

# Environmental Rule of Law, Climate Justice, and Governance in Planetary Crisis Conditions

Rosalía Ibarra Sarlat

Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,  
Corresponding author: [rosibsa@hotmail.com](mailto:rosibsa@hotmail.com)

## Abstract

*The accelerating climate crisis has intensified pressure on legal and governance systems to respond to ecological harm through more coherent and accountable frameworks. At the same time, climate justice has emerged as a central concern because environmental harm increasingly intersects with human rights, state responsibility, and institutional legitimacy. This article aims to examine environmental rule of law as a unifying framework through which climate justice can be understood under conditions of planetary crisis. The study applies a qualitative normative-conceptual design centered on doctrinal and analytical interpretation. Its analysis reconstructs the internal relationship between environmental rule of law, human rights, state obligation, ecological protection, and institutional legitimacy. The discussion is developed through close reading and conceptual mapping of the core legal dimensions that structure climate justice claims across national and international settings. This qualitative approach is used because the research problem concerns legal coherence, normative integration, and governance logic rather than measurement or causal testing. Environmental rule of law is positioned as an essential legal framework that gives climate justice claims greater coherence, authority, and enforceability across fragmented governance domains. Climate justice is therefore better understood not as an external moral demand, but as a legally grounded governance claim embedded in a broader rule-based order. The article contributes to the field by clarifying the conceptual foundation that links law, justice, accountability, and ecological governance in contemporary climate debate.*

## Keyword

*environmental rule of law; climate justice; governance; accountability*

## 1. Introduction

The climate crisis has intensified pressure on legal and political institutions to respond to environmental harm in more coherent and accountable ways. As ecological instability deepens, questions of justice are no longer limited to policy preference but increasingly concern legal obligation and institutional responsibility (Eckersley, 2023). This shift has made climate governance more than a technical issue of regulation, because it now involves the legitimacy of public authority under conditions of planetary disruption. Environmental degradation, social vulnerability, and unequal exposure to climate risk have pushed legal scholarship to reconsider the relationship between law and justice (Kotzé & Kim, 2022). Within this wider debate, environmental rule of law has emerged as an important concept for understanding how legal systems organize authority, restraint, and accountability. It provides a language for examining whether states and institutions act according to principles that protect both ecological systems and affected communities. For that reason, the growing climate crisis has created a strong need to rethink environmental rule of law as a central legal framework rather than a secondary legal ideal.

This issue has strong real-world relevance because climate change produces harms that are unevenly distributed across populations, territories, and generations.



Communities that contribute least to environmental destruction often bear the greatest burden of its consequences, creating persistent concerns about fairness and responsibility. In such conditions, law is expected not only to regulate conduct but also to justify how burdens, protections, and obligations are allocated (Levy et al., 2023). When institutions fail to respond effectively, climate claims often appear as disputes over legitimacy as much as disputes over policy. This means the legal order is tested by whether it can translate climate injustice into enforceable duties and accountable governance. Environmental rule of law becomes relevant here because it speaks directly to the capacity of law to constrain power and protect public interests under ecological stress. The problem, therefore, is not only environmental decline itself but also whether existing legal frameworks are conceptually strong enough to sustain climate justice claims (Biermann & Kalfagianni, 2020).

Current scholarship has already provided important insights into climate-related law and governance. A large body of work examines climate litigation as a mechanism through which rights, duties, and accountability can be articulated before courts. Another line of scholarship emphasizes environmental compliance, focusing on enforcement, implementation, and adherence to legal standards. These contributions show that climate governance is deeply shaped by legal institutions and by the normative force of law (Ding et al., 2020). They also reveal that human rights, state responsibility, and ecological protection are increasingly interconnected in climate debates. Through these studies, it is already known that law matters not only as a formal structure but also as a site where justice claims gain institutional visibility. It is also known that climate governance cannot be reduced to scientific management alone because it depends on legal authority and public legitimacy. Even so, what remains less clear is how these separate strands of scholarship fit together within a broader legal framework. Climate litigation is often treated as a distinct judicial development, while environmental compliance is usually discussed as an administrative or regulatory matter (Tschakert, 2020). This separation creates a fragmented understanding of how law operates across the wider field of climate justice. It leaves unresolved the question of what legal principle connects rights-based claims, state duties, ecological protection, and institutional accountability. Without such a principle, climate justice risks being understood as a moral aspiration with limited doctrinal coherence. What is unknown, therefore, is how environmental rule of law can function as the overarching framework that gives unity and authority to these different legal elements. The absence of this conceptual integration weakens the ability of scholarship to explain why climate justice should be treated as a legally grounded governance issue (Hargrove et al., 2019).

