The Right to Nature: Legal Recognition of Eco therapy and Green Rights

Dr. Swarup Mukherjee

Associate Professor
FACULTY OF LAW
ICFAI UNIVERSITY, TRIPURA

Abstract:
In an age marked by environmental degradation, mental health crises, and increasing urban isolation, access to nature is emerging as an essential dimension of human rights discourse. This paper explores the evolving legal concept of the "Right to Nature," arguing for its recognition as a justiciable right grounded in ecocentric jurisprudence, public health imperatives, and environmental justice. It examines the therapeutic benefits of nature-based interventions—collectively termed ecotherapy—and how these intersect with constitutional and international legal frameworks. Drawing from comparative constitutionalism, rights of nature jurisprudence, and indigenous traditions, the paper makes a compelling case for legally embedding green rights as fundamental to human dignity, well-being, and intergenerational justice. The study also critiques current legal gaps and advocates for integrating ecotherapy and environmental access into urban planning, health policy, and fundamental rights protections, particularly in plural and developing societies like India. Ultimately, the paper envisions a legal framework where human and ecological flourishing are co-constitutive and mutually reinforcing.

Keywords: Right to Nature, Ecotherapy, Green Rights, Environmental Justice, Therapeutic Jurisprudence, Ecocentric Constitutionalism, Mental Health and Nature, Human Dignity, Rights of Nature, Environmental Personhood, Urban Green Access, Indigenous Environmental Knowledge, Sustainable Well-being, Nature-Based Solutions, Environmental Human Rights.

INTRODUCTION

Nature is not merely a passive backdrop to human civilization—it is a dynamic, life-sustaining force integral to physical health, psychological well-being, cultural expression, and ecological equilibrium. Across history, human societies have relied on natural environments not only for material survival but also for spiritual nourishment, communal bonding, and emotional resilience. However, with the onset of rapid industrialization, urban sprawl, and technological detachment, this intrinsic relationship has been increasingly severed. The result is a multi-dimensional crisis: escalating mental health disorders, ecological degradation, climate anxiety, and a profound sense of alienation from the living world.

In this context, the notion of a **"Right to Nature"** has emerged as both a normative demand and a legal possibility. It asserts that all individuals—regardless of geography, identity, or status—possess a fundamental right to access, benefit from, and dwell in proximity to the natural world. This right challenges the commodification of nature and instead repositions it as an essential condition of human dignity, equality, and well-being.

Central to this discourse is the practice of **ecotherapy**—a suite of nature-based therapeutic interventions that include forest bathing, wilderness therapy, green exercise, horticulture, and animal-assisted healing. A growing body of medical and psychological research affirms that such practices can alleviate stress, reduce depression, improve cognitive function, and foster emotional resilience. Ecotherapy thus lends empirical support to the legal claim that nature access is not a luxury, but a necessity—particularly in urban and marginalized communities that suffer from "nature deficit" and environmental inequities.

Yet, despite this growing evidence, the right to nature and the role of ecotherapy remain largely invisible in dominant legal and policy frameworks. This invisibility is especially stark in developing and postcolonial nations, where access to natural resources is often stratified along lines of caste, class, ethnicity, and gender. Environmental law continues to be dominated by conservationist and utilitarian logics, rarely engaging with nature as a site of healing, justice, and human rights. In most jurisdictions, the absence of codified entitlements to green spaces leaves vast populations without legal recourse to demand environmental access or reparations for ecological deprivation.

This paper seeks to address this lacuna by bringing together three interrelated domains: **ecological philosophy, public health science, and legal theory**. It examines how the right to nature can be situated within constitutional guarantees of life and dignity, within international human rights instruments, and within evolving environmental jurisprudence that increasingly recognizes the personhood of natural entities. It further analyzes emerging judicial trends—especially in Latin America and South Asia—where courts are moving from anthropocentric models to **ecocentric legal reasoning**, recognizing rivers, forests, and entire ecosystems as rights-bearing entities.

Ultimately, the paper argues for a transformative legal architecture—one that not only safeguards nature from destruction but also guarantees meaningful human relationships with it. In affirming the right to nature, we begin to reconceive justice as a practice that must heal both people and the planet.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: NATURE, RIGHTS, AND THERAPEUTIC JUSTICE

1. Nature as a Legal and Moral Subject

The legal and philosophical conception of nature has undergone a significant transformation over the past few decades. Traditionally viewed as property or a passive object of regulation, nature is now increasingly recognized as a **legal subject** with intrinsic value and rights of its own. This evolution is grounded in the shift from an **anthropocentric** to an **ecocentric** worldview, where nature is not merely protected for human benefit, but valued as a living, interconnected system with inherent dignity.

