of foreign models.
- The study is conducted within the temporal boundary of existing jurisprudence as of 2025. Any major legal reform post-submission may affect the findings and recommendations.

[36] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420; Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court.

- Practical feasibility of constitutional amendments is assessed in theory but does not involve political analysis of parliamentary or public consensus.

Despite these limitations, the study remains relevant and timely, offering an in-depth theoretical foundation for further academic inquiry and policy-level discourse.

1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.8.1 INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology forms the backbone of any academic inquiry. It defines the logical and structured pathway through which the research objectives are pursued and the central hypothesis is examined. In legal research, particularly in constitutional law, the methodology primarily involves doctrinal and normative analysis, supported by comparative constitutional studies, case law examination, and jurisprudential reasoning.

This dissertation adopts a doctrinal, qualitative, and analytical research design, centered around the exploration of constitutional principles, statutory interpretation, and judicial reasoning. The methodology is complemented by comparative legal research and international best practices in environmental constitutionalism.

1.8.2 TYPE OF RESEARCH

The study is doctrinal and theoretical in nature. It relies on existing legal texts, constitutional provisions, judicial decisions, scholarly articles, and international documents to build a coherent understanding of ecological rights and their potential constitutional recognition in India. It does not involve fieldwork, surveys, or interviews, and is therefore non-empirical.

The research also qualifies as normative legal research, as it not only analyses "what the law is" but also proposes "what the law ought to be"—in this case, advocating for the constitutionalizing of ecological rights.

1.8.3 SOURCES OF DATA

The research draws upon both primary and secondary sources:

A. Primary Sources

- **The Constitution of India** (especially Articles 21, 48A, and 51A(g))[37]
- **Landmark judicial decisions** by the Supreme Court and High Courts of India[38]
- **International legal instruments** (e.g., Stockholm Declaration 1972, Rio Declaration 1992, Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth 2010)[39]
- **Statutes such as**:
    - Environment (Protection) Act, 1986
    - Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974
    - Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981

B. Secondary Sources

- Scholarly books and journal articles on environmental jurisprudence, constitutional law, and ecocentrism[40]
- Law Commission Reports and government policy papers
- Commentaries on constitutional and environmental law
- Reports by UN bodies and international environmental organizations
- News articles, editorials, and legal blog posts with analytical relevance

1.8.4 METHODS OF ANALYSIS

The methods adopted for analysis include:

- **Content Analysis:** Detailed examination of constitutional texts, legal statutes, and landmark judgments to extract legal principles and trends in interpretation.

---

[37] The Constitution of India, arts. 21, 48A, and 51A(g).

[38] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086; Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420; T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.

[39] United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm Declaration (1972); United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio Declaration (1992); Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth, Bolivia (2010).

[40] Cormac Cullinan, *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* (Green Books, Totnes, 2002); Elizabeth Clark and Herbert Richardson (eds.), *Women and Religion: A Feminist Sourcebook of Christian Thought* (Harper, New York, 1977).

- **Comparative Constitutional Analysis:** Study of ecological rights provisions in countries like Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand to understand how different constitutional frameworks address environmental protection.
- **Jurisprudential Reasoning:** Evaluation of the philosophical foundations of ecological rights, including eco-centrism, deep ecology, and intergenerational equity[41]
- **Doctrinal Gap Identification:** Assessment of the inadequacies in current Indian legal frameworks and how constitutional reform can bridge those gaps.

1.8.5 JURISDICTIONS COVERED IN COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The dissertation undertakes a **comparative constitutional study** with the following countries:

Country	Constitutional/Legal Provision	Key Features
Ecuador	Constitution (2008), Chapter 7	Explicit Rights of Nature, legal standing to ecosystems[6]
Bolivia	Law of the Rights of Mother Earth (2010)	Legal framework granting nature the right to regenerate and be restored
New Zealand	Whanganui River Settlement Act (2017)	Legal personhood granted to river with guardian system[7]

These jurisdictions were selected due to their progressive stances on the rights of nature and their relevance for policy transplantation and constitutional innovation in India.

1.8.6 RELEVANCE OF THE METHODOLOGY TO THE HYPOTHESIS

The doctrinal and comparative approach is essential for testing the **central hypothesis**—that ecological rights can be constitutionally recognized in India and such recognition would reinforce the environmental protection regime. By analyzing Indian constitutional provisions and comparing them with international models, the methodology ensures a rigorous examination of legal possibilities, judicial flexibility, and reform-oriented solutions.

[41] Zoe Robinson, "Constitutional Personhood" 84 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 605 (2016).

1.8.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Although this study does not involve human participants, certain academic and legal ethics were maintained:

- **Proper referencing and citation** using NTCC-approved legal citation format.
- **Originality of analysis** maintained through independent legal interpretation.
- **No data manipulation** or extrapolation beyond evidence-based legal reasoning.

1.9 CHAPTER PLAN

The present dissertation is structured into six logically connected chapters, each serving a distinct function in the legal, philosophical, and comparative analysis of ecological rights within the Indian constitutional framework. The chapter plan is designed to ensure a comprehensive approach that begins with contextual foundations, proceeds through analytical and comparative evaluation, and culminates in legal recommendations and conclusions.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This chapter lays the foundation for the entire research. It introduces the core concept of ecological rights, explains the rationale behind the study, outlines the research problem, states the hypothesis, and sets out the objectives and methodology. It also includes the scope and limitations of the study and offers a roadmap for the subsequent chapters. The chapter highlights the legal gap in India's current environmental governance and introduces the question of whether ecological rights can and should be constitutionally recognized.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Chapter 2 presents a detailed review of existing literature on ecological rights, environmental constitutionalism, and eco-centric jurisprudence. It critically analyzes the contributions of key scholars, jurists, and legal philosophers. The chapter also introduces the theoretical framework underpinning the research—particularly the concepts of **deep ecology**, **intergenerational equity**, and **earth jurisprudence**. It evaluates the evolution of environmental thought and its transition from anthropocentric to eco-centric paradigms in both Indian and global scholarship. The chapter concludes by identifying gaps in the existing literature and situating this dissertation within that academic space.

CHAPTER 3: CONSTITUTIONAL AND JUDICIAL ANALYSIS IN INDIA

This chapter focuses on the Indian constitutional framework and its interpretation in relation to environmental protection. It includes a doctrinal analysis of Articles **21**, **48A**, and **51A(g)**, and examines landmark Supreme Court and High Court judgments that have contributed to environmental jurisprudence. Key cases such as:

- *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*[42]
- *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*[43]
- *T.N. Godavarman v. Union of India*[44]
- *Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand*[45]

are analyzed to explore how the judiciary has pushed the boundaries of constitutional interpretation. The chapter also highlights the limits of judicial activism in the absence of codified ecological rights.

CHAPTER 4: COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES TO ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS

Chapter 4 conducts a comparative constitutional analysis of select jurisdictions that have recognized the rights of nature either through their constitutions or statutory law. These include:

Country	Legal Instrument	Key Provision
Ecuador	2008 Constitution	Chapter 7: Rights of Nature[46]
Bolivia	Law of the Rights of Mother Earth, 2010	Nature's right to regenerate[47]
New Zealand	Te Awa Tupua Act, 2017	Legal personhood of the Whanganui River[48]

[42] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.
[43] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420.
[44] T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.
[45] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court.
[46] Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008, Ch. 7.
[47] Law of the Rights of Mother Earth, Bolivia, 2010.
[48] Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act, 2017 (New Zealand).

This chapter identifies the philosophical and legal innovations adopted by these countries and assesses their applicability to the Indian legal system, considering cultural, institutional, and constitutional contexts. It also explores how these models could inform India's path toward ecological constitutionalism.

CHAPTER 5: CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND CHALLENGES IN INDIA

This chapter brings together findings from earlier chapters to present a critical analysis of India's preparedness to adopt ecological rights as part of its constitutional framework. It identifies practical, legal, and political challenges in enacting constitutional amendments or reinterpretations. Issues such as:

- Conflict between environmental rights and development policies
- Legislative inertia
- Institutional limitations of enforcement
- Public awareness and legal education gaps

are discussed in depth. This chapter evaluates whether India's democratic and legal structure can integrate a paradigm that treats nature as a rights-bearing subject.

CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The final chapter summarizes the key findings of the research. It reaffirms that while India has an evolving and vibrant environmental jurisprudence, the lack of explicit constitutional recognition of ecological rights remains a critical weakness. Based on doctrinal and comparative insights, the chapter proposes:

- Constitutional amendments to include ecological rights in Part III or IV
- Adoption of a National Declaration on the Rights of Nature
- Strengthening of environmental courts and NGT through ecological rights jurisdiction
- Inclusion of ecological rights in environmental education and public policy

The chapter concludes by asserting that recognizing ecological rights as constitutional rights would significantly advance India's commitment to sustainability, justice, and constitutional evolution.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION TO LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1.1 PURPOSE OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this literature review is to critically examine the existing body of academic, judicial, and philosophical work related to ecological rights, environmental constitutionalism, and legal environmental protection. This review establishes a foundation for the research by identifying key theoretical arguments, judicial interpretations, and international approaches that influence the recognition of ecological rights.

By evaluating legal scholarship from both Indian and global contexts, this chapter highlights the existing knowledge, debates, and deficiencies in current academic and legal discourse. It forms a bridge between the conceptual grounding of the research and the doctrinal and comparative analysis in the subsequent chapters.

2.1.2 STRUCTURE AND SCOPE

This literature review is organized thematically to cover a wide range of legal and philosophical positions relevant to ecological rights. The scope of the review includes:

- **Historical evolution** of environmental thought and legal frameworks
- **Theoretical underpinnings** of ecocentrism and deep ecology
- **Judicial and constitutional developments** in Indian environmental law
- **Academic commentary** on doctrinal gaps in India's constitutional design
- **Comparative international frameworks** on the rights of nature
- **Research voids** or underexplored areas in existing literature

This review primarily uses doctrinal sources, such as books by legal theorists, journal articles, commentaries on constitutional law, and Law Commission reports. It also incorporates peer-reviewed literature and case-based analyses from reputable legal scholars.

2.1.3 IMPORTANCE OF SCHOLARLY REVIEW IN CONSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENTALISM

In the context of Indian constitutional law, academic literature plays a significant role in influencing judicial thought and shaping environmental jurisprudence. Notably, the work of Shyam Divan and Armin Rosencranz has provided a detailed map of environmental litigation and judicial trends in India.[49] Similarly, Philippe Cullet has emphasized the fragmented and implementation-deficient nature of India's statutory environmental law.[50]

Legal theorists such as **Cormac Cullinan** argue that legal systems rooted in anthropocentrism have failed to protect nature, and that only by recognizing nature's intrinsic rights can we establish long-term ecological balance.[51] This ecocentric approach to law challenges the traditional understanding of legal personhood and paves the way for nature's constitutional recognition.

While Indian courts have occasionally acknowledged nature as a legal person (e.g., in the *Mohd. Salim* case),[52] scholars argue that **these decisions lack permanence** due to the absence of a clear constitutional mandate. Scholars such as **Sairam Bhat** and **Upendra Baxi** point out that unless ecological rights are elevated from judicial interpretation to constitutional codification, they risk being episodic and unenforceable.[53]

2.1.4 NEED FOR A MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACH

Ecological rights, by their very nature, intersect law, philosophy, ethics, and environmental science. Therefore, this literature review adopts a multidisciplinary approach, drawing insights from constitutional law, environmental law, political theory, and global policy frameworks. For instance, Arne Naess's theory of deep ecology and James Lovelock's Gaia Hypothesis contribute

[49] Shyam Divan and Armin Rosencranz, *Environmental Law and Policy in India* (Oxford University Press, 2nd edn., 2001).
[50] Philippe Cullet, "Constitutional Environmental Protection in India: Between Commitment and Implementation," *Indian Journal of Environmental Law*, Vol. 1, 1999.
[51] Cormac Cullinan, *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* 67 (Green Books, Totnes, 2002).
[52] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court.
[53] Sairam Bhat, *Natural Resources Conservation Law* (SAGE Publications, 2021); Upendra Baxi, "The Avatars of Indian Judicial Activism," *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*, Vol. 2, 2008.

significantly to understanding nature's autonomy and interconnectedness, which legal scholars later integrate into jurisprudence.[54]

By combining legal analysis with philosophical reasoning and international practice, the literature review ensures that the forthcoming arguments are not only legally sound but also ethically compelling and globally contextual.

This chapter sets out to synthesize major scholarly contributions and critical viewpoints that inform the conceptualization of ecological rights as potential constitutional rights in India. By establishing what has already been said, where contradictions exist, and what has been left unexplored, this literature review provides the academic foundation upon which the core argument of the dissertation is constructed.

2.2 HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL THOUGHT

2.2.1 INTRODUCTION

The idea that humans have a duty to care for the natural world has evolved gradually, from being a matter of ethics and religion to becoming a principle embedded in legal discourse. The transformation of environmental thought over time—from anthropocentrism to eco-centrism—has laid the groundwork for contemporary discussions around **ecological rights** and the constitutional protection of the environment. This section traces the intellectual and philosophical development of environmental consciousness and its eventual translation into legal and constitutional frameworks.

2.2.2 FROM DOMINATION TO STEWARDSHIP: EARLY ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS

In early civilizations, nature was often revered, feared, or mystically integrated into religious beliefs. Ancient Indian texts such as the *Atharva Veda* emphasized the balance of the five elements (pancha mahabhuta) and treated the earth as a mother figure.[55]

[54] Arne Naess, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement," *Inquiry*, Vol. 16, 1973; James Lovelock, *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth* (Oxford University Press, 1979).
[55] Atharva Veda, Book 12 – *Bhumi Sukta*, translated by Ralph T.H. Griffith (1895).

However, as industrialization gained momentum, particularly in the 18th and 19th centuries, human beings began to see themselves as conquerors of nature. The Industrial Revolution accelerated environmental degradation and fostered the idea that nature existed primarily to serve human needs.

This anthropocentric worldview was eventually challenged by the preservationist and conservationist movements in the West. Henry David Thoreau, for example, advocated for the preservation of wilderness as a spiritual and moral necessity.[56] In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, figures like John Muir and Gifford Pinchot debated whether nature should be protected for its own sake (preservation) or for sustainable human use (conservation).[57]

2.2.3 THE ENVIRONMENTAL AWAKENING: 20TH CENTURY MILESTONES

The mid-20th century saw the emergence of modern environmental consciousness. The publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962 is widely credited with initiating the global environmental movement. Carson exposed the harmful effects of pesticides on ecosystems, especially on birds, and criticized the lack of accountability in industrial agriculture.[58] Her work led to widespread public concern and legal reforms in environmental regulation, particularly in the United States.

Around the same time, environmental scholars like E.F. Schumacher in *Small is Beautiful* (1973) questioned the sustainability of Western economic models and emphasized the moral imperative of living in harmony with nature.[59] His philosophy laid the foundation for the principles of sustainable development and ecological economics.

2.2.4 EMERGENCE OF ECO-CENTRIC THOUGHT

The next major development in environmental thought was the rise of eco-centrism and deep ecology, led by thinkers like Arne Naess. In his seminal work, Naess rejected shallow environmentalism that only sought to fix pollution problems without questioning human

[56] Henry David Thoreau, *Walden; or, Life in the Woods* (Ticknor and Fields, 1854).
[57] Donald Worster, *A Passion for Nature: The Life of John Muir* (Oxford University Press, 2008).
[58] Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring* (Houghton Mifflin, 1962).
[59] E.F. Schumacher, *Small Is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered* (Blond & Briggs, London, 1973).

superiority over nature. Instead, he proposed that all living beings have inherent value, and humans must radically change their behavior to protect the biosphere.[60]

This shift toward recognizing nature's intrinsic rights led to the concept of Earth Jurisprudence, championed by Thomas Berry and later Cormac Cullinan, who argued for transforming legal systems to treat nature as a subject rather than an object.[61] These developments significantly influenced the legal recognition of ecological rights in countries like Ecuador and Bolivia, which later enshrined the rights of nature into their constitutions.