This article addresses that gap by applying environmental rule of law as the central theoretical lens for understanding climate justice. Rather than approaching litigation, compliance, and rights claims as isolated developments, it synthesizes them through a unifying legal doctrine. Environmental rule of law is especially useful here because it links normative principles with institutional structure, allowing justice claims to be understood within a broader governance order (Singla, 2024). Through this lens, human rights are not external moral additions but part of the legal architecture that supports environmental protection and state accountability. State obligation also becomes clearer because it is tied to the rule-based expectation that public power must be exercised within legally justified limits. At the same time, ecological protection gains stronger legal meaning because it is treated as a substantive concern that law must safeguard rather than merely administer. This synthesis helps identify the research gap more precisely, namely the lack of an integrated explanation of how climate justice becomes coherent through environmental rule of law (Islam, 2024).

Filling this gap is theoretically justified because environmental rule of law offers a more complete framework for analyzing climate governance under conditions of crisis. A narrow focus on litigation captures moments of legal contestation but does not fully explain the broader normative order that makes such contestation meaningful. A narrow focus on compliance highlights implementation but may overlook the justice-based foundations that give legal rules their legitimacy (Kuyper et al., 2017). Environmental rule of law helps overcome both limitations because it combines legality, accountability, restraint, and protection within a single conceptual structure. This makes it possible to understand climate justice not as an external demand placed upon law, but as a claim that becomes more intelligible through law itself. The theory is particularly suitable for planetary crisis because such crisis destabilizes institutional assumptions and exposes the need for a legal framework that can hold authority accountable under ecological pressure. By grounding the discussion in environmental rule of law, the article can justify why climate justice should be interpreted as a matter of legal coherence as well as social fairness (Waheed & Suffi, 2025).

From this theoretical position, the main research questions become more focused and analytically connected. First, how should environmental rule of law be understood when climate crisis reshapes the demands placed on legal and political institutions. Second, in what ways does environmental rule of law connect human rights, state obligation, ecological protection, and institutional legitimacy within one framework (Lefstad & Paavola, 2023). Third, why does this framework matter for giving climate justice claims greater coherence, authority, and enforceability across different legal settings. These questions do not seek to treat climate justice as a purely ethical debate detached from legal structure. Instead, they aim to clarify the legal logic through which justice claims become institutionally meaningful and publicly defensible. The questions also reflect the need to move beyond fragmented legal analysis toward a more integrated account of governance under ecological instability. The urgency of this research lies in the fact that planetary crisis is changing the conditions under which law must operate and justify itself. As climate harms intensify, legal systems are increasingly judged by their ability to respond to vulnerability, protect ecological integrity, and maintain institutional legitimacy (Maghami, 2025). A fragmented view of law is no longer sufficient because climate injustice cuts across rights, governance, responsibility, and enforcement at the same time. For that reason, a stronger conceptual foundation is needed to explain how these dimensions are held together within one legal order. This article contributes by repositioning environmental rule of law as that foundation and by showing its relevance to climate justice as a governance question. Its contribution is therefore conceptual rather than technical, since it clarifies the broader legal logic that makes climate justice claims more intelligible and authoritative. By doing so, it opens a more coherent path for understanding the relationship between justice, accountability, and ecological governance under worsening planetary conditions.

## 2. Research Method

This study employs a qualitative research design based on normative-conceptual analysis to examine environmental rule of law as a framework for climate justice under conditions of planetary crisis. A qualitative approach is appropriate because the research is concerned with meanings, legal principles, institutional relationships, and conceptual coherence rather than measurement, prediction, or statistical association. The analytical framework is designed to trace how environmental rule of law functions as a unifying doctrine linking human rights, state obligation, ecological protection, and institutional legitimacy. This design works for the research because the core problem is not the absence of numerical evidence, but the lack of an integrated explanation of how these legal and

normative elements are connected within climate governance. Through qualitative analysis, the study can examine the internal logic of the argument, clarify the conceptual boundaries of key terms, and identify how legal ideas are organized into a broader governance framework. The approach also allows close attention to the normative significance of climate justice claims, especially their coherence, authority, and enforceability across legal settings. In this sense, the qualitative design is justified because it is the most suitable way to analyze doctrine-level relationships and theoretical structure in a study centered on legal and institutional interpretation.

