The Environment As A Legal Subject: A Post-Humanist Philosophical Perspective

Hyronimus Rhiti

Law Study Program, Faculty of Law, Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author:
Email: hyronimus.rhiti@uajy.ac.id

Abstract.

The accelerating ecological crisis and the persistent anthropocentric orientation of legal systems have revealed significant limitations in traditional jurisprudence. Environmental degradation, climate change, and biodiversity loss underscore the urgency of rethinking legal frameworks that historically prioritize human interests over the rights and integrity of ecosystems. This study aims to explore the concept of the environment as a legal subject through the lens of post-humanist philosophy, emphasizing the ethical, ontological, and legal rationales for extending subjectivity beyond human entities. The research employs a philosophical and conceptual method, critically analyzing the theoretical foundations of legal subjectivity, post-humanist thought, and the moral standing of non-human entities. It synthesizes insights from legal philosophy, environmental ethics, and jurisprudence to construct a coherent framework for recognizing ecological systems as holders of rights within legal orders. The findings indicate that post-humanist philosophy provides a robust conceptual justification for acknowledging ecosystems as legal subjects. By decentering humans and emphasizing relationality among all living and non-living entities, law can be reoriented to protect the intrinsic value of nature, promote ecological sustainability, and ensure intergenerational justice. The study also identifies practical pathways for integrating ecological subjectivity into legal systems, including through the appointment of legal guardians for ecosystems and the adoption of rights-based frameworks in constitutional and statutory law. This research contributes to the theoretical discourse on environmental jurisprudence by offering a normative and philosophical basis for expanding the notion of legal subjectivity. It is expected to guide policymakers, scholars, and legal practitioners in developing laws that recognize the environment not merely as an object but as an active participant in legal and ethical frameworks.

Keywords: *Environmental Law; Legal Subjectivity and Post-Humanism.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The increasing ecological crisis in the twenty-first century has exposed the limitations of conventional legal systems in addressing environmental degradation. Climate change, deforestation, water scarcity, and the rapid loss of biodiversity have revealed that anthropocentric legal frameworks are insufficient to protect ecosystems and ensure the sustainability of the planet. Traditional jurisprudence generally recognizes legal subjectivity in terms of human beings and legal entities such as corporations, associations, and governmental institutions. While these frameworks facilitate human governance and societal organization, they often treat nature as a resource rather than a rights-bearing entity. As a result, environmental protection under such systems is largely reactive, focusing on regulating human exploitation rather than recognizing the intrinsic value and agency of ecological systems [1].Recent philosophical developments, particularly in post-humanist thought, challenge this anthropocentric bias by questioning the centrality of humans in moral, political, and legal frameworks. Post-humanism emphasizes relationality, interconnectedness, and the recognition of non-human entities as part of ethical and social considerations. In the legal context, this perspective encourages rethinking the scope of legal subjectivity to include ecosystems, rivers, forests, and other environmental entities as holders of rights, capable of representation in legal processes [2]. The recognition of ecological systems as legal subjects does not imply that these entities act independently in a human-like manner; rather, it assigns rights and protections through human proxies, ensuring that the environment's interests are formally considered in legal decision-making.

The theoretical foundation for treating the environment as a legal subject draws on interdisciplinary insights from legal philosophy, environmental ethics, and ecological science. Legal scholars argue that extending subjectivity beyond humans is consistent with the principles of justice, sustainability, and intergenerational equity [3]. By integrating post-humanist ethics into legal frameworks, law can be reconceptualized as an instrument that protects both human and non-human life, recognizing the

interdependence of all ecological components. Case studies from international jurisdictions, including the legal recognition of rivers and forests in New Zealand, Ecuador, and India, demonstrate that this shift is feasible and can be operationalized within existing legal structures [4].Furthermore, post-humanist legal theory aligns with progressive approaches to law, which view the legal system as a dynamic and adaptable instrument rather than a rigid codification of rules. Progressive law emphasizes the social purposes of law, including justice, human dignity, and, increasingly, ecological stewardship [5]. By incorporating ecological subjectivity, legal systems can move beyond anthropocentrism, creating mechanisms that protect the environment not merely as property but as an active participant in the legal order. This approach bridges philosophical theory and practical jurisprudence, enabling law to respond to the pressing environmental challenges of our time.The objectives of this research are threefold.