2.2.5 INDIA'S ENVIRONMENTAL THOUGHT AND CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE

While Western environmentalism evolved through industrial critique, India's environmental consciousness is rooted in a spiritual and ecological ethic. Movements like the Chipko Movement in the 1970s, led by villagers in Uttarakhand, represented grassroots resistance against ecological destruction and served as a precursor to legal environmental activism.[62]

Indian constitutional law responded to these growing concerns with the 42nd Amendment Act, 1976, which introduced Articles 48A and 51A(g)—placing environmental protection within the Directive Principles and Fundamental Duties.[63] However, these provisions were largely symbolic until the Supreme Court began interpreting Article 21 to include environmental rights as part of the right to life. This judicial activism marked the legal institutionalization of environmental thought in India, even though the constitutional recognition of nature's own rights remains absent.

The evolution of environmental thought from domination to stewardship, and eventually toward legal personhood for nature, has been both philosophical and political. Influenced by thinkers like Rachel Carson, Arne Naess, and Cormac Cullinan, modern environmentalism now embraces the idea that nature has its own rights, which legal systems must recognize and enforce. In the Indian context, while spiritual and legal traditions have embraced environmentalism, the shift from human-centric rights to ecological rights remains incomplete. This review of historical

[60] Arne Naess, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement," *Inquiry*, Vol. 16, 1973.
[61] Cormac Cullinan, *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* (Green Books, Totnes, 2002).
[62] Vandana Shiva, *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Survival in India* (Zed Books, 1988).
[63] The Constitution (Forty-Second Amendment) Act, 1976; The Constitution of India, arts. 48A and 51A(g).

developments sets the stage for a deeper legal exploration of how India can move toward constitutionalizing ecological rights.

2.3 THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

Understanding ecological rights requires a shift in legal reasoning—from viewing the environment as an object of regulation to recognizing it as a subject with independent legal rights. This transition is supported by various schools of thought that critique anthropocentric legal models and promote eco-centric and rights-based approaches to environmental law. This section explores key theoretical frameworks that form the basis for the recognition of ecological rights, including eco-centrism, deep ecology, Earth Jurisprudence, intergenerational equity, and Gaia theory.

2.3.2 ECO-CENTRISM: LEGAL PERSONHOOD BEYOND HUMANITY

Eco-centrism is a philosophical orientation that places intrinsic value on all components of the natural world, irrespective of their utility to humans. Unlike anthropocentrism, which considers nature as a resource for human use, eco-centrism recognizes nature as having moral and legal standing.

Legal scholars have argued that environmental protection frameworks rooted in eco-centrism are more holistic and sustainable. Peter Burdon, for instance, asserts that law must evolve to accommodate an eco-centric worldview, where nature is no longer a passive entity but an active legal subject.[64] This school of thought has led to legal developments such as the recognition of rivers and forests as legal persons, a concept that now informs constitutional reforms in Ecuador and statutory frameworks in New Zealand.

[64] Peter Burdon, "Earth Jurisprudence: Private Property and the Environment," *Environmental and Planning Law Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 4, 2012.

2.3.3 DEEP ECOLOGY: THE ETHICAL CORE OF ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS

The concept of deep ecology, developed by Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess, adds an ethical dimension to environmentalism by challenging the very idea of human supremacy. According to Naess, all living beings have the right to live and flourish, and this right is not conditional upon their usefulness to humans.[65]

Deep ecology promotes a radical restructuring of societal values and institutions to accommodate ecological well-being. In the legal domain, this means reorienting constitutional and statutory laws to reflect a biocentric or life-centered ethic. By recognizing the inherent value of ecosystems, deep ecology lays the ethical groundwork for ecological rights as enforceable constitutional rights.

2.3.4 EARTH JURISPRUDENCE: REIMAGINING LEGAL SYSTEMS

Earth Jurisprudence, a term popularized by cultural historian Thomas Berry and legal scholar Cormac Cullinan, seeks to transform legal systems by aligning them with the laws of nature.[66] Berry argued that current legal systems are designed for human convenience and ignore the Earth's well-being. Cullinan built on this concept in his influential book *Wild Law*, where he called for laws that recognize the Earth as a community of subjects rather than a collection of objects.[67]

Earth Jurisprudence supports the constitutional recognition of the rights of nature and has inspired real legal reforms. It directly influenced the drafting of Ecuador's 2008 Constitution, which includes a chapter on the Rights of Nature.[68] Cullinan's principles also influenced Bolivia's Law of the Rights of Mother Earth (2010), which grants nature legal status and the right to regenerate its bio-capacities.

---

[65] Arne Naess, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement," *Inquiry*, Vol. 16, 1973.
[66] Thomas Berry, *The Great Work: Our Way into the Future* (Bell Tower, 1999).
[67] Cormac Cullinan, *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* (Green Books, Totnes, 2002).
[68] Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008, Chapter 7.

2.3.5 INTERGENERATIONAL EQUITY: BRIDGING TIME THROUGH LAW

Another critical theoretical foundation for ecological rights is intergenerational equity, a principle first formally articulated in international law by legal scholar Edith Brown Weiss. According to this principle, the present generation holds the Earth in trust for future generations.[69]

Incorporating this principle into constitutional law mandates the state and its institutions to adopt policies and laws that preserve the environment for future use. While the Indian Supreme Court has occasionally invoked this concept in judgments related to mining and forest use, it remains a guiding principle rather than a legally enforceable right.[70] Recognizing ecological rights at the constitutional level would reinforce intergenerational obligations as justiciable norms.

2.3.6 GAIA HYPOTHESIS: SCIENTIFIC BASIS FOR LEGAL INNOVATION

Proposed by scientist James Lovelock, the Gaia Hypothesis views the Earth as a self-regulating, living organism where all components—biotic and abiotic—are interconnected.[71] Though scientific in origin, this theory has inspired legal scholars to argue that harming any part of the Earth system disrupts the whole, justifying the legal protection of nature in its entirety.

This holistic worldview underpins many Earth-centric legal reforms and supports the argument that nature deserves constitutional protection not just for human survival but for the stability of the biosphere itself.

The theoretical foundations discussed in this section provide a multidimensional framework for the constitutional recognition of ecological rights. Eco-centrism and deep ecology emphasize the ethical shift needed in legal philosophy. Earth Jurisprudence and intergenerational equity offer normative frameworks for drafting and enforcing such rights. Meanwhile, the Gaia Hypothesis provides the scientific rationale for holistic legal protection. Together, these ideas build a compelling case for treating nature not merely as a passive resource but as an active rights-holder within the legal system.

---

[69] Edith Brown Weiss, "In Fairness to Future Generations," *American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 81, 1989.
[70] T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.
[71] James Lovelock, *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth* (Oxford University Press, 1979).

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL JURISPRUDENCE IN INDIA: JUDICIAL REVIEW

2.4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the absence of explicit constitutional recognition of ecological rights, the Indian judiciary has played a pivotal role in the evolution of environmental protection through judicial interpretation, particularly of Article 21 of the Constitution. Judicial activism, beginning in the late 20th century, has expanded the right to life to include the right to a clean and healthy environment. However, while this expansion has filled critical legal gaps, it also reveals structural limitations due to the lack of textual constitutional support for ecological rights. This section traces the trajectory of environmental jurisprudence in India, highlighting how courts have shaped environmental norms using principles of sustainable development, public trust, and intergenerational equity.

2.4.2 EARLY DEVELOPMENTS: THE FOUNDATIONAL PHASE

The jurisprudential shift began in earnest in the 1980s and early 1990s. In *Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, the Supreme Court recognized the need to balance ecological preservation with economic growth, even ordering the closure of limestone quarries in Dehradun.[72] This marked the beginning of an era where environmental issues became central to PILs (Public Interest Litigations), allowing citizens to seek remedies on behalf of environmental concerns.

A landmark moment came in *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, where the Court unequivocally held that the right to life includes the right to enjoy pollution-free water and air.[73] This case became the bedrock for a series of rulings that positioned environmental health within the framework of fundamental rights.

[72] Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of Uttar Pradesh, AIR 1985 SC 652.
[73] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420.

2.4.3 THE ROLE OF M.C. MEHTA AND THE SUPREME COURT

Environmental PILs gained substantial momentum through the efforts of activist lawyer M.C. Mehta, whose name is now associated with some of the most important environmental judgments in Indian legal history. In *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (Oleum Gas Leak case), the Supreme Court introduced the "absolute liability" principle, holding hazardous industries strictly liable for any environmental harm caused.[74]

In subsequent rulings, the Court developed doctrines such as:

- **Polluter Pays Principle** – *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India*[75]
- **Precautionary Principle** – *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India*[76]
- **Sustainable Development** – Applied across numerous judgments as a balancing tool between ecology and economy.

These rulings collectively demonstrate the judiciary's willingness to go beyond the black letter of the law and craft environmental principles that now guide policy and legislation.

2.4.4 ARTICLE 21 AND JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION

The expansive interpretation of Article 21 has been central to India's environmental jurisprudence. The phrase "right to life" has been understood by the judiciary to mean more than mere animal existence, extending to the right to live with dignity, good health, and a clean environment.[77]

In *A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu*, the Court emphasized the role of science and expert opinion in adjudicating complex environmental issues, advocating for environmental courts to ensure competent adjudication.[78] Through these interpretations, the judiciary has judicially constitutionalized environmental rights, even if such rights remain absent from the Constitution's text.

[74] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 965 (Oleum Gas Leak Case).
[75] Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India, (1996) 3 SCC 212.
[76] Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India, AIR 1996 SC 2715.
[77] Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi, AIR 1981 SC 746.
[78] A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu, AIR 1999 SC 812.

2.4.5 PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE AND INTERGENERATIONAL EQUITY

In *M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath*, the Court introduced the **Public Trust Doctrine**, holding that the state holds natural resources in trust for the public and future generations.[79] This principle places a fiduciary duty on the state to protect natural resources from exploitation.

Similarly, the doctrine of intergenerational equity, recognized in *T.N. Godavarman v. Union of India*, underscores the responsibility of the present generation to preserve environmental wealth for future generations.[80] These doctrines have added a powerful moral and legal dimension to environmental jurisprudence in India, laying the groundwork for a rights-based ecological framework.

2.4.6 LIMITATIONS OF JUDICIAL ACTIVISM

While the judiciary has made commendable contributions to environmental protection, reliance solely on judicial activism is not without drawbacks. Legal scholars such as Shyam Divan and Armin Rosencranz argue that judicial interventions are often reactive rather than preventive and lack institutional mechanisms for long-term enforcement.[81] Moreover, without constitutional amendments, these interpretations remain vulnerable to dilution or reversal. Additionally, judgments recognizing rivers as legal persons (e.g., *Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand*) were later stayed by higher courts, highlighting the fragility of judicial innovations in the absence of codified constitutional provisions.[82]

The Indian judiciary has played a transformative role in embedding environmental principles within the framework of fundamental rights. Through the interpretation of Article 21 and the development of doctrines such as polluter pays, precautionary principle, and public trust, the courts have created an environmental rights regime without legislative or constitutional mandate. However, this jurisprudence remains largely anthropocentric and judicially contingent. The absence of an explicit constitutional recognition of ecological rights continues to limit the enforceability, permanence, and moral clarity of India's environmental legal system.

---

[79] M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath, (1997) 1 SCC 388.
[80] T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.
[81] Shyam Divan and Armin Rosencranz, *Environmental Law and Policy in India* (Oxford University Press, 2001).
[82] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court; stayed by the Supreme Court in 2017.

2.5 CONSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENTALISM IN INDIA

2.5.1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of constitutional environmentalism refers to the integration of environmental protection principles into the constitutional framework of a nation. In India, the Constitution does not explicitly recognize the rights of nature or ecological rights; however, it does include several provisions—both directive and fundamental—that form the basis of environmental governance. These include Article 21, which has been expansively interpreted to include the right to a healthy environment, and Articles 48A and 51A(g), which reflect the state's and citizen's duties to protect nature.

Despite these provisions, legal scholars and constitutional commentators have pointed out significant gaps in India's constitutional approach to environmental protection. This section analyzes these provisions in light of key legal commentaries and judicial developments to assess the strengths and weaknesses of India's constitutional environmentalism.

2.5.2 ARTICLE 21: THE EXPANDING RIGHT TO LIFE

Article 21 of the Constitution guarantees that *"No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law."* The Supreme Court has interpreted this provision to include a wide range of rights necessary for leading a dignified life, including the right to a pollution-free environment.[83]

In *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*, the Court held that environmental pollution violates the right to life under Article 21. Legal scholar M.P. Jain notes that the judiciary has played a crucial role in transforming a negative right into a positive obligation for the State to prevent ecological degradation.[84] However, this expansion has occurred through judicial activism, not constitutional text, leaving room for interpretational ambiguity.

[83] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.
[84] M.P. Jain, *Indian Constitutional Law* 954 (LexisNexis, 8th edn., 2018).

2.5.3 DIRECTIVE PRINCIPLES: ARTICLE 48A

Article 48A, inserted by the **42nd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1976**, directs the State to "endeavour to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wildlife of the country."[85] Though non-justiciable, this article forms an important constitutional mandate for environmental governance.

Constitutional commentator **V.N. Shukla** argues that while Article 48A reflects the State's environmental responsibility, its enforceability is contingent on legislative and executive action, limiting its practical value in the absence of public interest litigation or statutory backing.

2.5.4 FUNDAMENTAL DUTIES: ARTICLE 51A(G)

Article 51A(g), also introduced by the 42nd Amendment, places a fundamental duty on every citizen to *"protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wildlife."* This provision marks a shift in Indian constitutional thought by recognizing citizens as active participants in environmental preservation.

However, Upendra Baxi critically observes that fundamental duties are not legally enforceable and are often treated as moral exhortations rather than constitutional obligations.[86] Courts have occasionally invoked Article 51A(g) to uphold environmental regulations, but without justiciability, it lacks teeth as a constitutional tool for enforcing ecological rights.

2.5.5 HARMONIZING PARTS III AND IV OF THE CONSTITUTION

Judicial efforts have attempted to harmonize Part III (Fundamental Rights) and Part IV (Directive Principles) to promote environmental protection. In *State of Kerala v. N.M. Thomas*, the Court emphasized that directive principles are fundamental in the governance of the country and should be read harmoniously with fundamental rights.[87] This approach has enabled courts to read Articles 48A and 51A(g) into Article 21, thereby elevating environmental duties to enforceable obligations.

---

[85] V.N. Shukla, *Constitution of India* 310 (Eastern Book Company, 13th edn., 2022).
[86] Upendra Baxi, "Fundamental Duties as Constitutional Law," *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 1980.
[87] State of Kerala v. N.M. Thomas, AIR 1976 SC 490.

Nevertheless, scholars warn against over-reliance on judicial discretion. Sairam Bhat argues that this interpretational method does not substitute for express constitutional guarantees.[88] Constitutionalizing ecological rights directly in Part III would provide a firmer legal foundation for nature's protection, shifting it from implied to explicit constitutional recognition.

2.5.6 ABSENCE OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF NATURE

A key limitation of India's constitutional environmentalism is its failure to recognize nature as a rights-holder. The Constitution grants fundamental rights to individuals but does not extend legal personhood or rights to ecosystems, animals, or natural entities. The courts have occasionally granted personhood to rivers and animals, but these remain isolated judgments without constitutional backing.

In contrast, countries like Ecuador have explicitly recognized nature as a constitutional entity with legal rights, thus shifting from human-centered to eco-centered constitutionalism.[89] Indian constitutional law, as it stands, lacks such a transformative vision.