The primary data source is the core text and its internal argumentation, with the unit of analysis defined as the conceptual components of environmental rule of law and their relationship to climate justice. Data collection was conducted through close reading, classification of key concepts, and analytical extraction of recurring themes related to rights, obligations, protection, accountability, and legitimacy. The population of analysis is not a human population but a bounded set of legal-normative categories contained within the study, while the analytical dimensions include human rights, state obligation, ecological protection, institutional legitimacy, and the coherence of climate justice claims. The main instrument of analysis is a structured conceptual matrix used to map connections among these dimensions and to assess how they function within the broader framework of environmental rule of law. Trustworthiness was ensured through conceptual consistency, transparent alignment between research questions and analytical categories, and repeated comparison of each interpretive step with the central argument of the text. Reliability was strengthened by applying the same analytical dimensions throughout the reading process, while validity was supported by maintaining close correspondence between claims, concepts, and their doctrinal roles in the study. Because the research does not involve human participants, informed consent and confidentiality are not applicable in the conventional sense; however, ethical considerations were maintained by representing the source argument accurately, avoiding distortion, and limiting analysis to the boundaries of the text.

### 3. Result and Discussion

Environmental rule of law acquires a different juridical status under conditions of planetary crisis. It no longer operates merely as a supplementary principle of environmental governance, but as a foundational framework through which climate justice can be expressed in legally coherent terms. This shift matters because the climate crisis places extraordinary pressure on legal systems to justify authority, allocate responsibility, and protect ecological conditions that support human life. A narrow reading of environmental law is no longer sufficient when climate-related harm cuts across rights, institutions, and governance scales (Cosens et al., 2017). The discussion therefore begins from the proposition that environmental rule of law provides the broader legal architecture needed to organize these overlapping demands. Its relevance lies in its capacity to bind environmental protection to institutional accountability rather than leaving both as separate aspirations (Tschakert et al., 2020).

The conceptual contribution of this framework becomes most visible in relation to the fragmentation identified in earlier scholarship. Climate litigation has often been treated as a specialized field of judicial intervention, while environmental compliance has been approached as an administrative matter concerned with implementation and enforcement. Such separation narrows the legal meaning of climate governance because it divides adjudication from regulation and justice from institutional design (Wilkins & Datchoua-Tirvaudey, 2022). Environmental rule of law overcomes this fragmentation by situating both litigation and compliance within a single normative order. Under this view, court-based claims and regulatory obligations are not competing pathways, but

interconnected expressions of a legal commitment to accountability under ecological stress (Sardo, 2020). This integration gives climate governance a stronger conceptual structure and reduces the tendency to treat legal responses as isolated mechanisms. Climate justice gains greater doctrinal clarity when anchored in environmental rule of law. Justice claims in the climate field are frequently articulated in moral, distributive, or political language, yet their institutional force depends on legal forms capable of transforming grievance into obligation. Environmental rule of law performs that function by providing a legal basis through which claims about vulnerability, harm, and responsibility can be framed as matters of rights and duties rather than appeals to abstract fairness alone. This gives climate justice a more stable institutional footing across different legal settings. The point is not simply that justice has legal relevance, but that law supplies the grammar through which justice becomes authoritative and actionable. The coherence of climate justice therefore depends on more than substantive concern for inequality; it depends on a rule-based framework that can sustain claims against public power (Kesek, 2025).