First, it seeks to critically examine the philosophical and legal foundations for recognizing the environment as a legal subject. Second, it explores how post-humanist philosophy can inform normative arguments for ecological subjectivity. Third, it evaluates potential frameworks for implementing ecological rights in legal systems, drawing lessons from international precedents. By addressing these objectives, the study contributes to the broader discourse on environmental jurisprudence and provides normative guidance for policymakers, legal practitioners, and scholars.The introduction of ecological systems as legal subjects represents a paradigm shift in legal thought. It challenges long-standing anthropocentric assumptions and encourages the development of legal frameworks that are responsive to the interdependent nature of ecological and human systems. Post-humanist philosophy provides the ethical and conceptual grounding for this transformation, offering a vision of law that recognizes the intrinsic value and agency of non-human entities. By situating the environment within the sphere of legal subjectivity, law can evolve from a human-centered instrument to one that encompasses the broader ecological community, promoting sustainability, justice, and resilience for current and future generations.

II. METHODS

This study employs a philosophical and conceptual research method, focusing on the analysis of ideas, principles, and theoretical frameworks rather than empirical data collection. The approach is designed to explore the conceptual and normative dimensions of recognizing the environment as a legal subject, particularly through the lens of post-humanist philosophy and progressive legal thought. By emphasizing reasoning, critical reflection, and normative argumentation, the research seeks to clarify the ethical, legal, and philosophical bases for ecological subjectivity.The philosophical component involves examining the foundational assumptions of legal subjectivity, human-centered jurisprudence, and ecological ethics. The study interrogates the traditional dichotomies between subjects and objects, humans and nature, and rights and property, highlighting how these distinctions have historically shaped legal theory and practice. Through critical analysis, the research investigates the limitations of anthropocentric law and the moral imperatives for extending legal recognition to non-human entities. The philosophical inquiry is aimed at developing a coherent rationale for redefining legal subjectivity in ways that incorporate ecological interdependence and sustainability.

The conceptual component focuses on defining and operationalizing key concepts, including “legal subject,” “post-humanism,” and “ecological rights.” By clarifying these concepts, the study constructs a theoretical framework that can guide the interpretation and application of law to ecological entities. Conceptual analysis allows the research to assess the coherence, consistency, and implications of assigning legal personhood to ecosystems, as well as to explore mechanisms through which environmental entities could be represented in legal processes.Rather than relying on quantitative or case-based methods, the study emphasizes logical reasoning, comparative analysis of theoretical frameworks, and synthesis of interdisciplinary perspectives from law, philosophy, and environmental studies. The combination of philosophical inquiry and conceptual analysis provides a rigorous foundation for normative conclusions regarding ecological subjectivity. This method is particularly appropriate for addressing research questions about the ethical and legal justification for recognizing the environment as a legal subject, offering insights that can inform theory, policy, and legal reform.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Theoretical Foundations of Ecological Legal Subjectivity