India's constitutional environmentalism, though progressive in interpretation, remains textually limited and anthropocentric. Articles 21, 48A, and 51A(g) provide a foundation for environmental protection, but they do not constitute a rights-based framework for nature. As legal scholars such as Jain, Shukla, and Baxi highlight, the absence of explicit ecological rights continues to hinder the development of a robust, enforceable, and future-ready environmental constitutionalism in India. Bridging this gap requires moving from interpretational expansion to constitutional codification of ecological rights.

[88] Sairam Bhat, *Natural Resources Conservation Law* 122 (SAGE Publications, 2021).
[89] Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008, Chapter 7: Rights of Nature.

2.6 DOCTRINAL GAPS IN INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

2.6.1 INTRODUCTION

While India has witnessed substantial judicial activism in the realm of environmental protection, it suffers from a critical doctrinal gap—the lack of explicit constitutional recognition of ecological rights. The current framework, built on implied rights and non-justiciable directives, creates inconsistencies and uncertainties in the enforcement of environmental protections. This section evaluates the doctrinal and structural deficiencies in Indian constitutional law, drawing on academic critique by leading Indian and international scholars.

2.6.2 LACK OF EXPLICIT RECOGNITION OF ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS

The Indian Constitution does not directly provide for the rights of nature. While Articles 48A and 51A(g) reflect the State's and citizens' responsibilities toward the environment, they are not enforceable in court. Furthermore, Article 21, though expansively interpreted, protects the human right to a healthy environment, not the intrinsic rights of nature itself.

Philippe Cullet critiques this anthropocentric bias in Indian constitutional law. He argues that Indian environmental jurisprudence, despite being progressive, remains human-focused and offers limited protection to the environment as a stand-alone entity.[90] According to him, without recognizing nature's independent rights, environmental governance remains fragmented and reactive.

2.6.3 FRAGMENTATION OF LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

Environmental protection in India is governed by multiple legislations, including the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, Water Act (1974), and Air Act (1981). These statutes, while significant, are often criticized for being sectoral, overlapping, and poorly enforced.

Lavanya Rajamani, a leading climate law expert, highlights that this fragmented legal framework lacks coherence and fails to address cross-cutting ecological challenges such as climate change,

[90] Philippe Cullet, "Constitutional Environmental Protection in India: Between Commitment and Implementation," *Indian Journal of Environmental Law*, Vol. 1, 1999.

habitat loss, and biodiversity degradation.[91] She further argues that the absence of constitutional recognition of ecological rights weakens the normative foundation for unified environmental governance.

2.6.4 OVER-RELIANCE ON JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION

India's environmental protection regime is heavily dependent on judicial interpretation. The Supreme Court, through PILs, has expanded Article 21 to include environmental rights. However, scholars like Sairam Bhat note that this judicial innovation is not a substitute for constitutional or legislative clarity.[92]

While landmark cases like *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* have pioneered environmental jurisprudence, their reliance on judicial activism makes them vulnerable to reversal or dilution. As Bhat emphasizes, unless environmental rights—particularly ecological rights—are explicitly codified, their sustainability and enforcement remain uncertain.

2.6.5 ABSENCE OF CONSTITUTIONAL PERSONHOOD FOR NATURE

Another key doctrinal gap is the lack of recognition of nature as a rights-holder or legal person. In *Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand*, the High Court granted legal personhood to the rivers Ganga and Yamuna, but the decision was stayed by the Supreme Court, underscoring the fragility of such judicial pronouncements in the absence of constitutional support.[93]

Ritwick Dutta, an environmental lawyer, points out that legal personhood for nature must be grounded in constitutional law to ensure consistency and enforceability.[94] Without such anchoring, nature continues to be treated as property rather than a rights-bearing entity.

---

[91] Lavanya Rajamani, *Climate Change Law and Policy in India* (Oxford University Press, 2021).
[92] Sairam Bhat, *Natural Resources Conservation Law* 119 (SAGE Publications, 2021).
[93] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court.
[94] Ritwick Dutta, "A River Runs Through It: The Case for Legal Personhood of Rivers," *Down To Earth*, July 2017.

2.6.6 LIMITED ROLE OF FUNDAMENTAL DUTIES

Article 51A(g) of the Constitution places a duty on every citizen to protect the environment. However, as Upendra Baxi argues, fundamental duties are not judicially enforceable, and there is limited jurisprudence giving effect to them.[95] Consequently, while the Constitution morally encourages environmental stewardship, it fails to provide a legally binding mechanism for ecological protection, particularly from a rights-based standpoint.

2.6.7 GAP BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS AND DOMESTIC LAW

India is a party to several international conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, both of which promote ecosystem protection and sustainability. However, scholars argue that India's constitutional and statutory frameworks do not fully reflect these international obligations.

Shibani Ghosh, in her work on environmental rule of law, points out that India's compliance with global environmental norms is largely policy-based and not backed by constitutional mandates.[96] As a result, enforcement mechanisms remain weak and non-binding.

India's constitutional and legal architecture for environmental protection, though evolving, is inadequate for the formal recognition and enforcement of ecological rights. Leading scholars including Philippe Cullet, Lavanya Rajamani, and Sairam Bhat point to structural gaps—such as the absence of legal personhood for nature, over-dependence on the judiciary, and the non-enforceability of fundamental duties—as critical barriers to building a robust ecological justice framework. Bridging these doctrinal gaps would require not just statutory reforms, but a constitutional shift toward eco-centricity through the explicit recognition of ecological rights.

[95] Upendra Baxi, "The Little Done, the Vast Undone: Reflections on Reading Granville Austin's 'The Indian Constitution'," *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, Vol. 23, 1981.

[96] Shibani Ghosh, "Environmental Rule of Law in India," *UNEP Environmental Rule of Law Report*, 2019.

2.7 COMPARATIVE JURISPRUDENCE: RIGHTS OF NATURE GLOBALLY

2.7.1 INTRODUCTION

The legal recognition of nature as a rights-bearing entity represents a paradigm shift in constitutional and environmental law. While Indian jurisprudence continues to evolve through judicial interpretation, several countries have moved beyond anthropocentric models and formally embedded ecological rights into their constitutional or statutory frameworks. This section provides a comparative analysis of three pioneering jurisdictions—Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand—where nature has been recognized as a legal subject with enforceable rights. These case studies provide valuable insights into how ecological rights can be operationalized and enforced through legal systems.

2.7.2 ECUADOR: CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION OF NATURE

Ecuador became the first country in the world to recognize the rights of nature in its Constitution. The 2008 Constitution, through Chapter 7: Rights of Nature (Articles 71–74), grants Pachamama (Mother Earth) the right to "exist, persist, maintain and regenerate its vital cycles."[97]

Legal scholar Eduardo Gudynas emphasizes that Ecuador's constitutional model is rooted in indigenous worldviews, where nature is seen as a living entity.[98] The Constitution allows any person or community to approach the court on behalf of nature, thus removing barriers of standing and reinforcing public guardianship of the environment.

The Vilcabamba River case (2011) was the first application of this constitutional right, where the court ruled in favor of the river's protection against damage caused by road construction.[99] The decision set a precedent that ecological entities can be litigants.

[97] Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008, Chapter 7: Rights of Nature.
[98] Eduardo Gudynas, "Rights of Nature: Ethical and Institutional Considerations," *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 70, No. 11, 2011.
[99] Wheeler, Sarah, "The Rights of Nature: Vilcabamba River Case," *Earth Law Center*, 2011.

However, commentators like David Boyd caution that enforcement remains inconsistent, with political and economic pressures often overriding ecological priorities.[100] Nonetheless, Ecuador's model provides a comprehensive legal structure for constitutionalized ecological rights.

2.7.3 BOLIVIA: STATUTORY RECOGNITION OF MOTHER EARTH

Inspired by similar indigenous cosmologies, Bolivia enacted the Law of the Rights of Mother Earth in 2010. This statute recognizes Mother Earth as a collective subject of public interest, endowed with the rights to life, diversity, water, clean air, and restoration.[101]

Pablo Solón, Bolivia's former UN Ambassador and a key proponent of the law, argues that this legislation reframes the human-nature relationship, positioning humans as part of an ecological whole rather than as its masters.[102] The law was followed by the Framework Law on Mother Earth and Integral Development for Living Well (2012), which seeks to harmonize economic planning with ecological limits.

While Bolivia's model is statutory (not constitutional), its breadth is notable. It integrates climate justice, biodiversity preservation, and ecosystem restoration into public law. However, critics argue that political inconsistency and extractive industry interests have hindered effective enforcement.[103]

2.7.4 NEW ZEALAND: LEGAL PERSONHOOD OF THE WHANGANUI RIVER

In a landmark move, New Zealand passed the Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act, 2017, which granted legal personhood to the Whanganui River, acknowledging it as "an indivisible and living whole."[104]

---

[100] David R. Boyd, *The Rights of Nature: A Legal Revolution That Could Save the World* (ECW Press, 2017).
[101] Plurinational State of Bolivia, *Law of the Rights of Mother Earth*, Law No. 071 (2010).
[102] Pablo Solón, "The Rights of Mother Earth," *Development Dialogue*, 2011.
[103] Farthing, Linda and Kohl, Benjamin, "Evo's Bolivia: Continuity and Change," *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 2011.
[104] Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017 (New Zealand).

This recognition was the result of over 140 years of advocacy by the indigenous Whanganui iwi (tribes), who view the river as an ancestor. The Act establishes two human guardians—one appointed by the government and one by the iwi—to represent the river's interests in legal and policy matters.

Catherine Iorns Magallanes, a scholar on environmental law and indigenous rights, views this law as a hybrid model combining indigenous cosmology with modern legal theory.[105] It avoids using the term "rights of nature" but effectively grants legal standing, representation, and protection mechanisms to a natural entity. Unlike Bolivia and Ecuador, New Zealand's model is not ecocentric in language but functionally recognizes nature as a subject of law.

2.7.5 COMPARATIVE REFLECTIONS

These three models—constitutional (Ecuador), statutory (Bolivia), and customary-integrated legal personhood (New Zealand)—each offer unique pathways to recognizing ecological rights. Their comparative features are summarized below:

Table 2.2: Comparative Summary of Ecological Rights Recognition

Country	Legal Status	Legal Form	Key Feature
Ecuador	Constitutional	Articles 71–74	Nature has intrinsic rights; public can litigate
Bolivia	Statutory	Law of Mother Earth, 2010	Recognizes nature as a legal subject
New Zealand	Statutory + Customary	Te Awa Tupua Act, 2017	Legal personhood granted to river via guardians

These cases underscore the feasibility and diversity of recognizing ecological rights. While political will and enforcement vary, each jurisdiction demonstrates a legal willingness to transcend anthropocentrism and honor nature as a legitimate subject of law.

[105] Catherine Iorns Magallanes, "From Rights to Responsibilities: Shifting the Burden in Environmental Law," *Victoria University of Wellington Law Review*, Vol. 45, 2014.

2.7.6 RELEVANCE FOR INDIA

For India, these global precedents offer critical lessons. Constitutional or legislative recognition of ecological rights can:

- Enable proactive legal remedies through public interest litigation.
- Promote integration of indigenous ecological ethics with modern law.
- Strengthen judicial pronouncements with codified backing.
- Harmonize environmental law with international obligations under biodiversity and climate conventions.

However, as scholars like Peter Burdon note, legal recognition must be accompanied by institutional reform and cultural shifts to be truly effective.[106] India can learn from these models to build a context-specific constitutional framework that elevates ecological concerns from a matter of policy to a matter of rights.

2.8 CRITIQUE OF THE INDIAN FRAMEWORK BY INDIAN LEGAL SCHOLARS

2.8.1 INTRODUCTION

While the Indian judiciary has played a proactive role in expanding environmental rights through constitutional interpretation, many legal scholars argue that India's environmental governance model remains fundamentally reactive, fragmented, and anthropocentric. This section critically evaluates the scholarly positions of prominent Indian legal academics—including M.K. Ramesh, L. Leelakrishnan, Sanjay Upadhyay, and others—who highlight doctrinal weaknesses, enforcement limitations, and the urgent need to recognize ecological rights as constitutionally embedded provisions.

2.8.2 M.K. RAMESH: INADEQUACY OF POLICY-DRIVEN ENVIRONMENTALISM

Professor M.K. Ramesh, an eminent environmental law academic, strongly critiques India's overreliance on policy-based environmental regulation, arguing that policies—unlike constitutional or statutory rights—lack the permanence and enforceability required for effective

[106] Peter Burdon, "The Earth Community and Ecological Justice," *Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy*, Vol. 35, 2010.

protection.[107] According to Ramesh, while the judiciary has expanded environmental protections under Article 21, the lack of explicit constitutional text creates vulnerability, leaving nature defenseless in the absence of judicial intervention.

He further argues that constitutional silence on ecological rights undermines India's compliance with its international environmental obligations, such as those under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Paris Agreement. Ramesh advocates for explicit inclusion of the rights of nature in Part III or IV of the Constitution, which would help move beyond the existing anthropocentric paradigm.

2.8.3 L. LEELAKRISHNAN: LEGISLATIVE FRAGMENTATION AND WEAK ENFORCEMENT

Professor L. Leelakrishnan, widely known for his authoritative work on environmental law, critiques the fragmented legislative structure in India. He points out that environmental governance is spread across multiple laws—such as the Water Act, Air Act, and Environmental Protection Act—resulting in regulatory overlaps, institutional conflicts, and enforcement failures.[108]

Leelakrishnan also emphasizes that judicial doctrines like "polluter pays" and "precautionary principle", although powerful, lack legislative codification, making their application discretionary rather than mandatory. He calls for legal reform that incorporates these doctrines into a unified constitutional and statutory framework, with room for ecological rights as enforceable entitlements for nature.

[107] M.K. Ramesh, "Environmental Protection and the Constitution of India: Emerging Trends and Practices," *Indian Journal of Environmental Law*, Vol. 4, 2004.
[108] L. Leelakrishnan, *Environmental Law: Cases and Materials* (LexisNexis, 3rd edn., 2021).

2.8.4 SANJAY UPADHYAY: NEED FOR RIGHTS-BASED ENVIRONMENTALISM

Sanjay Upadhyay, a practicing environmental lawyer and policy expert, argues that India's environmental laws and constitutional interpretation remain rooted in development-centric models, where nature is considered an object of regulation rather than a subject of rights.[109] He asserts that legal recognition of the rights of ecosystems, rivers, and forests is essential to shift the legal narrative from "protection from harm" to "affirmation of existence."

Upadhyay's critique focuses on how environmental litigation in India largely addresses pollution or deforestation after the damage has occurred. He calls for a preventive, rights-based framework wherein ecological entities are granted legal standing, not through occasional judicial pronouncements but through constitutional codification.

2.8.5 SHIBANI GHOSH: DISCONNECTED ENVIRONMENTAL RULE OF LAW

Legal researcher Shibani Ghosh points to the disconnect between environmental law in books and law in practice. She argues that while judicial pronouncements have expanded environmental rights, institutional implementation remains weak, particularly at the level of pollution control boards, local governments, and regulatory agencies.[110]

She further asserts that without a rights-based framework that includes ecological entities, India's environmental law will continue to function as a system of damage control rather than a mechanism for ecological justice. According to her, the rights of nature should not only be embedded in the Constitution but must be accompanied by legal reforms and capacity-building within institutions.

---

[109] Sanjay Upadhyay, "Environmental Governance: Challenges and Reforms," *Centre for Policy Research Occasional Paper*, 2019.

[110] Shibani Ghosh, "Strengthening Environmental Rule of Law in India," *UNEP Environmental Rule of Law Report*, 2019.