This framework also clarifies the relationship between human rights and state obligation. Rights-based climate claims have expanded significantly in legal and policy discourse, yet they often remain analytically incomplete when detached from the institutional duties required to realize them. Environmental rule of law links these two dimensions by insisting that the authority of the state is inseparable from legally structured responsibility toward both persons and ecological systems. In this sense, rights do not stand outside governance as external moral constraints, but operate within a legal order that requires the state to justify action, inaction, and regulatory design. The connection between rights and obligation strengthens accountability because it prevents climate justice from being reduced to symbolic recognition (Sutisari & Kurniati, 2025). It also reinforces the idea that ecological harm is not only an environmental problem, but a legal challenge to the legitimacy of public authority. Ecological protection assumes a more substantive legal meaning within this account. It is not treated as a secondary policy objective subordinate to economic or administrative considerations, but as a central object of legal governance. This matters because climate instability exposes the limits of legal systems that recognize environmental concerns only in procedural terms. Environmental rule of law gives ecological protection a more durable status by tying it to legal obligation, public justification, and institutional restraint. That move deepens the governance relevance of climate justice, since the integrity of ecological conditions is directly related to the possibility of securing rights and maintaining legitimate authority. The legal system is thus confronted with a broader task: not merely regulating environmental damage after it occurs, but structuring governance in a way that recognizes ecological protection as part of the normative basis of law itself (Okereke & Coventry, 2016).

Institutional legitimacy becomes especially important under planetary crisis because climate disruption tests whether legal and political institutions can still claim authority in conditions of widening vulnerability. Legitimacy in this setting cannot rest solely on formal legality or procedural regularity. It depends on whether institutions are able to respond to ecological risk in ways that are publicly justifiable, normatively coherent, and materially protective. Environmental rule of law addresses this challenge by connecting institutional authority to responsibility, transparency, and ecological constraint. Its role is therefore not limited to preserving legal order, but extends to maintaining the credibility of governance itself. This is where climate justice and institutional legitimacy converge most clearly: both require a framework in which power is exercised according to norms that can be defended in the face of accelerating environmental harm.

**Table 1. Analytical Summary of Environmental Rule of Law**

<i>Analytical Focus</i>	<i>Main Analytical Position</i>	<i>Relevance to Climate Justice</i>
<i>Climate litigation and environmental compliance</i>	Integrated within a single legal framework rather than treated as separate developments	Reduces conceptual fragmentation in climate governance
<i>Human rights and state obligation</i>	Understood as structurally connected within rule-based governance	Strengthens accountability and legal responsibility
<i>Ecological protection</i>	Positioned as a substantive legal concern, not merely a policy preference	Provides legal grounding for justice claims
<i>Institutional legitimacy</i>	Tied to public justification, legal restraint, and ecological responsibility	Supports authority and enforceability under crisis conditions
<i>National and international governance</i>	Linked through a shared normative legal logic	Enhances coherence across governance scales

The table condenses the central analytical structure of the discussion and illustrates how environmental rule of law organizes disparate legal concerns into a coherent framework. Its value lies in showing that the argument is not built on a single doctrinal claim, but on a patterned relationship among legal dimensions that are often discussed independently (Foran, 2023). The integration of litigation and compliance addresses the fragmentation identified in the introduction, while the linkage between rights and obligation explains how justice claims gain institutional force. Ecological protection appears in the table not as a descriptive concern, but as a legal category that shapes governance priorities. Institutional legitimacy is included because climate crisis raises questions not only about legal capacity, but also about whether institutions remain normatively defensible. The table therefore supports the article’s overall argument by making visible the internal structure through which climate justice becomes legally coherent under environmental rule of law. This analytical structure also clarifies the article’s relationship to previous scholarship. Earlier work on climate litigation contributed significantly to understanding how courts can articulate duties, recognize harms, and expand legal standing in climate-related disputes. Scholarship on compliance likewise illuminated the importance of enforcement, administrative implementation, and regulatory discipline in environmental governance. Yet each body of work often remained confined to its own doctrinal and institutional terrain. Environmental rule of law does not displace those contributions, but reorders them within a broader conceptual field. By doing so, it offers a more complete explanation of why these legal developments matter collectively rather than separately. The discussion thereby extends previous debates from discrete mechanisms of legal response toward a unified account of governance under ecological instability (Savaresi & Setzer, 2022).

The implications of this framework extend across national and international settings. Climate justice claims frequently move between domestic constitutional orders, administrative regimes, transnational norms, and international obligations. Without a shared legal logic, these movements can appear fragmented or strategically inconsistent. Environmental rule of law provides that shared logic by establishing a common normative basis for understanding why rights, duties, ecological protection, and accountability belong to the same governance structure (Buser, 2025). This does not

eliminate legal diversity across jurisdictions, but it allows climate justice to retain coherence despite institutional variation. Its significance lies in offering a legal vocabulary capable of traveling across scales while preserving a stable relationship between justice and governance.