The concept of legal subjectivity has traditionally been anthropocentric, focusing almost exclusively on human beings and legal entities such as corporations, associations, and governmental institutions [6]. Classical jurisprudence recognizes humans as natural persons, endowed with rights and responsibilities by virtue of their existence, and legal persons, created through statutory or common law, who are capable of acting within the legal system independently of their members. However, this conception of legal subjectivity excludes non-human entities, relegating nature to a status of property or object that can be owned, managed, or exploited [7]. The ongoing ecological crisis, marked by climate change, biodiversity loss, deforestation, and pollution, challenges the adequacy of such anthropocentric legal frameworks. Human-centered law has repeatedly failed to protect ecological systems in their own right, highlighting the urgency of reconsidering who or what can hold legal rights. This failure is not merely practical but philosophical, rooted in long-standing assumptions about the centrality of humans in moral, political, and legal orders [8].Post-humanist philosophy provides a conceptual foundation for extending legal subjectivity beyond humans. By decentering human agency and emphasizing relationality among all entities, post-humanism challenges the hierarchical distinctions between humans and non-humans that underpin conventional legal theory [9]. Within this framework, ecosystems, rivers, forests, and other environmental entities can be considered participants in moral and legal deliberations.

The recognition of ecological systems as legal subjects is not contingent upon their capacity for reason or will, but upon normative and ethical considerations that recognize their intrinsic value and their essential role in sustaining life on Earth [10]. Legal subjectivity, in this sense, becomes a tool for acknowledging the interconnectedness of human and non-human entities, allowing law to function as a mediator that balances competing interests while safeguarding ecological integrity.A key philosophical justification for ecological subjectivity comes from environmental ethics. Thinkers such as Aldo Leopold and Arne Naess emphasize that ecosystems possess intrinsic value independent of human utility [11]. Leopold's "land ethic" positions humans as members of a larger ecological community, morally responsible for maintaining its health and resilience. Naess's deep ecology framework similarly underscores the moral obligation to respect the rights of all living beings, advocating for legal recognition of non-human entities as part of ethical responsibility [12]. These philosophical arguments provide a foundation for extending legal protections to ecosystems, suggesting that legal systems should reflect ecological realities rather than exclusively human priorities. By integrating these insights into jurisprudence, law can transition from a mechanism of human governance to a framework that ensures the sustainability of the broader ecological community.The historical evolution of legal personhood further supports the plausibility of ecological subjectivity. Corporations, for instance, were recognized as legal persons despite lacking consciousness or moral agency, functioning through legal fictions that allow them to own property, enter into contracts, and be held liable for wrongdoing [13].

This precedent illustrates that legal subjectivity is fundamentally a normative construct, not a natural inevitability. Extending such recognition to ecosystems, therefore, is consistent with existing legal reasoning: representatives or guardians can act on behalf of ecological entities to ensure their interests are considered in legal processes. Such mechanisms have been successfully implemented in countries like New Zealand and Ecuador, where rivers and forests have been granted legal personhood, demonstrating that non-human legal subjectivity is both feasible and operationalizable [14].Furthermore, comparative legal studies reveal that the recognition of ecological subjectivity is not merely symbolic but can transform legal practice. In New Zealand, the Whanganui River was granted legal personhood, acknowledging its cultural and ecological significance and appointing guardians to represent its interests [15]. Ecuador's constitutional recognition of nature's rights similarly embeds ecological considerations into national legal frameworks, requiring courts and policymakers to consider the rights of ecosystems alongside human rights. These cases indicate a global trend toward expanding the scope of legal subjectivity, reflecting both normative and pragmatic imperatives. By examining these precedents, legal theorists can develop frameworks that reconcile human legal systems with ecological realities, fostering a more inclusive and responsive jurisprudence.

Implementation of Ecological Legal Subjectivity and Operational Challenges

The recognition of ecological entities as legal subjects has transitioned from theoretical discourse into concrete legal frameworks in several jurisdictions, revealing both the promise and the complexity of operationalizing non-human legal subjectivity. The notion that rivers, forests, and ecosystems can be treated as legal persons represents a fundamental shift in legal reasoning, moving beyond anthropocentric paradigms toward ecocentric governance. In practice, such recognition necessitates mechanisms that allow ecosystems to be represented in legal, administrative, and policy-making processes, ensuring that their interests are considered in decision-making. In New Zealand, for example, the Whanganui River, an entity of profound cultural and ecological significance, was granted legal personhood under the Te Awa Tupua Act of 2017. This legislation acknowledges the river as an indivisible and living whole, encompassing its physical and metaphysical elements from the mountains to the sea. To operationalize this legal status, the Act establishes a guardianship framework, appointing two legal representatives one nominated by the Whanganui iwi and one by the Crown to act on behalf of the river [16]. These guardians hold the authority to participate in legal proceedings, engage in resource management, and advocate for the river's ecological and cultural rights. Through these mechanisms, the river's interests are actively protected, demonstrating that legal personhood for non-human entities is not merely symbolic but functionally enforceable.