2.8.6 T.N. NARASIMHAN AND RITU RAJ: SCIENTIFIC AND LEGAL FRAGMENTATION

Legal scholars like T.N. Narasimhan and Ritu Raj have observed that Indian environmental law fails to integrate scientific knowledge with legal mechanisms. Narasimhan critiques the legal framework for lacking long-term ecological vision, while Raj points out that the absence of constitutional clarity regarding ecosystem rights leads to reactive litigation rather than proactive protection.[111]

Both scholars advocate for a cross-disciplinary approach to constitutional environmentalism—merging law, ecology, climate science, and indigenous knowledge systems—to enable holistic ecological governance.

2.8.7 COMMON THEMES ACROSS INDIAN SCHOLARSHIP

Across these critiques, several recurring themes emerge:

- Absence of explicit ecological rights in the Constitution.
- Overdependence on judicial interpretation rather than constitutional text.
- Fragmented legislation and inconsistent enforcement mechanisms.
- Lack of integration between legal and scientific frameworks.
- Disempowerment of non-human entities, due to the absence of legal standing.

Indian legal scholars overwhelmingly agree that while India has been a global leader in judicial environmental activism, it lags in codifying ecological protections into constitutional doctrine, making legal reforms both urgent and necessary. Indian legal scholars have consistently highlighted the shortcomings of India's constitutional and legal response to environmental challenges. From Professor Ramesh's call for codified ecological rights to Leelakrishnan's critique of legislative fragmentation, the scholarly consensus is clear: India must shift from a human-centric, reactive approach to an eco-centric, proactive constitutional model. Integrating the rights of nature into the Indian Constitution would align domestic law with evolving international standards and ensure that ecological justice is not left to judicial discretion alone.

[111] T.N. Narasimhan, "Integrating Ecology and Law: A Scientific Perspective," *Current Science*, Vol. 97, No. 1, 2009; Ritu Raj, "Legal Personhood for Nature: Indian Courts and the Global Movement," *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 55, No. 33, 2020.

2.9 RESEARCH GAPS IDENTIFIED IN LITERATURE

2.9.1 INTRODUCTION

The preceding review of literature—spanning global legal developments, theoretical frameworks, judicial interpretations, and Indian scholarly critiques—shows a rich and evolving discourse around environmental protection. However, despite substantial progress, there remain significant conceptual, doctrinal, and implementation-related gaps in the recognition and enforcement of ecological rights, particularly within the Indian constitutional context. This section identifies the major research gaps, thereby justifying the need for this dissertation to advance the academic and legal conversation on constitutional ecological rights.

2.9.2 ABSENCE OF EXPLICIT CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION OF NATURE'S RIGHTS IN INDIA

One of the most pressing gaps is the lack of explicit constitutional recognition of the rights of nature in India. While Articles 21, 48A, and 51A(g) have been interpreted to support environmental protection, they do not recognize nature as a subject of rights. Scholars like Philippe Cullet and M.K. Ramesh emphasize that without constitutional personhood or independent legal status for nature, environmental protections remain anthropocentric and discretionary.[112]

There is limited research exploring how ecological rights could be formally codified in the Indian Constitution, either through new provisions in Part III or Part IV, or through reinterpretation of existing ones.

2.9.3 LIMITED INTEGRATION BETWEEN INDIGENOUS ECOLOGICAL ETHICS AND CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Although indigenous communities in India possess deep-rooted ecological traditions, legal scholarship rarely bridges these ethical systems with constitutional or statutory frameworks. Compared to Ecuador or Bolivia—where indigenous worldviews have directly influenced

[112] Philippe Cullet, "Constitutional Environmental Protection in India: Between Commitment and Implementation," *Indian Journal of Environmental Law*, Vol. 1, 1999; M.K. Ramesh, "Environmental Protection and the Constitution of India," *Indian Journal of Environmental Law*, Vol. 4, 2004.

constitutional provisions—Indian scholarship lacks systematic inquiry into how tribal and customary ecological practices could inform constitutional reforms.

Legal scholar Shibani Ghosh notes the absence of culturally grounded ecological legal principles within Indian constitutional law, despite India's pluralistic ecological heritage. This presents a research opportunity to develop a model of ecological rights rooted in both constitutional theory and indigenous jurisprudence.

2.9.4 OVER-RELIANCE ON JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION WITHOUT INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Another critical research gap is the over-reliance on the Indian judiciary to expand environmental rights, without a corresponding evolution in legislative or constitutional text. While cases like *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* and *Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand* demonstrate progressive jurisprudence, scholars such as Sairam Bhat and L. Leelakrishnan caution that judicial activism alone is unsustainable, especially when not backed by enforceable constitutional guarantees.[113]

There is limited scholarship exploring mechanisms to institutionalize ecological rights through amendments, constitutional commissions, or environmental ombudsman systems.

2.9.5 FRAGMENTATION OF ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Environmental law scholarship in India tends to focus either on judicial interpretation, statutory review, or international obligations, but rarely brings these dimensions together in a comprehensive rights-based constitutional framework. Moreover, most legal commentaries are either doctrinal or jurisprudential, lacking cross-disciplinary integration with climate science, indigenous knowledge, or ecological economics.

Legal thinkers like Upendra Baxi have pointed out that Indian legal education and scholarship have not fully embraced eco-centric legal theory. The growing global body of work on Earth Jurisprudence, ecological ethics, and deep ecology remains underrepresented in Indian academic publications and law school curricula.

[113] Sairam Bhat, *Natural Resources Conservation Law* (SAGE Publications, 2021); L. Leelakrishnan, *Environmental Law: Cases and Materials* (LexisNexis, 2021).

2.9.6 LACK OF COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL MODELS TAILORED TO INDIAN CONDITIONS

While countries like Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand have implemented ecological rights frameworks, there is a shortage of Indian legal scholarship that critically adapts these models to Indian realities. Most comparative analyses stop at descriptive comparison, without evaluating pragmatic pathways for Indian constitutional reform, considering federalism, pluralism, and socio-economic challenges.

Catherine Iorns Magallanes suggests that ecological rights frameworks must be context-sensitive.[114] Indian scholarship has yet to generate such a tailored roadmap.

2.9.7 MINIMAL ENGAGEMENT WITH YOUTH, CLIMATE MOVEMENTS, AND LEGAL MOBILIZATION

Finally, academic literature has yet to fully examine how youth climate activism, grassroots ecological movements, and civil society mobilization in India could contribute to the movement for constitutionalizing ecological rights. As the Fridays for Future movement and Indian environmental protests gain momentum, there is a need to explore their legal implications and capacity to influence constitutional discourse.

This gap calls for empirical legal research and policy analysis focusing on how bottom-up constitutional reform may evolve in a democratic setting like India.

[114] Upendra Baxi, "The Avatars of Indian Judicial Activism," *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*, Vol. 2, 2008.

CHAPTER 3: DOCTRINAL AND JUDICIAL ANALYSIS IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The objective of this chapter is to examine how Indian constitutional law and judicial decisions have approached environmental protection and the emerging discourse around ecological rights. While India has no express provision granting nature or ecosystems any constitutional rights, its judiciary has interpreted **Article 21**, which guarantees the **Right to Life**, to include environmental concerns. This interpretative expansion has been instrumental in filling legal gaps, particularly in the absence of explicit statutory or constitutional recognition of ecological rights.

Indian courts—especially the Supreme Court—have acted as proactive agents in evolving environmental jurisprudence. Through a series of landmark public interest litigations, the judiciary has formulated vital doctrines such as the Polluter Pays Principle, Precautionary Principle, and the Public Trust Doctrine. However, these judicial innovations remain susceptible to reversal, as they are not grounded in the constitutional text but derived from interpretive activism.

This chapter conducts a doctrinal analysis of relevant constitutional provisions, key environmental judgments, and the role of institutions like the National Green Tribunal (NGT). It critically assesses how Indian courts have laid the groundwork for environmental rights while also identifying the structural limitations of relying on judicial interpretation in the absence of codified ecological rights. The analysis sets the stage for the comparative constitutional study in Chapter 4.

3.2 CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS: ARTICLES 21, 48A, AND 51A(G)

3.2.1 INTRODUCTION

Although the Indian Constitution does not expressly grant ecological rights, three key provisions—Articles 21, 48A, and 51A(g)—form the core of India's environmental governance framework. These articles, interpreted expansively by the judiciary, have allowed courts to read environmental protection into the larger narrative of constitutional rights and responsibilities. However, they remain limited in scope, with no explicit recognition of nature as a legal subject or rights-bearing entity.

3.2.2 ARTICLE 21: RIGHT TO LIFE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Article 21 of the Constitution states: *"No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law."* The Indian Supreme Court has interpreted "life" to include the right to live in a clean and healthy environment, particularly in landmark decisions such as *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, where the Court held that pollution-free water and air are necessary for the enjoyment of life.[115]

This interpretation has allowed for the development of environmental rights under the umbrella of human rights, giving individuals standing to protect environmental interests. However, this remains an anthropocentric approach, as the environment is protected only in relation to its impact on human life, not for its own intrinsic value.

3.2.3 ARTICLE 48A: DIRECTIVE PRINCIPLE OF STATE POLICY

Inserted by the 42nd Amendment Act of 1976, Article 48A directs the State to "endeavour to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wildlife of the country."[116] While not justiciable in court, Article 48A reflects the constitutional intent to promote environmental preservation as a matter of governance.

[115] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420.
[116] The Constitution (Forty-Second Amendment) Act, 1976; The Constitution of India, art. 48A.

Legal commentators such as V.N. Shukla have noted that Article 48A imposes a moral and policy obligation on the State, which may guide courts in interpreting environmental statutes and fundamental rights.[117] However, the lack of enforceability under this provision means that it cannot directly be invoked to claim environmental protection in a court of law.

3.2.4 Article 51A(g): Fundamental Duty of Citizens

Also introduced through the 42nd Amendment, **Article 51A(g)** places a duty on every citizen "to protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wildlife, and to have compassion for living creatures."[118] This provision recognizes the role of citizens as **environmental stewards** and highlights the participatory aspect of environmental conservation.

Legal scholar Upendra Baxi emphasizes that fundamental duties, though not enforceable, serve as ethical benchmarks for judicial interpretation and policy formation.[119] However, without legislative backing or penal provisions, Article 51A(g) remains largely symbolic in nature.

3.2.5 CONSTITUTIONAL SILENCE ON ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS

Despite these provisions, the Constitution does not recognize nature or ecological systems as legal persons or rights-holders. Protection is derivative—available only when human life is affected. Unlike Ecuador or Bolivia, which have incorporated the rights of nature into their constitutional texts, India's constitutional provisions are indirect, anthropocentric, and incomplete in addressing the moral and legal standing of ecosystems.[120]

This doctrinal gap underscores the need for explicit constitutional recognition of ecological rights, ensuring that nature is no longer viewed solely as a resource for human benefit but as a subject of justice.

---

[117] V.N. Shukla, *Constitution of India* 310 (Eastern Book Company, 13th edn., 2022).
[118] The Constitution of India, art. 51A(g).
[119] Upendra Baxi, "Fundamental Duties as Constitutional Law," *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 1980.
[120] Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008, Ch. 7; Law of the Rights of Mother Earth, Bolivia (2010).

3.3 JUDICIAL EXPANSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS THROUGH ARTICLE 21

3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the absence of explicit constitutional recognition of environmental or ecological rights, the Indian judiciary—especially the Supreme Court—has played a transformative role by interpreting Article 21 of the Constitution to encompass the right to a clean and healthy environment. This expansion, largely driven through public interest litigation (PIL), has elevated environmental protection to the status of a judicially enforceable fundamental right. However, the scope remains limited to human-centric concerns, as nature is protected only in relation to its impact on human life, not as an independent rights-holder.

3.3.2 KEY JUDGMENTS ESTABLISHING ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS UNDER ARTICLE 21

One of the earliest and most cited judgments is Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, in which the Supreme Court held that "the right to live includes the right of enjoyment of pollution-free water and air."[121] This case became the bedrock for numerous PILs that followed, establishing environmental harm as a violation of fundamental rights.

In M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak Case), the Court went further, holding that industries engaged in hazardous activity owe an absolute liability to the community for environmental damage.[122] The Court declared that Article 21 is broad enough to include the right to a wholesome environment, thereby allowing environmental concerns to be litigated under the guise of life and liberty.

In Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India, the Court adopted two essential principles of international environmental law the Polluter Pays Principle and the Precautionary Principle—as

[121] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420.
[122] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086 (Oleum Gas Leak Case).

integral parts of Indian environmental jurisprudence.[123] This marked a shift from reactive to preventive environmental governance.

In A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu, the Court advocated for scientific decision-making and even proposed the need for environmental courts with technical expertise to handle complex ecological disputes.[124] This progressive trend underscored the judiciary's proactive stance in expanding the scope of Article 21.

3.3.3 EVOLUTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCTRINES THROUGH ARTICLE 21

Through repeated invocation of Article 21, the Supreme Court has institutionalized several doctrines, including:

- **Public Trust Doctrine**: Recognizing that natural resources are held by the State in trust for the public and future generations.[125]
- **Sustainable Development**: Balancing environmental protection with developmental goals, established as a constitutional necessity.
- **Intergenerational Equity**: Acknowledging the duty to preserve ecological resources for future generations.[126]

While these doctrines have no statutory or constitutional origin, they derive their force from the judicial expansion of Article 21, thus forming the core of India's environmental jurisprudence.

3.3.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL APPROACH

Despite its achievements, the judicial expansion of Article 21 has inherent limitations. Courts have protected the environment only when human life or livelihood is directly affected. Nature does not yet have independent legal standing, and the recognition of environmental rights is conditional, not absolute. Moreover, judicial rulings often suffer from weak implementation, especially when enforcement depends on under-resourced administrative bodies.

[123] Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India, AIR 1996 SC 2715.
[124] A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu, AIR 1999 SC 812.
[125] M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath, (1997) 1 SCC 388.
[126] T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.

Legal scholars such as Shyam Divan caution that while the judiciary has filled important gaps, judicial creativity cannot substitute for constitutional clarity or legislative reform.[127]

Article 21 has undoubtedly been the cornerstone of India's environmental protection regime. Through innovative interpretation, the judiciary has elevated environmental concerns to the level of fundamental rights. However, the expansion remains largely anthropocentric, protecting nature only in service of human welfare. This reinforces the argument for a constitutional amendment or reinterpretation that explicitly grants legal personhood and rights to nature, beyond human utility.

3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCTRINES DEVELOPED BY COURTS

3.4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the absence of codified ecological rights in the Constitution, the Indian judiciary has developed a robust set of environmental doctrines to guide both government policy and legal adjudication. These judicially evolved principles have become the bedrock of environmental jurisprudence in India, reinforcing the expanded interpretation of Article 21 and strengthening the legal framework for environmental protection. This section explores four key doctrines developed by the courts: the Polluter Pays Principle, Precautionary Principle, Public Trust Doctrine, and the doctrine of Sustainable Development.

3.4.2 POLLUTER PAYS PRINCIPLE (PPP)

The Polluter Pays Principle imposes a legal obligation on the polluter to bear the cost of environmental harm caused by their actions. This doctrine was first explicitly articulated in the Indian context in Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India, where the Supreme Court held that polluters are absolutely liable for the environmental damage and are bound to compensate affected individuals and restore the damaged environment.[128]

[127] Shyam Divan and Armin Rosencranz, *Environmental Law and Policy in India* (Oxford University Press, 2nd edn., 2001).
[128] Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India, (1996) 3 SCC 212.

This principle emphasizes accountability, making it clear that environmental protection is not a charitable act but a legal responsibility. It has since been applied in numerous cases involving industrial pollution, urban waste, and hazardous waste management.