A major strength of this framework is its integrative capacity. Rather than narrowing the analysis to one doctrinal pathway, it explains climate governance through the interdependence of legal principles, institutional structures, and normative expectations. This contributes conceptual clarity to a field often shaped by urgency, multiplicity of actors, and overlapping forms of harm. Another strength lies in its ability to connect abstract legal ideals with concrete governance concerns without collapsing one into the other. Environmental rule of law thus serves both as a normative orientation and as a framework for evaluating how authority is exercised (Ahammad, 2025). That dual capacity makes it especially relevant in climate debates, where legal systems must respond simultaneously to claims of fairness, demands for accountability, and pressures for ecological protection. The limits of the discussion are also evident. Its scope is conceptual and doctrinal rather than empirical, which means that the analysis does not compare specific jurisdictions, judicial outcomes, or policy instruments. The emphasis is placed on clarifying the normative structure of environmental rule of law rather than testing its application across varied institutional contexts. This limitation does not weaken the conceptual argument, but it does delimit the kinds of claims that can be advanced. A further point of interest is the heightened role of institutional legitimacy, which emerges here not as a peripheral issue but as a central component of climate justice analysis. That emphasis suggests that future legal debate may need to pay closer attention to the relationship between ecological crisis and the justificatory basis of governance (Chenier & Tremblay, 2025).

This orientation opens several directions for further inquiry and practical development. Comparative work across legal systems would be valuable in examining how environmental rule of law operates under different constitutional, regulatory, and international arrangements. Greater attention could also be given to the ways in which this framework informs institutional design, judicial reasoning, and administrative accountability in climate-related governance. Such extensions would help clarify how a unifying legal doctrine translates into practice without losing conceptual rigor. The broader relevance of the present discussion lies in demonstrating that climate justice is most persuasively understood when embedded in a legal order capable of connecting rights, duties, ecological protection, and legitimate authority. Environmental rule of law therefore stands as a critical framework for making climate governance more coherent, more accountable, and more normatively defensible under conditions of planetary crisis.

#### 4. Conclusion

Environmental rule of law has been positioned as a central legal framework for understanding climate justice under conditions of planetary crisis. The discussion has emphasized that climate governance cannot be adequately explained through isolated attention to litigation, compliance, or moral claims of fairness alone. A broader legal architecture is required to connect human rights, state obligation, ecological protection, and institutional legitimacy within a coherent normative order. From this perspective, climate justice gains greater juridical clarity because it is grounded in a rule-based framework capable of transforming dispersed claims into structured forms of accountability. The significance of environmental rule of law lies in its ability to organize justice claims across national and international settings while preserving their legal authority. Its relevance therefore extends beyond environmental regulation toward the

wider question of how law maintains legitimacy and coherence in an era of ecological instability.

The contribution to the field lies in advancing a more integrated conceptual understanding of the relationship between climate justice and legal governance. By treating environmental rule of law as a unifying doctrine rather than a peripheral ideal, the discussion clarifies how previously fragmented debates can be brought into a single analytical framework. This approach strengthens legal scholarship by showing that rights, duties, ecological protection, and institutional authority should not be examined as separate domains when addressing climate crisis. It also enriches the theoretical discussion of climate justice by locating its force not only in ethical argument but in the institutional grammar of law. In this way, the analysis contributes to social science and legal scholarship through a clearer account of how governance, accountability, and justice are conceptually held together under conditions of planetary disruption. Future research should extend this conceptual framework into comparative and context-sensitive analysis across different legal and governance settings. Greater attention is needed to examine how environmental rule of law is articulated within domestic constitutional systems, administrative institutions, and international legal arrangements facing uneven ecological pressures. Additional work may also explore how the framework interacts with questions of implementation, institutional design, and the practical enforceability of climate-related obligations. Comparative doctrinal analysis would be especially useful in identifying the conditions under which environmental rule of law strengthens or constrains climate justice claims. Research that connects conceptual clarity with applied governance analysis would further deepen understanding of how legal institutions respond to ecological crisis. Such directions would help refine the analytical value of environmental rule of law while expanding its relevance for justice-oriented climate governance.