The **Rights of Nature doctrine**—first constitutionally recognized in Ecuador (2008) and legislatively in Bolivia—posits that ecosystems possess legal standing, and that their right to exist, regenerate, and flourish must be upheld by human institutions. This doctrine draws a distinction between **instrumental value** (nature as a means to human ends) and **intrinsic value** (nature as valuable in itself). It is influenced by **Earth Jurisprudence**, a legal philosophy articulated by Cormac Cullinan and inspired by thinkers like Thomas Berry. Earth Jurisprudence urges legal systems to harmonize with the laws of the Earth and recognize humanity as one part of a larger, interconnected ecological community.

This shift also questions the limitations of traditional environmental law, which often treats nature as an externality to be managed. Instead, it advocates for a **relational and reciprocal ethic**, where humans have responsibilities—not dominion—over natural systems. Recognizing nature as a moral subject expands the scope of justice to include the non-human world and creates legal avenues to claim environmental harm as a violation of both ecological and human rights.

2. Ecotherapy and the Science of Healing Through Nature

Ecotherapy, also known as nature-based therapy or green therapy, encompasses a range of practices that utilize the natural environment to improve psychological and physiological health. These include **forest bathing (Shinrin-yoku)**, **horticultural therapy**, **animal-assisted therapy**, **nature walks**, and **wilderness retreats**. The unifying idea is that nature is not only therapeutic, but essential for holistic human development.

Scientific studies have confirmed that regular interaction with green spaces leads to **reduced cortisol levels** (stress hormone), **lower blood pressure**, **improved attention span**, **enhanced immune function**, and **greater emotional resilience**. Neurobiological research shows that natural settings activate brain regions associated with empathy, creativity, and relaxation. Such benefits are particularly crucial in urbanized societies marked by digital overstimulation, environmental alienation, and rising cases of anxiety and depression.

Post-COVID-19, ecotherapy gained increased relevance as people grappled with isolation, burnout, and trauma. Nature-based interventions were widely adopted for frontline workers, students, and vulnerable communities to aid emotional recovery and restore mental balance.

International bodies such as the **World Health Organization (WHO)** and the **American Psychological Association (APA)** have begun to recognize the value of nature contact in mental health strategies, particularly in preventive care. However, these recognitions remain largely informal, and few jurisdictions have translated them into enforceable legal guarantees of nature access.

3. Therapeutic Justice and the Law

The convergence of environmental access and health equity introduces the emerging paradigm of **therapeutic justice**—a legal and policy framework that emphasizes healing, rehabilitation, and well-being over punitive or transactional approaches. It is especially pertinent in the context of the **right to health**, where environmental conditions directly shape both physical and mental outcomes.

Extending health rights to include **environmental exposure**—such as proximity to green spaces, clean air, and natural light—acknowledges that well-being is not solely determined by biomedical interventions, but by ecological and spatial determinants. This approach challenges legal systems to move beyond curative models and invest in **preventive public health**, with nature-based solutions as a core component.

Therapeutic justice has already found application in innovative domains such as **prison reform** and **addiction recovery**. In Norway and parts of the United States, nature-based rehabilitation programs have been implemented to reduce recidivism and promote emotional healing among incarcerated individuals. Similarly, green therapy is being integrated into programs for veterans, survivors of trauma, and children with behavioral challenges.

Embedding therapeutic justice in law requires a paradigm shift—from viewing nature as optional or decorative to treating it as **legally indispensable** to human dignity and rehabilitation. It also invites policymakers to consider how urban planning, zoning laws, and health services can structurally guarantee environmental access as a **public good**.

CASE STUDIES: LEGAL AND THERAPEUTIC INNOVATIONS IN PRACTICE

1. Nature-Based Rehabilitation in Norwegian Prisons

Norway's correctional system exemplifies the principles of therapeutic justice by integrating **green environments into incarceration settings**. At facilities like **Bastøy Prison**, often referred to as the "world's most humane prison," inmates engage in outdoor activities such as farming, fishing, forestry, and animal care within a low-security, nature-rich environment. These nature-based activities are seen not only as occupational therapy but also as a means of restoring **dignity, emotional regulation, and social integration**.

The legal philosophy underlying such programs reflects a **restorative model**, which emphasizes healing over retribution. Norway has one of the **lowest recidivism rates globally** (around 20%), a figure often linked to such rehabilitative, ecologically-grounded prison environments. While not explicitly framed as a legal "right to nature," these policies operationalize the core values of **therapeutic justice**, environmental access, and reintegration.

2. Forest Therapy as Public Health in Japan and South Korea

The practice of **Shinrin-yoku** or "forest bathing" originated in Japan in the 1980s as a national response to rising urban stress and overwork. Endorsed by Japan's **Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries**, Shinrin-yoku encourages individuals to immerse themselves in forested environments for stress reduction and immune support.