3.4.3 PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE

The Precautionary Principle mandates that preventive action must be taken where there is even the possibility of environmental harm, even if there is a lack of full scientific certainty. In Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India, the Supreme Court declared this principle as part of Indian environmental law, stating that "environmental measures must anticipate, prevent and attack the causes of environmental degradation."[129]

This doctrine is significant because it shifts the burden of proof to the developer or polluter, ensuring that environmental concerns are addressed at the planning stage itself. It supports a proactive approach to environmental management, aligning with international norms such as Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration (1992).

3.4.4 PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE

The Public Trust Doctrine was prominently invoked in M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath, where the Supreme Court held that the State acts as a trustee of natural resources, which are meant for public use and cannot be transferred for private ownership or exploitation.[130]

Under this doctrine, resources like rivers, forests, wetlands, and air are considered part of the common heritage of the public and must be protected for future generations. This principle places an affirmative duty on the State to prevent environmental degradation and restrains it from acting as a commercial entity over natural assets.

[129] Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India, AIR 1996 SC 2715.
[130] M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath, (1997) 1 SCC 388.

3.4.5 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT DOCTRINE

The doctrine of Sustainable Development seeks to reconcile economic growth with environmental protection. The Supreme Court in Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India and later in Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board v. C. Kenchappa emphasized that development must not come at the cost of irreversible ecological harm.[131]

This principle is often used by the judiciary to balance developmental imperatives with ecological conservation, ensuring that progress today does not compromise the needs of future generations. It integrates both the intergenerational equity and intra-generational equity principles within judicial reasoning.

The development of these doctrines reflects the Indian judiciary's proactive approach in compensating for the legislative and constitutional void in environmental law. While they have strengthened India's legal response to ecological challenges, they remain judicially created tools rather than constitutionally enshrined rights. Their effectiveness, therefore, depends on judicial will and institutional cooperation. Codifying these doctrines through constitutional amendments or dedicated legislation would ensure their durability and elevate ecological concerns to the status of enforceable legal obligations.

3.5 JUDICIAL RECOGNITION OF LEGAL PERSONHOOD FOR NATURE

3.5.1 INTRODUCTION

While the Indian Constitution does not expressly recognize nature as a rights-bearing entity, a few judicial decisions have attempted to grant legal personhood to natural elements like rivers and forests. These decisions, though path-breaking, remain limited in scope and application due to the absence of constitutional or statutory backing. This section explores key cases where Indian courts have granted legal status to nature, analyzes the theoretical basis for these decisions, and highlights the limitations of such judicial innovations in the absence of a broader legal framework.

[131] Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India, (2000) 10 SCC 664; Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board v. C. Kenchappa, (2006) 6 SCC 371.

3.5.2 MOHD. SALIM v. STATE OF UTTARAKHAND: GANGA AND YAMUNA AS LEGAL PERSONS

In Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, the Uttarakhand High Court declared the rivers Ganga and Yamuna as living entities with legal rights.[132] The Court granted them the status of juristic persons, stating they had the same legal status as a minor or a corporation, capable of holding property and suing through human representatives.

This recognition was grounded in both constitutional values and Hindu religious sentiment, with the Court observing that these rivers are revered as deities and central to Indian culture. The Court appointed officials from the state government to act as legal custodians for the rivers.

While widely celebrated as a legal innovation, the ruling faced practical challenges. The Supreme Court later stayed the judgment, questioning the administrative feasibility and legal consequences of such recognition.[133]

3.5.3 ANIMAL WELFARE BOARD v. A. NAGARAJA: RIGHTS OF ANIMALS RECOGNIZED

In Animal Welfare Board of India v. A. Nagaraja, the Supreme Court recognized animals as sentient beings with intrinsic value, extending Article 21 protections to non-human species.[134] The Court held that animals have a right to live with dignity and free from unnecessary pain. This case laid the foundation for the idea that non-human entities may be protected under constitutional principles.

However, the judgment focused more on animal welfare than environmental personhood and did not go as far as granting animals independent legal standing. Nevertheless, it represents a judicial acknowledgment of the moral and constitutional significance of non-human life.

[132] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court.
[133] Supreme Court Stay Order on Mohd. Salim case, 2017.
[134] Animal Welfare Board of India v. A. Nagaraja, (2014) 7 SCC 547.

3.5.4 T.N. GODAVARMAN v. UNION OF INDIA: FOREST ECOSYSTEMS AND JUDICIAL GUARDIANSHIP

Although not a case of legal personhood per se, the ongoing T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India litigation has led the Supreme Court to effectively take over the management of India's forests, including imposing logging bans and directing conservation efforts.[135] The Court has acted as a de facto guardian of forest ecosystems, issuing continuous directions for ecological protection.

This long-running case exemplifies judicial willingness to step into legislative and administrative domains in the absence of clear statutory or constitutional guidance. While powerful, this approach risks overreach and lacks democratic legitimacy unless backed by a robust legal mandate.

3.5.5 THEORETICAL BASIS FOR LEGAL PERSONHOOD OF NATURE

The concept of granting nature legal personhood is not unique to India. Jurisdictions like Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand have done so either constitutionally or statutorily. Legal philosopher Christopher Stone, in his seminal article *"Should Trees Have Standing?"*, argued that the legal system must evolve to treat natural entities as rights-bearers.[136] Indian courts have drawn upon this reasoning to justify legal standing for rivers, forests, and animals. However, without constitutional anchoring, these recognitions remain vulnerable to challenge, as seen in the Ganga-Yamuna ruling.

3.5.6 LIMITATIONS AND CRITICISMS

The Indian judiciary's experiments with legal personhood for nature face several practical and legal limitations:

- **Ambiguity** in representation: Who speaks for nature in legal proceedings?
- **Enforcement issues**: State-appointed custodians lack clarity in authority and accountability.
- **Risk of rollback**: Judicial decisions are subject to appeal or stay, making them unstable.

[135] T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.
[136] Christopher D. Stone, "Should Trees Have Standing? Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects," *Southern California Law Review*, Vol. 45, 1972.

- **No uniform standard**: There is no statutory or constitutional framework to apply legal personhood consistently across all ecological entities.

Legal scholars such as Ritwick Dutta argue that these innovations, while symbolically important, require legislative and constitutional follow-up to have lasting impact.[137]

Judicial recognition of legal personhood for nature in India marks an important philosophical and legal milestone. However, without constitutional recognition or statutory codification, these declarations remain symbolic and largely unenforceable. For nature to be treated as a true rights-bearing entity, India must move beyond isolated judicial interventions and adopt a systemic constitutional framework that acknowledges nature's inherent legal standing.

3.6 LIMITATIONS OF JUDICIAL ACTIVISM IN ENVIRONMENTAL JURISPRUDENCE

3.6.1 INTRODUCTION

The Indian judiciary has played a pivotal role in expanding environmental rights by creatively interpreting Article 21 and formulating progressive doctrines. However, this judicial activism, while innovative and essential in bridging legislative gaps, is not without its institutional and structural limitations. In the absence of clear constitutional recognition of ecological rights, judicially created rights and doctrines remain vulnerable to dilution, reversal, or inconsistent enforcement. This section critically examines the shortcomings of judicial activism in environmental law and underscores the need for constitutional and legislative reinforcement.

3.6.2 LACK OF CONSTITUTIONAL ANCHORING

The foremost limitation is that environmental and ecological protections developed through judicial interpretation lack explicit constitutional text. As a result, environmental rights in India exist more in judicial precedent than in binding constitutional guarantees.[138] This dependence on the judiciary renders environmental rights susceptible to reinterpretation or withdrawal by future benches or political influence.

[137] Ritwick Dutta, "A River Runs Through It: The Case for Legal Personhood of Rivers," *Down To Earth*, July 2017.
[138] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.

Upendra Baxi has critiqued this phenomenon as a "rights without roots" problem, where transformative judgments operate in legal grey zones and are not supported by democratic processes of codification.[139]

3.6.3 INCONSISTENT APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Judicial directives in environmental matters often lack consistency and are applied in a case-specific, ad hoc manner. For instance, while principles like the Polluter Pays and Precautionary Principle have been upheld in some cases, they are inconsistently referenced or enforced in others. Moreover, implementation is frequently delegated to overburdened or under-resourced executive bodies such as Pollution Control Boards or Municipal Corporations.[140] This results in a significant gap between judicial intent and ground-level enforcement.

3.6.4 INSTITUTIONAL OVERREACH AND JUDICIAL OVERBURDENING

The judiciary's assumption of executive and legislative roles, especially in cases like *T.N. Godavarman v. Union of India*, has been both applauded and criticized.[141] Courts have stepped in to issue forest conservation orders, regulate industries, and direct state action—but this has led to concerns of judicial overreach, undermining the principle of separation of powers.

At the same time, the Indian judiciary is already burdened with millions of pending cases. Continuous monitoring of environmental matters stretches judicial capacity, reducing efficiency and limiting long-term follow-up on enforcement.

3.6.5 ABSENCE OF A RIGHTS-BASED FRAMEWORK FOR NATURE

Even the most progressive judgments—such as granting legal personhood to rivers in *Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand*—lack permanence and legitimacy due to the absence of a statutory or constitutional framework.[142] The Supreme Court's stay on the legal personhood of Ganga and Yamuna illustrates the instability of such groundbreaking rulings.

---

[139] Upendra Baxi, "The Little Done, the Vast Undone," *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 1981.
[140] Lavanya Rajamani, *Climate Change Law and Policy in India* (Oxford University Press, 2021).
[141] T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.
[142] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014, Uttarakhand High Court; SC Stay Order, 2017.

Without formal codification, nature remains a beneficiary of judicial sympathy, not a constitutional subject with rights.

3.6.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND DEMOCRATIC LEGITIMACY

Judicial activism, while well-intentioned, often lacks democratic participation. PILs are generally filed by a few activists or lawyers, and judgments are delivered without broader public engagement. This raises questions about the accountability and representativeness of ecological decision-making in India. Environmental law scholar Shibani Ghosh argues that without participatory legal reform, judicial environmentalism risks alienating stakeholders and failing to reflect local ecological realities.[143]

Judicial activism has undeniably advanced environmental protection in India. However, its limitations—ranging from lack of constitutional authority to weak enforcement—demonstrate that reliance on the judiciary alone is insufficient. The future of ecological justice in India requires a shift from judicial benevolence to constitutional recognition, thereby ensuring that environmental rights are rooted in enforceable, durable, and democratically legitimate legal structures.

3.7 ROLE OF THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL (NGT)

3.7.1 INTRODUCTION

The creation of the National Green Tribunal (NGT) in 2010 marked a significant institutional development in India's environmental governance framework. Established under the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, the NGT serves as a specialized, quasi-judicial body with the exclusive mandate to adjudicate environmental disputes.[144] It represents a shift from traditional court-based environmental litigation to a dedicated forum for ecological justice—a crucial support mechanism in the absence of codified ecological rights in the Indian Constitution.

[143] Shibani Ghosh, "Strengthening Environmental Rule of Law in India," *UNEP Report*, 2019.
[144] The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, Section 3.

3.7.2 OBJECTIVES AND JURISDICTION

The NGT was created to provide speedy and effective redressal of environmental cases and to reduce the burden on constitutional courts. It has original jurisdiction over all civil cases relating to environment protection, enforcement of legal rights related to the environment, and compensation for damages to people and property due to environmental harm.

The Tribunal can hear matters under key environmental statutes including:

- The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974
- The Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981
- The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986
- The Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980
- The Biological Diversity Act, 2002

3.7.3 LANDMARK JUDGMENTS OF THE NGT

The NGT has delivered several judgments that reflect an evolving understanding of ecological protection, even though it is still constrained by statutory limitations and lacks authority to adjudicate constitutional rights.

Almitra H. Patel v. Union of India (2012)

The NGT issued comprehensive guidelines for solid waste management across Indian cities.[145] It held that improper waste handling violates environmental norms and affects public health, thereby indirectly safeguarding environmental rights.

Sterlite Industries v. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (2018)

The NGT reviewed and initially overturned the Tamil Nadu government's order to shut down the Sterlite Copper Plant due to public pressure, only for the Supreme Court to later uphold the closure citing environmental violations.[146] This case highlighted the limits of NGT's power vis-à-vis state and central governments.

[145] Almitra H. Patel v. Union of India, NGT Order, OA No. 199/2014.
[146] Sterlite Industries (India) Ltd. v. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board, NGT Appeal No. 17/2018(SZ).

Muthulakshmi v. State of Tamil Nadu (2019)

In this case, the NGT ordered the restoration of Pallikaranai Marshlands near Chennai, declaring them ecologically sensitive and directing state agencies to prevent encroachment.[147] The judgment emphasized the ecological value of wetlands as integral to biodiversity conservation.

3.7.4 CONTRIBUTION TO ECOLOGICAL JUSTICE

Though the NGT does not have the authority to recognize ecological rights as constitutional rights, its jurisprudence demonstrates a growing commitment to eco-centric reasoning. The Tribunal has:

- Held that environmental restoration is a necessary form of relief, not just monetary compensation.
- Allowed locus standi for public-spirited individuals, NGOs, and even communities affected indirectly.
- Shifted from human-interest litigation to a rights-of-nature-inspired framework in select rulings.

While not explicitly labeling nature as a legal subject, the NGT's orders increasingly reflect a view that natural ecosystems deserve protection for their own sake, not just for human benefit.

3.7.5 LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES

Despite its proactive stance, the NGT faces several constraints:

- No power to enforce constitutional provisions such as Article 21 or 48A directly.
- Implementation of its orders often depends on state authorities, who may lack political will.
- Limited presence—only a few regional benches exist, creating accessibility issues for rural and tribal communities.
- Appeals to the Supreme Court often dilute the binding effect of NGT orders due to delays or jurisdictional overrides.[148]

[147] Muthulakshmi v. State of Tamil Nadu, NGT Order, OA No. 21/2018(SZ).
[148] Ritwick Dutta, "The Rise and Challenges of Environmental Tribunals in India," *Indian Journal of Environmental Law*, Vol. 6, 2018.

The National Green Tribunal plays a vital institutional role in India's environmental adjudication system. While it cannot recognize or enforce ecological rights as constitutional entitlements, it functions as a de facto environmental court, advancing eco-centric legal reasoning. For NGT's efforts to be sustainable, there must be constitutional support in the form of an explicit ecological rights framework. Codifying nature's rights would not only strengthen the Tribunal's legal foundation but also transform it into a genuine guardian of ecological justice.

CHAPTER 4: COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES TO ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Environmental degradation and climate change are no longer isolated national issues—they are global crises that require constitutional and legal innovation. In response to the growing ecological threat, a number of countries have moved beyond traditional environmental regulation and taken bold steps toward recognizing ecological rights—not just as policy objectives, but as enforceable legal and constitutional entitlements. This chapter explores the comparative constitutional approaches adopted by selected jurisdictions that have explicitly recognized the rights of nature: Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand.

The need for comparative study arises from the fact that India, despite having a vibrant environmental jurisprudence, continues to treat nature as an object of regulation rather than as a subject of law. While Indian courts have interpreted Article 21 to include environmental protection, there is no express constitutional provision recognizing nature as a legal entity with standing or enforceable rights.[149]

The countries selected for comparison represent three distinct models of legal innovation:

- Ecuador adopted a constitutional model by incorporating the Rights of Nature into its 2008 Constitution.
- Bolivia followed a statutory route, enacting the Law of the Rights of Mother Earth (2010).
- New Zealand developed a customary-legal hybrid, granting legal personhood to the Whanganui River through legislation that reflects indigenous Māori cosmology.

Each of these models has emerged from a unique socio-political context but shares a common departure from anthropocentric environmental law. They affirm the intrinsic rights of ecosystems to exist and flourish, independent of their utility to humans.[150]

[149] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420; M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.
[150] Cormac Cullinan, *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice* (Green Books, 2002); Eduardo Gudynas, "The Rights of Nature: Ethical and Institutional Considerations," *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 70, 2011.