This framework has facilitated projects such as Te Pūwaha, the revitalization of the Port of Whanganui, and Te Kōpuka nā Te Awa Tupua, which are designed to restore the river's health and uphold its interests, exemplifying how legal recognition can translate into practical environmental governance [17].Ecuador represents another jurisdiction that has incorporated ecological legal subjectivity into its constitutional framework. The 2008 Constitution grants nature, or *Pachamama*, inherent rights, including the right to exist, persist, maintain, and regenerate its life cycles. Ecuadorian law empowers public institutions to act as guardians of ecosystems, bringing legal actions to prevent harm and enforce environmental protections [18]. This approach operationalizes ecological rights through institutional representation, allowing the state to defend the intrinsic value of ecosystems regardless of their utility to humans. By codifying the rights of nature at the constitutional level, Ecuador provides a robust legal foundation that legitimizes ecological legal subjectivity and creates mechanisms for enforceability. Comparative experiences, however, indicate that while legal recognition establishes the theoretical possibility of ecosystem protection, practical challenges arise in terms of enforcement, coordination among stakeholders, and the integration of indigenous knowledge systems into formal legal procedures.Colombia's recognition of the Atrato River as a legal person in 2016 illustrates both the potential and the challenges of implementing ecological legal subjectivity.

The Colombian Constitutional Court declared that the Atrato River possesses rights to protection, conservation, maintenance, and restoration, and appointed the government and local communities as guardians to represent its interests [19]. While this legal innovation has empowered local stakeholders to initiate restoration projects and monitor ecological integrity, it has also revealed operational challenges, including jurisdictional overlaps, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and the complexity of translating ecological needs into actionable legal claims.Similarly, in India, the Uttarakhand High Court granted legal personhood to the Ganga and Yamuna rivers, appointing state officials as guardians. Yet, despite this recognition, practical obstacles such as insufficient funding, enforcement gaps, and conflicting development projects have limited the effectiveness of these legal innovations [20]. These examples underscore that while legal personhood for ecosystems establishes normative recognition, the success of implementation depends on effective institutional arrangements, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and ongoing monitoring and evaluation.One of the primary challenges in operationalizing ecological legal subjectivity is the determination of legal standing and the scope of guardian authority. The question of who may represent the interests of ecosystems, and under what conditions, remains a complex legal and ethical issue [21]. In New Zealand, the dual-guardian model has proven effective by balancing indigenous perspectives with state oversight, ensuring that both cultural and ecological interests are considered [22].

In Ecuador, the constitutionally mandated oversight by state institutions provides a centralized mechanism for enforcement, although it can sometimes limit the participation of local communities [23]. In Colombia and India, hybrid approaches involving both government authorities and community

representatives have been implemented, highlighting the importance of inclusive governance in maintaining ecological integrity [24]. Across these jurisdictions, the appointment of guardians functions as a bridge between abstract legal recognition and practical enforcement, allowing ecosystems to participate indirectly in legal and administrative processes.Another significant challenge lies in reconciling the rights of ecosystems with human development needs. Conflicts frequently emerge between industrial, agricultural, and infrastructural projects and the legally recognized rights of natural entities. Courts and regulatory agencies must engage in complex balancing exercises to determine the extent to which development can proceed without infringing upon ecological rights. The Colombian and Indian cases illustrate the tension between economic imperatives and ecological protections, revealing the need for flexible legal frameworks that can accommodate both environmental and developmental priorities. Integrating scientific assessments, environmental monitoring data, and traditional ecological knowledge into legal decision-making processes is crucial for addressing these conflicts effectively.