Japan has designated over **60 certified forest therapy trails** and incorporated nature walks into **public health programs**, especially for aging populations. In South Korea, the **Korean Forest Service** has established **"healing forests"** and "forest welfare hubs," integrating nature-based interventions into state-run wellness, mental health, and rehabilitation services. These programs demonstrate a **state-led recognition of ecotherapy** as a legitimate and structured form of public health delivery.

While not always codified in constitutional or statutory language, these initiatives reflect the **functional legalization** of nature access in health governance, setting precedents for future rights-based frameworks.

3. Urban Green Prescriptions in the United Kingdom

In the UK, **"green prescribing"** has been introduced within the **National Health Service (NHS)** framework. Under this scheme, general practitioners can prescribe activities such as **gardening, nature walks, and**

conservation volunteering as part of a non-clinical treatment plan—especially for individuals with mild to moderate depression or anxiety.

The government's **Loneliness Strategy (2018)** and **25-Year Environment Plan (2018)** both recognize access to green spaces as vital for community well-being and individual recovery. Although these prescriptions are not judicially enforceable rights, their implementation through public institutions marks a significant step toward embedding ecotherapy in **healthcare law and social welfare policy**.

4. Community Forest Rights in India

In India, the **Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006**, commonly known as the **Forest Rights Act (FRA)**, grants legal recognition to the rights of forest-dependent communities over land, water, and forest resources. While primarily designed for socio-economic justice, the FRA implicitly affirms the **right to live in, manage, and spiritually relate to nature**—particularly for Adivasi and forest-dwelling populations.

In states like **Maharashtra and Odisha**, successful implementation of **community forest resource rights** has led to improved environmental stewardship, food security, and even emotional well-being among indigenous communities. These cases affirm that **legal recognition of human-nature relationships** can have profound ecological and psychosocial impacts.

Although not labeled as ecotherapy in the Western sense, the **spiritual and cultural healing derived from nature-based living** under the FRA embodies similar values—highlighting the pluralistic, culturally sensitive dimensions of the right to nature in the Global South.

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS ON THE RIGHT TO NATURE

The recognition of the "Right to Nature" is gaining traction across legal systems globally, both as a derivative of environmental rights and as a stand-alone entitlement. While still evolving, various **international frameworks, constitutional innovations, and judicial precedents** have begun to embed ecocentric values into the fabric of legal systems. These developments reflect an emerging consensus that access to and protection of nature is not only a matter of environmental sustainability but of human rights, dignity, and justice.

1. United Nations Frameworks

The United Nations has played a catalytic role in articulating and promoting the normative foundation of environmental rights:

- **Human Right to a Clean, Healthy and Sustainable Environment (UNHRC Resolution 48/13, 2021):** This landmark resolution, adopted by the UN Human Rights Council and later recognized by the General Assembly in 2022, formally acknowledges that every person has the right to live in a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment. While not legally binding, it provides a powerful **declaratory basis** for domestic incorporation and judicial recognition of environmental entitlements, including access to green spaces as essential to health and well-being.
- **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs):** The **2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development** identifies direct links between environmental well-being and human health:
  - **SDG 3** aims to ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages, implicitly recognizing nature's role in mental and physical health.
  - **SDG 11** promotes sustainable cities and communities, calling for increased access to safe, inclusive, and accessible green and public spaces.
- **UN Harmony with Nature Initiative:** Established in 2009, this UN program encourages legal systems to incorporate **Earth-centered governance**, emphasizing **interconnectedness, ecological integrity**, and **biocultural rights**. It advocates for legal recognition of the **intrinsic value of nature**, beyond anthropocentric benefit, and has influenced reforms in several Latin American countries.

2. Constitutional and Legislative Innovations

Some of the most transformative developments in the right to nature have occurred at the constitutional and statutory levels, especially in Latin America and Europe:

- **Ecuador (2008): Rights of Pachamama:** Ecuador became the first country in the world to enshrine the **Rights of Nature** in its Constitution. Article 71 recognizes **Pachamama** (Mother Earth) as a rights-bearing entity with the right to exist, persist, maintain, and regenerate its vital cycles. Citizens have standing to bring legal actions on behalf of ecosystems, shifting environmental law from regulatory compliance to rights enforcement.
- **Bolivia: Law of the Rights of Mother Earth (2010):** Bolivia's legislation declares Mother Earth a living system with **inherent rights**, including the right to life, biodiversity, and restoration. The law draws heavily from Indigenous Andean cosmologies and mandates that state and society act as stewards of nature's integrity. It also established a legal duty to promote harmony between humans and nature.
- **France and Finland: Green Prescriptions and Urban Mandates:** In Europe, while rights of nature are not formally constitutionalized, **green access is increasingly being legislated as part of urban planning and public health policy**.
  - In **France**, legislation mandates urban areas to provide minimum green space per capita, with a focus on reducing urban heat and psychological stress.
  - **Finland** has incorporated "green prescriptions" into its public healthcare services, particularly for children and the elderly, recognizing the **therapeutic and preventive value of nature**.