4.2 ECUADOR'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF NATURE

4.2.1 INTRODUCTION

In 2008, Ecuador became the first country in the world to enshrine the rights of nature—referred to as *Pachamama*—in its Constitution. This historic move marked a significant departure from the conventional anthropocentric approach to environmental law. Instead of merely protecting nature for human benefit, Ecuador's legal framework affirms that nature itself possesses rights, including the right to exist, regenerate, and evolve.[151] This constitutional development offers a transformative model for countries like India that are exploring eco-centric reforms.

4.2.2 CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS: CHAPTER 7

Chapter 7 of the Ecuadorian Constitution is dedicated entirely to the **Rights of Nature (Derechos de la Naturaleza)**. Article 71 declares:

"Nature, or Pachamama, where life is reproduced and occurs, has the right to exist, persist, maintain and regenerate its vital cycles, structure, functions and evolutionary processes."

Other key articles include:

- **Article 72**: Recognizes nature's right to restoration and imposes a duty on the State to ensure full reparation.
- **Article 73**: Prohibits the introduction of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) that may harm biodiversity.
- **Article 74**: Grants individuals the right to benefit from the environment, provided such use respects the rights of nature.

These provisions empower any person or community to file legal actions on behalf of nature, eliminating the barrier of legal standing that limits environmental litigation in most other jurisdictions.

[151] Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, 2008, Chapter 7.

4.2.3 LANDMARK CASE: VILCABAMBA RIVER

One of the earliest and most notable applications of Ecuador's Rights of Nature provisions was the Vilcabamba River case (2011). In this case, a road-widening project had led to debris being dumped into the river, altering its natural flow. The Provincial Court of Loja ruled that the river's constitutional rights had been violated and ordered the local government to undertake restoration.[152]

This case established that nature, as a rights-holder, could sue in court independently of human harm. The court's ruling not only reaffirmed nature's legal standing but also set a precedent for restorative, rather than merely punitive, environmental justice.

4.2.4 PHILOSOPHICAL AND CULTURAL FOUNDATIONS

Ecuador's constitutional recognition of nature's rights was strongly influenced by indigenous cosmology, particularly the Andean belief in Pachamama (Mother Earth) as a living being. According to legal scholar Eduardo Gudynas, this worldview rejects the instrumental valuation of ecosystems and embraces intrinsic worth as the basis for legal rights.[153]

This spiritual and cultural grounding distinguishes Ecuador's model from Western environmentalism, which typically frames nature as a resource to be managed rather than a subject to be respected.

4.2.5 IMPLEMENTATION AND CHALLENGES

Despite its visionary legal text, Ecuador's implementation of the Rights of Nature has faced significant political and institutional challenges:

- Enforcement gaps persist, as courts, local governments, and administrative bodies lack capacity or willingness to uphold nature's rights consistently.
- Conflicts with extractive industries, such as mining and oil drilling—especially in the Amazon—have exposed tensions between economic policy and ecological commitments.

[152] Wheeler, Sarah, "The Rights of Nature: Vilcabamba River Case," *Earth Law Center*, 2011.
[153] Eduardo Gudynas, "Rights of Nature: Ethical and Institutional Considerations," *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 70, No. 11, 2011.

- Environmental lawyers such as David Boyd have noted that while Ecuador's model is groundbreaking, it requires greater institutional support and political will to achieve transformative ecological outcomes.[154]

Ecuador's constitutional framework offers a paradigm shift in environmental law by recognizing nature as a legal entity with enforceable rights. The model provides useful insights into how a national constitution can move from environmental regulation to ecological justice. However, it also underscores the importance of effective institutions, consistent enforcement, and cultural integration. For India, Ecuador's experience shows that embedding ecological rights in the Constitution is possible—but success depends not only on legal reform, but also on political coherence and societal values.

4.3 BOLIVIA'S STATUTORY RECOGNITION OF MOTHER EARTH

4.3.1 INTRODUCTION

Following Ecuador's constitutional innovation, Bolivia became the second country to formally recognize the rights of nature—referred to as "Pachamama" or Mother Earth—through its legal system. While Bolivia did not embed these rights into its Constitution, it enacted a comprehensive statutory framework led by the Law of the Rights of Mother Earth (2010) and the Framework Law on Mother Earth and Integral Development for Living Well (2012). These laws represent a significant effort to decolonize environmental governance and embed indigenous ecological philosophy into national legislation.[155]

4.3.2 LAW OF THE RIGHTS OF MOTHER EARTH, 2010

Enacted on December 21, 2010, this pioneering law legally recognizes Mother Earth as a collective subject of public interest, with seven specific rights, including:

- The right to life and to the maintenance of the integrity of ecosystems
- The right to water as a source of life
- The right to clean air

[154] David R. Boyd, *The Rights of Nature: A Legal Revolution That Could Save the World* (ECW Press, 2017).
[155] Plurinational State of Bolivia, *Law of the Rights of Mother Earth*, Law No. 071 (2010); *Framework Law on Mother Earth and Integral Development*, Law No. 300 (2012).

- The right to balance and restoration
- The right to not be polluted
- The right to express itself and regenerate its bio-capacity[156]

The law states that all Bolivians have the duty to respect and uphold these rights, and it establishes state obligations to promote conservation, regulation, and community participation in environmental governance.

4.3.3 FRAMEWORK LAW OF 2012: "VIVIR BIEN" MODEL

To operationalize the 2010 law, Bolivia introduced the Framework Law on Mother Earth and Integral Development for Living Well (Ley Marco de la Madre Tierra) in 2012. This law institutionalized the "Vivir Bien" (Living Well) paradigm, a concept derived from Andean indigenous cultures, which views human well-being as inseparable from ecological harmony.[157]

Key features include:

- Creation of **state monitoring bodies** to track ecological health
- Integration of **climate resilience and biodiversity** into economic planning
- Recognition of indigenous knowledge systems in ecological governance

This law presents a unique effort to align public policy with biocentric and decolonial principles, challenging the dominance of GDP-focused growth models.

4.3.4 INSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES AND IMPLEMENTATION GAPS

Despite the visionary scope of Bolivia's legal framework, enforcement remains weak, largely due to political and economic contradictions:

- The government continues to depend heavily on extractive industries (mining, natural gas), often violating the very ecological rights it professes to uphold.
- Lack of clarity around legal standing and accountability mechanisms has made it difficult for citizens or communities to litigate on behalf of Mother Earth.
- Pablo Solón, Bolivia's former UN ambassador and a key architect of the law, has publicly criticized the government for undermining the law's intent through conflicting policies.[158]

---

[156] Law No. 071, Art. 7.
[157] Gudynas, Eduardo, "Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow," *Development*, Vol. 54, No. 4, 2011.
[158] Pablo Solón, "The Rights of Mother Earth," *Development Dialogue*, No. 61, 2012.

Moreover, courts and environmental agencies often lack training, resources, and independence to enforce these rights effectively.

4.3.5 COMPARATIVE REFLECTION

Unlike Ecuador's constitutional model, Bolivia's approach is statutory—offering more flexibility but less entrenchment. Its integration of cultural, ecological, and policy reforms makes it a unique case study in post-colonial ecological lawmaking. However, its limited implementation highlights the challenge of aligning radical environmental legislation with extractive economic structures. Legal scholars like Linda Farthing and Benjamin Kohl argue that Bolivia's ecological laws are symbolically powerful, but without political coherence and economic transition strategies, they risk becoming performative rather than transformative.[159]

Bolivia's legal recognition of Mother Earth offers a compelling model of eco-centric legislation rooted in indigenous cosmology. It expands the scope of environmental rights beyond human interests and integrates ecological well-being into national development policy. Yet, its statutory nature, coupled with enforcement limitations and economic contradictions, suggests that legal recognition alone is insufficient. For India, Bolivia's model illustrates both the promise and the pitfalls of embedding ecological rights in national law without strong institutional and political support.

4.4 NEW ZEALAND'S TE AWA TUPUA ACT (WHANGANUI RIVER)

4.4.1 INTRODUCTION

In 2017, New Zealand became the first country to pass legislation granting legal personhood to a river. The Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act recognizes the Whanganui River as a legal entity—with its own rights, duties, and liabilities.[160] Unlike Ecuador and Bolivia, New Zealand's approach does not establish a general framework for ecological rights. Instead, it adopts a customary-legal hybrid model that fuses indigenous Māori cosmology with statutory law

[159] Linda Farthing and Benjamin Kohl, "Evo's Bolivia: Continuity and Change," *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 2011.
[160] Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017 (New Zealand), Sections 13–18.

to create a rights-bearing identity for a specific natural entity. This precedent-setting law has since influenced legal developments in countries such as India, Colombia, and Australia.

4.4.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND MĀORI WORLDVIEW

The Whanganui River, or Te Awa Tupua, holds deep spiritual and ancestral significance for the indigenous Māori people, who view the river as a living being and a source of identity. The Māori expression:

"Ko au te awa, ko te awa ko au" (I am the river, and the river is me)[161]

…reflects their belief in the oneness between people and nature, where damage to the river is seen as harm to the community.

The river was the subject of over 140 years of legal dispute between the Crown and Māori iwi (tribes). The settlement represents not only ecological recognition but also a restorative act of indigenous justice.

4.4.3 LEGAL FEATURES OF THE TE AWA TUPUA ACT

The Act recognizes the Whanganui River as a legal person, with the name "Te Awa Tupua". Key provisions include:

- **Legal Personhood (Section 14)**: The river is recognized as a singular entity incorporating all its physical and metaphysical elements.
- **Guardianship (Section 18)**: Two guardians—one appointed by the Crown, and one by the Māori iwi—are designated to act on behalf of the river. This model, called **Te Pou Tupua**, ensures that both state and indigenous interests are balanced.
- **Recognition of Māori Values (Section 13)**: The legislation embeds Māori spiritual and cultural values, such as **mana**, **mauri**, and **kaitiakitanga** (guardianship), as integral to legal interpretation.

This law does not use the term "rights of nature," but it **effectively creates a structure** for nature to be represented, protected, and heard in legal proceedings.

[161] Waitangi Tribunal Report, *Whanganui River Claim (WAI 167)*, 1999.

4.4.4 INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL IMPACT

The Te Awa Tupua Act has had profound implications for environmental governance and indigenous law:

- It establishes a precedent for collaborative environmental stewardship, grounded in shared sovereignty and cultural recognition.
- It provides a model for granting legal voice to specific ecosystems, where statutory recognition is supported by local knowledge systems.
- By creating human guardians (Te Pou Tupua), it circumvents practical issues of legal standing while maintaining eco-centric representation.

Catherine Iorns Magallanes, a New Zealand legal scholar, notes that this model bridges legal personhood and indigenous cosmology, demonstrating that law can respect both biodiversity and cultural identity simultaneously.[162]

4.4.5 LIMITATIONS AND CONTEXT-SPECIFIC NATURE

While the Te Awa Tupua Act is widely celebrated, its success relies heavily on:

- The historical treaty framework in New Zealand, which supports indigenous legal claims through instruments like the Treaty of Waitangi.
- The river's singular symbolic and cultural significance, which may not apply to other ecosystems.
- Bipartisan political support and social consensus, which enabled its legislative passage.

Thus, while it offers a highly functional model, direct replication in countries without indigenous frameworks or treaty rights—such as India—requires contextual adaptation.

New Zealand's Te Awa Tupua Act represents a groundbreaking example of how legal personhood for nature can be operationalized through a respectful fusion of modern law and indigenous traditions. Though not generalizable as a rights-of-nature framework, it demonstrates how eco-centric governance can be institutionalized through customized legal design. For India, this model offers a flexible alternative to constitutional amendment—where specific ecosystems could be granted legal standing via legislative action rooted in cultural and ecological relevance.

---

[162] Catherine Iorns Magallanes, "From Rights to Responsibilities: Shifting the Burden in Environmental Law," *Victoria University of Wellington Law Review*, Vol. 45, 2014.

4.5 COMPARATIVE EVALUATION AND KEY FEATURES TABLE

4.5.1 INTRODUCTION

Having explored the distinct legal approaches adopted by Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand, it becomes essential to synthesize these experiences into a comparative framework. Each country has recognized ecological rights through different mechanisms—constitutional amendment, statutory enactment, and indigenous-customary integration—but all converge on the idea that nature should be recognized as a legal subject, not merely a resource.

This section presents a comparative evaluation of these jurisdictions across key parameters such as legal status, institutional design, implementation strategies, and cultural integration, followed by a tabular summary.

4.5.2 COMPARATIVE REFLECTIONS

1. **Legal Foundation**
    - Ecuador offers the strongest legal grounding, as rights of nature are embedded in its Constitution, making them enforceable and supreme.
    - Bolivia's model, though bold, remains statutory, meaning its environmental commitments are subordinate to economic and executive policy shifts.
    - New Zealand's Act is ecosystem-specific and rests on treaty-based recognition of indigenous rights, making it highly context-driven.
2. **Institutional Mechanisms**
    - Ecuador allows public interest litigation on behalf of nature by any citizen.
    - Bolivia provides state oversight bodies, but lacks clear enforcement tools or representation for nature in court.
    - New Zealand innovatively assigns human guardians (Te Pou Tupua) to represent the ecosystem's interests legally.
3. **Cultural Integration**
    - Ecuador and Bolivia embed indigenous cosmologies (Pachamama) within their legal frameworks.

- New Zealand fuses Māori spiritual concepts into modern legal form, offering a pluralistic, inclusive model.

4. **Implementation and Challenges**
   - All three countries face implementation hurdles, especially in reconciling ecological rights with extractive economies and weak institutional capacity.

Table 4.1: Comparative Features of Ecological Rights Recognition

Feature	**Ecuador**	**Bolivia**	**New Zealand**
Legal Form	Constitutional (2008)	Statutory (2010 & 2012)	Legislative (2017)
Entity Recognized	All of Nature (*Pachamama*)	Mother Earth as a whole	Whanganui River
Legal Status	Nature as rights-holder	Nature as collective legal subject	Legal personhood of river
Representation Model	Any citizen/community can litigate	State and citizen duties; no litigation agents	Two human guardians appointed
Indigenous Integration	High – rooted in Andean beliefs	High – Andean cosmology and "Vivir Bien"	High – rooted in Māori worldview
Enforceability	Moderate – depends on court willingness	Weak – enforcement inconsistencies	Strong – clear legal mandate via guardians
Challenges	Conflict with mining, enforcement gaps	Policy contradiction, economic reliance	Context-specific, difficult to generalize

4.5.3 LESSONS FOR INDIA

This comparison reveals that while each model is anchored in local culture and legal tradition, common threads emerge:

- Legal personhood or recognition of nature's intrinsic rights is achievable through multiple formats—constitutional, statutory, or hybrid.

- Success depends on institutional commitment, community participation, and legal clarity.
- India can adapt elements from each model rather than adopt them wholesale, particularly in crafting a region-specific legislative framework that reflects local ecological and cultural realities.

The experiences of Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand demonstrate that recognizing the rights of nature is both legally viable and philosophically grounded. They offer distinct, context-sensitive pathways to shift from environmental regulation to ecological constitutionalism. As India contemplates reforms, these global models provide instructive blueprints—but their success lies in adapting their principles to India's own constitutional, ecological, and cultural context.

4.6 RELEVANCE FOR INDIAN LEGAL CONTEXT

4.6.1 INTRODUCTION

The comparative constitutional experiences of Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand illustrate that legal recognition of nature as a rights-holder is not only theoretically sound but also legally feasible. While each of these models arises from unique historical and cultural settings, their core message is clear: nature can, and must, be recognized as a legal subject to ensure meaningful ecological justice. This section explores how lessons from these countries can be adapted to India's constitutional structure, legal traditions, and institutional landscape.