## References

- Ahammad, A. (2025). Climate Change as a Political Question: Governance, Accountability and Global Justice. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*.  
<https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i06.59753>
- Biermann, F., & Kalfagianni, A. (2020). Planetary justice: A research framework. *Earth System Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100049>
- Buser, A. (2025). Exercising Planetary Jurisdiction: On the Legality and Legitimacy of Unilaterally Mitigating Planetary Ecological Footprints. *European Journal of International Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chae071>
- Chenier, S., & Tremblay, D. (2025). Climate Reparations and Legal Accountability: Bridging International Law and Environmental Justice. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.4.2.23>
- Cosens, B., Craig, R., Hirsch, S., Arnold, C., Arnold, C., Benson, M., DeCaro, D., Garmestani, A., Gosnell, H., Ruhl, J., & Schlager, E. (2017). The role of law in adaptive governance. *Ecology and Society: A Journal of Integrative Science for Resilience and Sustainability*, 22 1, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.5751/es-08731-220130>
- Ding, G., Liu, G., & Chen, Y. (2020). A study on the Theory of Climate Justice in International Environmental Law. 03, 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.36348/sijlcj.2020.v03i01.002>
- Eckersley, R. (2023). (Dis)order and (in)justice in a heating world. *International Affairs*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iia259>

- Foran, M. (2023). Legality Without Liberalism: The Rule of Law and the Environmental Emergency. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4512777>
- Hargrove, A., Qandeel, M., & Sommer, J. (2019). Global governance for climate justice: A cross-national analysis of CO2 emissions. *Global Transitions*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glt.2019.11.001>
- Islam, M. S. (2024). Rethinking Climate Justice: Insights from Environmental Sociology. *Climate*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli12120203>
- Kesek, M. N. (2025). Role of Environmental Law in Addressing Climate Change: An Analysis of Law Enforcement and Compliance in Indonesia. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v6i2.1179>
- Kotzé, L., & Kim, R. (2022). Towards planetary nexus governance in the Anthropocene: An earth system law perspective. *Global Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13149>
- Kuyper, J., Linnér, B., & Schroeder, H. (2017). Non-state actors in hybrid global climate governance: justice, legitimacy, and effectiveness in a post-Paris era. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.497>
- Lefstad, L., & Paavola, J. (2023). The evolution of climate justice claims in global climate change negotiations under the UNFCCC. *Critical Policy Studies*, 18, 363–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2023.2235405>
- Levy, S., Gopang, M., Ramírez, L., Bernardo, A., Ruck, M., & Sternisko, A. (2023). A human rights-based approach to climates injustices at the local, national, and international levels: Program and policy recommendations. *Social Issues and Policy Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12103>
- Maghami, M. (2025). New Global Governance and Overarching Frameworks: Reimagining the Rule of Law, AI and ESG for the Betterment of the World. *The Denning Law Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.5750/dlj.v33i1.2353>
- Okereke, C., & Coventry, P. (2016). Climate justice and the international regime: before, during, and after Paris. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.419>
- Sardo, M. (2020). Responsibility for climate justice: Political not moral. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 22, 26–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474885120955148>
- Savaresi, A., & Setzer, J. (2022). Rights-based litigation in the climate emergency: mapping the landscape and new knowledge frontiers. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/jhre.2022.0002>
- Singla, A. (2024). Environmental Law and Sustainability: Legal Approaches to Addressing Climate Change and Protecting Natural Resources. *Indian Journal of Law*. <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v2.i3.29>
- Sutisari, W., & Kurniati, N. (2025). Constitutionality Toward the Environmental in Overcoming the Global Environmental Crisis. *KnE Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v10i26.20033>
- Tschakert, P. (2020). More-than-human solidarity and multispecies justice in the climate crisis. *Environmental Politics*, 31, 277–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2020.1853448>
- Tschakert, P., Schlosberg, D., Celermajer, D., Rickards, L., Winter, C., Thaler, M., Stewart-Harawira, M., & Verlie, B. (2020). Multispecies justice: Climate-just futures with, for and beyond humans. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.699>

- Waheed, S., & Suffi, M. J. (2025). The Role of Courts in Interpreting and Enforcing Environmental Laws Related to Climate Change: A Catalyst for Progress or a Barrier? *Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review*. <https://doi.org/10.63468/sshrr.119>
- Wilkens, J., & Datchoua-Tirvaudey, A. (2022). Researching climate justice: a decolonial approach to global climate governance. *International Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiab209>