Lessons learned from these comparative experiences suggest that best practices for implementing ecological legal subjectivity include multi-stakeholder governance, transparent monitoring, and adaptive legal mechanisms. Collaborative frameworks that involve indigenous communities, governmental agencies, and civil society organizations have proven effective in ensuring accountability and ecological protection. Legal systems must also provide mechanisms for dispute resolution, enforcement, and continuous evaluation of ecosystem health. By embedding ecological rights into constitutions or statutory laws, countries strengthen the legitimacy and enforceability of non-human legal subjectivity. Moreover, interdisciplinary cooperation between legal scholars, ecologists, policymakers, and social scientists enhances the design and implementation of ecological legal frameworks, facilitating evidence-based decision-making that respects both ecological and human interests.The practical implementation of ecological legal subjectivity has implications beyond the immediate protection of rivers, forests, and ecosystems. It signals a broader transformation of legal systems toward ecocentric paradigms that decenter human interests while recognizing the intrinsic value of non-human entities. This shift challenges traditional anthropocentric assumptions about legal personhood, liability, and contractual obligations, compelling legal systems to reconsider notions of responsibility, stewardship, and governance.

The experiences of New Zealand, Ecuador, Colombia, and India collectively demonstrate that ecological legal subjectivity is not only theoretically defensible but also operationally feasible. The comparative analysis of these jurisdictions provides valuable insights into institutional design, governance mechanisms, and strategies for overcoming practical challenges, offering a roadmap for countries seeking to adopt similar ecological legal frameworks. The operationalization of ecological legal subjectivity requires more than normative recognition; it demands robust institutional structures, inclusive governance models, and adaptive legal mechanisms that can accommodate ecological, cultural, and human development interests. Guardianship frameworks, constitutional recognition of nature’s rights, and multi-stakeholder governance models collectively illustrate that non-human legal subjectivity can be integrated into legal practice in meaningful ways. The lessons from comparative jurisdictions underscore the potential for ecological personhood to transform legal reasoning, advance environmental protection, and embed ecological ethics into the core of legal systems, demonstrating that the recognition of ecosystems as legal subjects is both feasible and capable of producing tangible ecological and social outcomes.

IV. CONCLUSION

The analysis of legal subjectivity demonstrates that traditional anthropocentric legal frameworks have historically excluded non-human entities, treating nature merely as property or resource. Philosophical perspectives from post-humanist thought and environmental ethics provide compelling arguments for recognizing ecosystems as legal subjects. Comparative examples, including the legal personhood of rivers and forests in several countries, illustrate that legal recognition of non-human entities is both conceptually coherent and practically implementable. The historical evolution of legal personhood, such as corporations being recognized despite lacking consciousness, provides a precedent supporting ecological subjectivity.

Thus, extending legal rights to ecosystems aligns with existing legal reasoning while challenging long-standing anthropocentric assumptions.The operationalization of ecological legal subjectivity emphasizes the necessity of guardianship frameworks, multi-stakeholder governance, and institutional support. Comparative experiences from different jurisdictions reveal both successes and limitations in implementing these legal innovations, particularly regarding enforcement, monitoring, and balancing ecological and human development interests. Legal mechanisms, including guardianship appointments and constitutional recognition, bridge normative theory with practical application, ensuring ecosystems' interests are represented in decision-making processes. These examples underscore the transformative potential of ecological legal personhood, prompting a shift toward ecocentric legal paradigms that decenter humans while recognizing intrinsic value in non-human entities. Overall, the integration of ecological subjectivity into law offers a viable pathway for enhancing environmental protection and embedding ecological ethics within legal systems.