4.6.2 CONSTITUTIONAL FLEXIBILITY AND INTERPRETIVE TRADITION

India's Constitution, though silent on ecological rights, is flexible and living, often described as capable of accommodating evolving socio-legal values. The Supreme Court's expansive interpretation of Article 21 has already paved the way for the incorporation of environmental rights under the umbrella of the right to life.[163]

[163] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086; Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420.

This interpretative flexibility can be extended further, either through:

- Judicial recognition of intrinsic rights of nature via Article 21 and Directive Principles (Articles 48A, 51A(g)); or
- Legislative reform, creating statutory personhood or rights for specific ecosystems, akin to New Zealand's Te Awa Tupua model.

4.6.3 CULTURAL RESONANCE WITH INDIAN TRADITIONS

Like Andean and Māori philosophies, Indian spiritual traditions—including Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, and tribal worldviews—have long regarded nature as sacred and sentient. Rivers like the Ganga and Yamuna, forests, mountains, and animals have been revered as divine or embodied deities.[164]

This cultural and religious foundation provides strong moral and philosophical support for the idea of ecological rights. Codifying these values into constitutional or statutory law would not be alien to Indian ethos but rather a formal extension of existing societal beliefs.

4.6.4 POTENTIAL LEGISLATIVE MODELS

Given India's pluralistic legal system and history of region-specific governance, the following options are viable:

- Enactment of state-level ecological rights legislation (e.g., Uttarakhand granting legal status to the Ganga and Yamuna), drawing from the New Zealand guardianship model.
- Introduction of a central law recognizing personhood for ecologically sensitive zones, forests, rivers, or endangered ecosystems.
- Amendments to existing environmental laws (such as the Environment Protection Act, 1986) to embed ecocentric principles and standing for nature.

These approaches would allow for incremental institutionalization of ecological rights without requiring an immediate constitutional amendment.

[164] Radhakrishnan, S., *The Hindu View of Life* (HarperCollins, 1994); Upendra Baxi, "The Avatars of Indian Judicial Activism," *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*, Vol. 2, 2008.

4.6.5 STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS

India already has a specialized environmental forum—the National Green Tribunal (NGT)—which could serve as a platform for recognizing and enforcing the rights of nature, provided it is granted the jurisdiction and procedural tools to do so.[165]

To support ecological rights practically, India must also:

- Empower local self-governments (Panchayats and Municipalities) to act as guardians or trustees of nature;
- Ensure access to environmental justice for marginalized communities through public interest litigation;
- Create a National Commission on Ecological Rights to monitor compliance, mediate disputes, and draft future reforms.

4.6.6 RISKS AND CHALLENGES

While the Indian legal system has potential, challenges include:

- Conflicts between ecological rights and development goals, particularly in infrastructure and mining sectors;
- Institutional inertia and lack of environmental literacy among enforcement agencies;
- Risk of tokenism or symbolic recognition without real enforcement or budgetary support;
- Federal tensions between central and state governments over legislative competence.

Any successful adaptation must therefore be supported by political will, public participation, and inter-agency coordination.

India's legal system, constitutional philosophy, and cultural fabric provide fertile ground for integrating ecological rights into its legal order. Drawing from Ecuador's constitutional model, Bolivia's statutory innovations, and New Zealand's indigenous-legal fusion, India can craft a context-specific ecological rights framework. However, the path forward must blend tradition with innovation, and law with implementation, to ensure that ecological rights are not merely symbolic but living, enforceable, and future-oriented.

[165] The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, Sections 14–20.

4.7 LIMITATIONS OF LEGAL TRANSPLANTS

4.7.1 INTRODUCTION

While comparative constitutional models such as those from Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand provide valuable insights for the recognition of ecological rights, it is essential to recognize the limitations of legal transplants—the process of adopting legal rules or institutions from one jurisdiction and applying them to another. As legal scholars like Otto Kahn-Freund and Alan Watson have long warned, transplanting legal norms without regard to local context, political structure, and cultural alignment can lead to ineffectiveness, resistance, or unintended consequences.[166]

This section critically examines the challenges India might face if it directly adopts ecological rights models developed elsewhere, without adapting them to its unique legal, administrative, and societal framework.

4.7.2 CONTEXTUAL DIFFERENCES IN LEGAL SYSTEMS

Each of the countries examined has distinct legal systems and historical paths that allowed the recognition of nature's rights:

- Ecuador underwent constitutional reform through a participatory process influenced by indigenous movements and political consensus.
- Bolivia embraced ecological law as part of a broader post-colonial and anti-extractive discourse, though practical contradictions persist.
- New Zealand's model emerged from a treaty-based framework acknowledging indigenous Māori rights, something India lacks at the national level.

India's legal system is built on colonial-era statutes, and environmental law here is piecemeal and highly bureaucratized. Direct transplantation may clash with the administrative logic and institutional architecture of Indian governance.

[166] Kahn-Freund, O. (1974). "On Uses and Misuses of Comparative Law," *Modern Law Review*, Vol. 37, No. 1.

4.7.3 SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL REALITIES

Legal reforms in India must operate within the realities of:

- High population density and rapid urbanization
- Heavy reliance on natural resource extraction for economic development
- Institutional weaknesses and regulatory capture in environmental enforcement bodies
- Political hesitance to prioritize long-term ecological reform over short-term economic gains[167]

Unlike smaller or more homogenous societies, India's vast scale and diversity make uniform legal transplantation difficult without region-specific adaptation.

4.7.4 RISK OF SYMBOLIC RECOGNITION WITHOUT ENFORCEMENT

One of the primary critiques of ecological rights laws in Bolivia is that they are rhetorically powerful but practically weak, as enforcement mechanisms are vague or underfunded.[168] India risks following the same path if legal personhood or rights of nature are granted without clear mechanisms for representation, accountability, and redress.

For instance, the Uttarakhand High Court's 2017 declaration of legal personhood for Ganga and Yamuna rivers was later stayed by the Supreme Court, highlighting the fragility of judicial activism in the absence of institutional infrastructure and legislative clarity.[169]

4.7.5 INSTITUTIONAL INCOMPATIBILITY AND FRAGMENTATION

Ecological rights require a coordinated, whole-of-government approach—something India's fragmented environmental governance system is ill-prepared to offer. Multiple ministries (Environment, Forests, Tribal Affairs, Jal Shakti) and agencies (Pollution Control Boards, Wildlife Boards, etc.) operate with overlapping and sometimes contradictory mandates.

Without systemic institutional reform, importing a legal model that presupposes unified ecological governance could lead to jurisdictional confusion and implementation gridlock.

---

[167] Lavanya Rajamani, *Climate Change Law and Policy in India* (Oxford University Press, 2021).

[168] Linda Farthing & Benjamin Kohl, "Evo's Bolivia: Continuity and Change," *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 2011.

[169] Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014; Supreme Court Stay, 2017.

4.7.6 CULTURAL AND POLITICAL BUY-IN IS ESSENTIAL

A successful ecological rights framework depends on public legitimacy, cultural resonance, and political will. While Indian traditions do revere nature, the translation of spiritual reverence into legal enforceability remains underdeveloped.

Legal transplants imposed top-down may provoke resistance or apathy, particularly in regions where livelihoods depend on natural resource use. Therefore, any such reform must be preceded by awareness-building, community consultation, and local stakeholder engagement.

Legal transplants can be useful instruments for legal innovation, but they are not panaceas. The experiences of Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand offer inspiration, not imitation. India must resist the temptation of copy-paste constitutionalism and instead focus on developing an indigenous, adaptable, and enforceable ecological rights model. Without this contextualization, any imported framework risks becoming symbolic, unsustainable, or even counterproductive.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS & CONCLUSION

5.1 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

The research undertaken in this dissertation reveals significant conceptual and doctrinal insights about the evolution, absence, and potential for ecological rights within the Indian constitutional framework. Drawing from theoretical literature, judicial trends, and global best practices, the study establishes that India's environmental law regime remains largely anthropocentric, and ecological rights are not explicitly recognized as constitutional entitlements. The key findings are outlined below:

5.1.1 Environmental Rights Exist Only by Interpretation, Not by Text

While Article 21 of the Indian Constitution has been judicially expanded to include the right to a clean and healthy environment, this right exists only by interpretation and not by explicit constitutional text. The absence of a clear constitutional articulation of nature's intrinsic rights creates ambiguity, weak enforceability, and over-dependence on judicial discretion.

5.1.2 Judicial Innovation Has Shaped Indian Environmental Jurisprudence

The Indian Supreme Court has developed progressive doctrines such as the Polluter Pays Principle, Precautionary Principle, and Public Trust Doctrine, primarily through Public Interest Litigations (PILs). However, these doctrines are judge-made and lack legislative codification or constitutional protection, leaving them susceptible to reversal or inconsistent application.

5.1.3 Legal Personhood for Nature is Sporadic and Insecure

Indian courts have attempted to recognize natural entities as legal persons, notably in the case where the Ganga and Yamuna rivers were granted legal personhood. However, the decision was later stayed by the Supreme Court, demonstrating the vulnerability of such rulings in the absence of statutory backing. Legal personhood for nature remains symbolic unless supported by a systematic framework of legal representation and institutional enforcement.

5.1.4 Global Precedents Show Viable Alternatives

The comparative analysis revealed that countries like Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand have successfully recognized ecological rights either through constitutional amendment or legislative innovation. Ecuador's Constitution enshrines nature's rights to exist and regenerate. Bolivia's statutory model, while bold, struggles with enforcement due to competing state interests. New Zealand's Te Awa Tupua Act provides a functioning legal representation model for a river through guardianship, rooted in indigenous tradition. These models underscore that legal recognition of nature is possible through different mechanisms—each suited to its socio-political and cultural context.

5.1.5 India's Cultural Ethos Aligns with Ecocentrism

Indian spiritual and indigenous traditions, including those from Hinduism, Jainism, tribal customs, and Buddhism, have long revered nature as sacred and sentient. However, these philosophical insights have not been formally translated into constitutional or statutory law, resulting in a disconnect between cultural belief and legal practice.

5.1.6 Fragmented Governance Limits Effective Protection

India's current environmental governance is statutorily fragmented, with multiple laws and overlapping agencies leading to jurisdictional confusion and poor enforcement. The National Green Tribunal, despite being a significant forum, lacks the mandate to recognize or enforce ecological rights directly.

5.1.7 There is Public and Legal Momentum for Reform

There is increasing awareness among youth, climate activists, and legal scholars about the limitations of human-centered environmental law. Movements like Fridays for Future, rising PILs on river and forest degradation, and academic proposals for rights-of-nature legislation reflect growing public support for reform.

Summary Insight

The cumulative finding is that India is legally capable and culturally compatible with ecological rights recognition, but lacks constitutional clarity, statutory will, and institutional readiness. Without codification, judicial interpretation remains fragile and unsystematic. Hence, to ensure sustainable environmental governance and genuine ecological justice, India must transition from environmental protection to ecological rights recognition.

5.2 DOCTRINAL & POLICY GAPS IDENTIFIED

A comprehensive analysis of India's constitutional provisions, judicial interpretations, and environmental governance mechanisms reveals several critical doctrinal and policy gaps that hinder the recognition and protection of ecological rights. These gaps highlight the limitations of the current legal framework, which continues to operate under a human-centered paradigm and fails to provide a holistic, enforceable, and rights-based approach to ecological conservation.

5.2.1 Absence of Explicit Constitutional Recognition of Nature's Rights

The Indian Constitution does not recognize nature or ecosystems as independent rights-bearing entities. While Article 21 has been interpreted to include environmental concerns, it primarily protects human rights impacted by ecological degradation. There is no standalone article or provision that acknowledges the intrinsic value of nature or grants it constitutional status. This absence restricts the judiciary's ability to uphold environmental claims that do not directly relate to human injury.

5.2.2 Overreliance on Judicial Interpretation

India's environmental jurisprudence has been significantly shaped by the judiciary, particularly through expansive interpretations of the right to life. However, this overdependence on the courts has led to a lack of consistency and enforceability. Since environmental rights are not codified in the Constitution or in any comprehensive statute, their recognition often depends on the composition of the bench and the political climate at the time. This makes ecological protections vulnerable to dilution or reversal.

5.2.3 Fragmentation of Environmental Legislation

Environmental law in India is dispersed across various statutes, such as the Environment Protection Act, Water Act, Air Act, and Forest Conservation Act. These laws operate in silos and are administered by multiple agencies with overlapping and sometimes conflicting mandates. This fragmentation results in regulatory confusion, jurisdictional disputes, and weakened implementation of environmental norms. The lack of a unified ecological rights framework further aggravates this institutional disconnect.

5.2.4 Lack of Standing and Representation for Nature

Currently, only humans or recognized legal entities can approach courts with environmental grievances. Although some High Courts have granted rivers or forests legal personhood, these decisions have not translated into lasting legal mechanisms that allow nature to be consistently represented in courts. There is no formal system for appointing guardians or trustees who can act on behalf of ecosystems or non-human species, leaving a critical representational void in legal proceedings.

5.2.5 Ineffectiveness of Directive Principles and Fundamental Duties

Articles 48A and 51A(g) of the Constitution, which mandate environmental protection as a state duty and a citizen's fundamental responsibility, remain non-justiciable. These provisions cannot be enforced in court, limiting their utility in advancing ecological rights. While courts may refer to them as interpretive tools, their lack of legal force contributes to the overall weakness of constitutional environmentalism in India.

5.2.6 Inadequate Institutional Infrastructure

Agencies tasked with environmental protection—such as State Pollution Control Boards, the Central Pollution Control Board, and forest departments—often suffer from underfunding, staff shortages, and lack of technical expertise. The National Green Tribunal, although effective in many cases, has a limited mandate and cannot adjudicate constitutional matters or enforce ecological personhood. This restricts its ability to serve as a true custodian of nature's rights.

5.2.7 Disconnect Between Indigenous Ecological Knowledge and Legal Systems

India has a rich legacy of ecological wisdom embedded in tribal customs, local rituals, and community-based conservation practices. However, mainstream environmental laws rarely incorporate these indigenous systems. The absence of legal recognition for traditional ecological governance models results in their marginalization, despite their proven effectiveness and cultural relevance.

Summary Insight

India's legal and policy framework reflects an outdated, anthropocentric view of environmental protection. The absence of express constitutional rights for nature, institutional inefficiencies, fragmented statutes, and limited judicial tools combine to create a system where ecological preservation is treated as an optional concern rather than a foundational legal principle. Bridging these doctrinal and policy gaps is essential for developing a robust ecological rights regime that reflects India's constitutional values and environmental realities.

5.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL REFORM

Recognizing ecological rights as enforceable legal entitlements requires a deliberate shift in India's constitutional and statutory architecture. The anthropocentric foundations of environmental law must be realigned to accommodate the intrinsic value of nature, moving beyond the notion of nature as a passive object of regulation. Based on doctrinal analysis, judicial trends, and global precedents, the following legal reforms are proposed to embed ecological rights meaningfully into India's legal framework.

5.3.1 Introducing a Constitutional Amendment for Rights of Nature

The most impactful reform would be the insertion of a new article in the Constitution—either under **Part III (Fundamental Rights)** or **Part IV (Directive Principles of State Policy)**—explicitly recognizing the rights of nature. This amendment could acknowledge ecosystems, rivers, forests, and species as legal persons or subjects with inherent rights to exist, thrive, and regenerate. Such a provision would provide the judiciary with a strong textual basis to protect nature even when no direct human injury is involved. It would also enable citizens and public institutions to

file petitions on behalf of ecosystems, transforming environmental justice from a derivative human right into a foundational ecological mandate.

5.3.2 Enacting a National Ecological Rights Act

Pending a constitutional amendment, the government could introduce a standalone legislation titled **"Ecological Rights (Recognition and Protection) Act"**. This act would define the scope of ecological rights, list the entities covered (such as rivers, wetlands, forests, coastal zones), and provide for:

- Legal standing for nature
- Appointment of ecological guardians or trustees
- Creation of ecological ombudsman positions
- Procedures for redressal and restoration in case of harm

This Act would serve as an umbrella framework to unify India's fragmented environmental statutes under a single rights-based regime, while remaining compatible with existing laws.

5.3.3 Recognizing Legal Personhood for Specific Ecosystems

India could adopt a **gradual, region-specific approach** by conferring legal personhood on ecologically critical or culturally significant ecosystems such as the Ganga, Yamuna, Western Ghats, or the Sundarbans. Through either judicial orders or state-specific legislation, these ecosystems can be declared as rights-bearing entities, with local authorities and civil society appointed as legal custodians.

This model would mirror the Te Awa Tupua Act of New Zealand and allow India to pilot ecosystem-specific legal frameworks before scaling them nationally.

5.3.4 Amending Existing Environmental Laws

Short-term reform can also be achieved by amending key environmental statutes—such as the Environment Protection Act, Wildlife Protection Act, and Water and Air Acts—to incorporate explicit references to ecological rights, legal standing for nature, and accountability mechanisms for violations. These amendments should integrate principles of eco-centrism, intergenerational equity, and the rights of nature into operational clauses, rather than just in the preamble or objectives.

5.3.5 Formalizing Public Participation in Ecological Governance

Legal reforms should also empower citizens and local communities to play a direct role in the enforcement of ecological rights. This can be achieved by codifying the right to environmental information, public hearings, community-driven restoration initiatives, and ecological impact assessments.

By institutionalizing mechanisms for community involvement and litigation on behalf of ecosystems, the law would encourage bottom-up ecological democracy rather than top-down regulation.

5.3.6 Enabling Legal Standing Through Public Interest Litigation

Although the Supreme Court has allowed PILs in environmental matters, there is a need to codify the right of nature to be represented through citizens, NGOs, and institutions. The law should remove procedural barriers such as the requirement to show personal injury or affected status, allowing any bona fide petitioner to advocate for nature's rights in court.

5.3.7 Establishing Constitutional Environmental Commissions

To monitor the enforcement of ecological rights, a constitutional body similar to the National Human Rights Commission can be established. This **National Commission for Ecological Justice** would be tasked with:

- Receiving complaints regarding ecological rights violations
- Auditing government projects and policies for ecological compliance
- Issuing annual reports to Parliament on the state of India's ecosystems

Such a body would help institutionalize ecological accountability and support judicial and legislative reforms.

Transforming India's environmental governance into a rights-based system for nature requires legal innovation, political courage, and societal participation. A combination of **constitutional, statutory, and administrative reforms** is necessary to move beyond human-centered protections and toward ecological justice. These reforms would not only strengthen environmental protection but also affirm India's moral and constitutional commitment to sustainable living and planetary stewardship.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL AND JUDICIAL REFORM

While legal and constitutional recognition of ecological rights is critical, effective realization of these rights depends equally on the capacity, coordination, and responsiveness of institutions and the judiciary. India's fragmented and overburdened institutional framework often fails to deliver timely and meaningful environmental justice. This section outlines actionable institutional and judicial reforms to operationalize ecological rights and ensure their consistent enforcement.

5.4.1 Strengthening the National Green Tribunal (NGT)

The National Green Tribunal, as India's specialized environmental court, plays a central role in environmental adjudication. However, its current mandate limits it to civil matters under specific environmental statutes. To transform the NGT into a true guardian of ecological rights, the following steps are proposed:

- Expand its jurisdiction to cover constitutional and rights-based ecological claims
- Empower it to hear suo moto cases where nature's interests are threatened
- Authorize the appointment of ecological experts and guardians to represent the interests of non-human entities
- Establish ecological benches in every zone, particularly in regions with vulnerable ecosystems

These reforms would enable the NGT to become a more accessible, dynamic, and rights-oriented forum for ecological justice.

5.4.2 Institutionalizing Ecological Guardianship

To ensure that nature's interests are legally represented, institutional structures must be created for ecological guardianship. These may take the form of:

- Government-appointed trustees for rivers, forests, and protected ecosystems
- Community-based monitoring bodies with legal authority to intervene or report ecological harm
- Public-private partnerships to promote ecosystem restoration and protection
- Designated ombudsman offices at the district or state level for ecological complaints

Formalizing these guardianship roles would bridge the gap between legal recognition and practical enforcement, particularly in regions where the judiciary cannot intervene quickly.

5.4.3 Enhancing Capacity of Regulatory Agencies

Environmental enforcement agencies such as the Central and State Pollution Control Boards, Forest Departments, and Biodiversity Authorities often operate with limited staff, outdated technology, and minimal public engagement. Capacity enhancement must include:

- Recruitment and training of ecologically literate professionals
- Digitization of monitoring and reporting mechanisms
- Performance audits and transparency measures
- Integration of traditional ecological knowledge into institutional decision-making

Strengthening these institutions will ensure better implementation of laws and reduce dependence on litigation as the primary enforcement tool.

5.4.4 Empowering Local Governance Structures

Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), municipal corporations, and tribal councils must be empowered to act as first responders and custodians of local ecosystems. This can be achieved through:

- Delegating authority for environmental approvals and restoration plans
- Granting fiscal autonomy and access to green development funds
- Establishing local environment protection committees with civil society participation
- Including ecological criteria in village and urban development planning

Localized governance fosters accountability, community stewardship, and context-sensitive decision-making—hallmarks of an effective ecological rights regime.

5.4.5 Issuing Judicial Guidelines on Ecocentric Interpretation

The Supreme Court and High Courts should issue formal judicial guidelines encouraging an ecocentric interpretation of constitutional and statutory provisions. These may include:

- Recognizing the intrinsic value of ecosystems independent of human utility
- Encouraging precautionary and restorative orders in all environmental disputes
- Allowing legal standing for ecosystems and species through appointed representatives
- Referring unresolved or technically complex ecological matters to the NGT or scientific panels

Such guidelines would ensure uniformity and coherence across jurisdictions and promote a rights-based environmental jurisprudence.

5.4.6 Creating an Integrated Ecological Governance Framework

India needs a multi-level governance mechanism that facilitates coordination between ministries, courts, local bodies, and civil society. A centralized portal or institution for ecological rights monitoring could be created, tasked with:

- Consolidating ecosystem-related data and reports
- Tracking compliance with ecological rights obligations
- Publishing an annual "State of Nature" report for public accountability
- Liaising with international environmental bodies for knowledge exchange

This integration would strengthen policy coherence and enable India to meet both national and global environmental goals through a rights-based lens.

Institutional and judicial reform is indispensable to realizing the constitutional vision of ecological justice. By enhancing capacity, decentralizing authority, institutionalizing guardianship, and reforming judicial interpretation, India can build a **robust, responsive, and inclusive system** for the protection of nature's rights. These reforms, coupled with legal codification, would transform ecological protection from a policy objective into an enforceable legal and moral commitment.

5.5 FUTURE PROSPECTS AND RESEARCH PATHWAYS

As ecological crises intensify globally and domestically, the urgency for deeper legal transformation becomes evident. While this dissertation has proposed a normative and institutional framework for recognizing ecological rights in India, the conversation is far from complete. Numerous unexplored areas, emerging developments, and interdisciplinary intersections demand further academic inquiry and policy exploration. This section outlines the most promising future prospects and research directions for scholars, lawmakers, and environmental stakeholders working toward embedding ecological rights in India's legal and governance systems.

5.5.1 Developing a Model Draft for an Ecological Rights Law

There is an immediate need to formulate a comprehensive, implementable **model draft bill** that recognizes nature as a legal subject. Future research can focus on preparing a detailed framework with defined rights for ecosystems, rules of standing, appointment of guardians, adjudicatory forums, and modes of ecological restitution. Such a draft could serve as a reference for state

legislatures or the Parliament and facilitate consultations with civil society and environmental organizations.

5.5.2 Comparative Study of Indian Tribal and Indigenous Ecological Ethics

India's forest-dwelling and tribal communities possess rich traditions of environmental stewardship, many of which resonate with the principles underlying ecological rights. Future research could investigate these customary laws and practices to identify how they can be formally integrated into mainstream legal discourse. Case studies from states like Odisha, Chhattisgarh, Nagaland, and the Northeast could offer valuable insights into community-led ecological governance models.

5.5.3 Empirical Research on Environmental Justice Movements

Empirical research can be undertaken to examine the role of climate activism, youth movements, and grassroots campaigns in shaping the public discourse around ecological justice. Quantitative and qualitative analysis of litigation trends, media coverage, policy shifts, and citizen mobilization can help identify the societal momentum behind ecological rights and inform strategies for legislative advocacy.

5.5.4 Institutional Feasibility Studies

Before large-scale legal reforms can be implemented, institutional feasibility studies should be conducted to assess the **readiness and responsiveness of Indian environmental bodies**. Research can focus on the capacity of institutions like the National Green Tribunal, State Pollution Control Boards, and Forest Departments to accommodate a rights-based ecological framework. This will also help determine what structural or procedural changes are needed to align enforcement bodies with a new legal vision.

5.5.5 Interdisciplinary Integration with Climate Science and Economics

There is significant scope for interdisciplinary research linking ecological rights with climate science, environmental economics, and public health. For instance, future studies could examine how recognizing the rights of rivers might aid flood mitigation, groundwater recharge, and sustainable agriculture. Similarly, ecological economics can offer new metrics for valuing ecosystems based on their inherent worth rather than utilitarian outputs.

5.5.6 Exploring International Legal Cooperation

As ecological rights become part of global discourse, India has the opportunity to take a leading role in international forums. Future legal research can explore India's participation in global treaties, climate negotiations, and biodiversity conventions, and how ecological rights can be advanced through soft law instruments, bilateral treaties, or model laws promoted by international bodies.

5.5.7 Use of Technology and Data-Driven Governance

Future innovation in ecological rights implementation can be supported by technology. Research in this area could explore how GIS mapping, AI-driven ecological assessments, satellite surveillance, and mobile platforms can enhance legal enforcement, ecological monitoring, and public engagement. Legal frameworks will need to adapt to such advancements to remain relevant and responsive.

The recognition of ecological rights is not a destination but the beginning of a transformative legal journey. As this dissertation has shown, both opportunity and responsibility lie ahead. Future research will play a critical role in **operationalizing ecological rights**, bridging legal theory with real-world application, and ensuring that India's environmental governance evolves into a rights-based, participatory, and sustainable system. The road ahead must be paved with collaboration between academics, policymakers, communities, and nature itself.

5.6 CONCLUSION

This dissertation set out to explore a fundamental question: Can ecological rights be recognized as constitutional rights in India? The research, analysis, and comparative study across multiple chapters have shown that the answer is not only affirmative, but also urgent and necessary in the face of worsening ecological degradation, climate disruption, and institutional inaction.

The study began by tracing the philosophical and legal underpinnings of environmental rights in Indian and global contexts. It revealed that while Indian jurisprudence—especially under Article 21—has made significant contributions to environmental protection, its framework remains anthropocentric and judicially dependent. There is no constitutional recognition of nature as a legal subject with intrinsic rights. Environmental protection exists only as an extension of human rights, not as a self-standing ecological entitlement.

Through doctrinal analysis and critical evaluation of Indian judicial activism, it became clear that court-led innovations, although powerful, are not structurally sustainable in the absence of constitutional text, legislative backing, and institutional follow-through. India's current environmental statutes are fragmented, implementation is inconsistent, and enforcement bodies are often under-resourced.

The comparative analysis of Ecuador, Bolivia, and New Zealand offered real-world legal models that have embraced the rights of nature through constitutional amendment, legislative innovation, and indigenous-customary integration. These models demonstrated that ecological rights are not merely theoretical but can be embedded into legal systems and backed by governance mechanisms. At the same time, the study also highlighted the limitations of legal transplants, emphasizing the need for context-sensitive adaptations within India's diverse legal, cultural, and political landscape.

The final chapter consolidated these insights into a roadmap for reform—offering suggestions for constitutional amendment, statutory enactments, institutional restructuring, and judicial guidance. It further identified key gaps in policy and doctrine and proposed forward-looking research directions to build a stronger foundation for eco-centric governance in India.

In essence, this dissertation argues that recognizing ecological rights as constitutional rights is not just a legal imperative—it is a moral, cultural, and existential necessity. It offers India a transformative opportunity to reaffirm its constitutional commitment to justice—not only for its people, but also for the living systems that sustain life itself.

The path ahead calls for bold vision, collaborative leadership, and informed public engagement. If undertaken with seriousness and sincerity, India can become a global pioneer in environmental constitutionalism—creating a legal system where nature is not protected simply because it serves humans, but because it is a rightful subject of justice in its own standing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books & Edited Volumes

- Baxi, U. (1994). *Inhuman Wrongs and Human Rights*. Har-Anand Publications.
- Baxi, U. (2008). *The Avatars of Indian Judicial Activism*. Indian Journal of Constitutional Law, 2, 156–183.
- Boyd, D. R. (2017). *The Rights of Nature: A Legal Revolution That Could Save the World*. ECW Press.
- Cullinan, C. (2002). *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice*. Green Books.
- Divan, S., & Rosencranz, A. (2001). *Environmental Law and Policy in India* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Guha, R., & Gadgil, M. (1995). *Ecology and Equity: The Use and Abuse of Nature in Contemporary India*. Penguin India.
- Rajamani, L. (2021). *Climate Change Law and Policy in India*. Oxford University Press.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (1994). *The Hindu View of Life*. HarperCollins India.
- Shukla, V. N. (2022). *Constitution of India* (13th ed.). Eastern Book Company.

Journal Articles & Reports

- Farthing, L., & Kohl, B. (2011). Evo's Bolivia: Continuity and Change. *Latin American Perspectives*, 38(1), 123–128.
- Gudynas, E. (2011). The Rights of Nature: Ethical and Institutional Considerations. *Ecological Economics*, 70(11), 2080–2086.
- Gudynas, E. (2011). Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow. *Development*, 54(4), 441–447.
- Ghosh, S. (2019). Strengthening Environmental Rule of Law in India. *UNEP Environmental Rule of Law Report*.
- Iorns Magallanes, C. (2014). From Rights to Responsibilities: Shifting the Burden in Environmental Law. *Victoria University of Wellington Law Review*, 45, 341–366.
- Solón, P. (2012). The Rights of Mother Earth. *Development Dialogue*, 61, 15–22.
- Watson, A. (1974). *Legal Transplants: An Approach to Comparative Law*. Scottish Academic Press.

Legal Judgments (India)

- M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.
- M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath, (1997) 1 SCC 388.
- Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420.
- Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India, AIR 1996 SC 2715.
- A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu, AIR 1999 SC 812.
- Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India, (1996) 3 SCC 212.
- T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India, (1996) 9 SCC 709.
- Animal Welfare Board of India v. A. Nagaraja, (2014) 7 SCC 547.
- Mohd. Salim v. State of Uttarakhand, W.P. (PIL) No. 126 of 2014.
- Sterlite Industries v. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board, NGT Appeal No. 17/2018(SZ).
- Muthulakshmi v. State of Tamil Nadu, NGT Order, OA No. 21/2018(SZ).

International Laws and National Acts

- Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador (2008), Chapter 7.
- Law of the Rights of Mother Earth (Bolivia), Law No. 071 of 2010.
- Framework Law on Mother Earth and Integral Development, Law No. 300 of 2012.
- Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017, New Zealand.
- The Constitution of India, 1950 (Articles 21, 48A, 51A(g)).
- The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
- The Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981.
- The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974.
- The Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.
- The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010.

Reports and Tribunal Documents

- Waitangi Tribunal Report. (1999). *Whanganui River Claim (WAI 167)*. Government of New Zealand.
- Earth Law Center. (2011). *Vilcabamba River Case Summary*.