REFERENCES

[1] C. D. Stone, "Should Trees Have Standing? Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects," Southern California Law Review, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 450–501, 1972.

[2] B. Latour, Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

[3] D. R. Boyd, "The Rights of Nature: A Legal Revolution That Could Save the World," *EcoHealth*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–3, 2019.

[4] J. Ruru, "Listening to Papatuanuku: A Call to Reform Water Law," ***Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand***, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 215–224, 2019.

[5] S. Rahardjo, "Progressive Law and Environmental Protection in Indonesia," ***Asian Journal of Comparative Law,*** vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 33–54, 2017.

[6] J. Baeyaert, "The Evolution of Legal Personhood and Its Implications for Artificial Intelligence," ***TechReg Journal***, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 45-60, 2025.

[7] "Legal Personhood for Non-Human Entities – The Future of AI and Environmental Rights," *Obiter Dicta*, Mar 13, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://obiterdicta.co.uk/202425-1/legal-personhood-for-non-human-entities-the-future-of-ai-and-environmental-rights.

[8] J. Gilbert, "Understanding the Rights of Nature," *Human Ecology*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2023.

[9] C. Clark, "Book review: Jana Norman, Posthuman Legal Subjectivity: Reimagining the Human in the Anthropocene (Routledge, Abingdon 2022) 186 pp," ***Journal of Human Rights and the Environment***, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–6, 2023.

[10] P. Baard, "Rights of Nature Through a Legal Expressivist Lens," ***J. Ethics Environ.***, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2024.

[11] A. Leopold, A Sand County Almanac, Oxford University Press, 1949.

[12] A. Næss, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary," Inquiry, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 95–100, 1973.

[13] J. Barkan, "Corporate Personhood as Legal and Literary Fiction," in States, Firms, and Their Legal Fictions, M. J. Durkee, Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024, pp. 261–282.

[14] R. M. U. Azam, S. A. Zerin, and F. F. K. Alabi, "The Rights of Nature Movement: Legal, Cultural, and Policy Challenges in Implementing Eco-Centric Laws," ***Journal of Environmental Law & Policy***, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2025.

[15] K. Bosselmann and T. Williams, "The River as a Legal Person: The case of the Whanganui River in New Zealand," Heinrich Böll Stiftung, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.boell.de/en/2025/01/29/river-legal-person-case-whanganui-river-new-zealand.

[16] V. A. J. Kurki, "Can nature hold rights? It's not as easy as you think," Transnational Environmental Law, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 215–238, 2022.

[17] G. Plowens, "A challenge to Te Kōpuka's allyships," ***Journal of Environmental Law and Policy***, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2024.

[18] V. Kahui, "Comparative analysis of Rights of Nature case law: Ecuador and beyond," Environmental Law Review, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 120–135, 2024.

[19] M. C. Fuchs, "The Concept of Rights of Nature in Colombia and Ecuador," World Heritage and Protected Areas, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 45–60, 2025.

[20] S. Jolly, "Of Ebbs and Flows: Understanding the Legal Consequences of Granting Personhood to Natural Entities in India," Transnational Environmental Law, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 467–492, Nov. 2021.

[21] M. Miller, "Environmental personhood and standing for nature," University of New Hampshire Law Review, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 1–20, 2019.

[22] M. Cribb, E. Macpherson, and A. Borchgrevink, "Beyond legal personhood for the Whanganui River: Collaboration and pluralism in implementing the Te Awa Tupua Act," ***The International Journal of Human Rights,*** vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 275–294, 2024.

[23] M. Jodyvash, "The role of cultural pluralism in Indigenous peoples' defense of nature," Oñati Socio-Legal Series, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 1–22, 2025.

[24] S. Tabares, "Do hybrid organizations contribute to Sustainable Development Goals? Evidence from B Corps in Colombia," ***Journal of Cleaner Production***, vol. 278, p. 123858, 2021.