These examples reflect a growing trend to **mainstream nature access into governance**, public services, and fundamental legal entitlements.

3. Jurisprudential Advances

In the absence of explicit legislative frameworks, courts around the world have begun to innovate by interpreting existing constitutional provisions in ecocentric ways:

- **Colombia – Atrato River Case (T-622/16):** The Constitutional Court of Colombia recognized the **Atrato River as a legal person**, with rights to protection, conservation, and restoration. The Court emphasized **biocultural rights**, affirming that Indigenous communities' spiritual and cultural ties to the river warranted constitutional protection. A **guardian model** was established, where community and state representatives jointly safeguard the river's rights.
- **India – Uttarakhand High Court (2017):** In a similar move, the **Ganga and Yamuna Rivers** were declared **legal persons** by the Uttarakhand High Court, invoking the public trust doctrine and spiritual significance of these rivers. Though the order faced implementation and jurisdictional challenges, it marked a judicial turn toward recognizing the **sacred and ecological value of natural entities**.
- **Comparative Climate and Rights-Based Litigation:** Across jurisdictions such as the Netherlands (*Urgenda Foundation v. State of Netherlands*), Pakistan (*Leghari v. Federation of Pakistan*), and Germany (*Neubauer v. Germany*), courts are increasingly using **constitutional and human rights arguments** to enforce environmental protection. While not all explicitly refer to a "right to nature," they affirm that environmental degradation violates rights to life, health, and intergenerational justice—laying the groundwork for broader recognition of nature-based rights.

Together, these developments illustrate a **growing judicial, legislative, and international consensus** that the environment is not only to be preserved but to be accessed, experienced, and lived with in ways that are equitable, healing, and respectful. The right to nature, once an abstract ecological ideal, is now becoming a **justiciable and enforceable claim** in legal systems around the world.

THE INDIAN PERSPECTIVE: GAPS AND OPPORTUNITIES

While international jurisprudence on the right to nature is evolving steadily, the Indian legal landscape presents both significant **constitutional potential** and persistent **implementation gaps**. India's ecological diversity, rich indigenous traditions, and constitutional commitment to social justice create fertile ground for integrating nature-based rights into its legal framework. However, urbanization, policy fragmentation, and environmental inequities continue to hinder the full realization of this emerging right. This section explores India's legal foundations, present limitations, and future pathways for embracing ecotherapy and green rights as actionable entitlements.

1. Constitutional Foundations

India's Constitution, while not explicitly enumerating a "right to nature," provides several foundational principles that support its recognition:

- **Article 21: Right to Life**: Article 21 of the Constitution guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. Through expansive judicial interpretation, this provision has come to include the **right to a clean and healthy environment** as essential to a life of dignity. Landmark cases such as *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar* (1991) affirmed that the right to life encompasses the right to pollution-free water and air. This interpretation lays a constitutional basis for extending environmental rights to include **access to nature and ecological well-being**.
- **Articles 48A and 51A(g): Environmental Duty Provisions**: Article 48A (Directive Principles) directs the State to protect and improve the environment, while Article 51A(g) (Fundamental Duties) obliges every citizen to protect the natural environment. Though non-justiciable, these provisions have been invoked by courts to impose **positive environmental duties** on the State and the public. They provide jurisprudential space to argue for nature access as a civic entitlement and responsibility.
- **Judicial Activism and the Public Trust Doctrine**: Indian environmental jurisprudence, especially through PILs, has seen proactive judicial interventions. In *M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath* (1997), the Supreme Court applied the **public trust doctrine**, holding that natural resources like rivers and forests are held by the state in trust for the people. This doctrine can be extended to support legal claims to green access, nature conservation, and ecotherapy infrastructure as part of public trust obligations.

Together, these constitutional tools—though scattered—offer a promising framework for advancing the **right to nature as an implicit fundamental right**.

2. Ecotherapy in India

India has a long-standing tradition of nature-based healing, but its integration into formal health and environmental policy remains limited.

- **Indigenous and Traditional Healing Systems**: Practices such as **Ayurveda, Siddha, and tribal medicine** have historically emphasized the therapeutic potential of natural environments, herbal treatments, forest immersion, and seasonal cycles. Many Indigenous communities in India regard forests, rivers, and mountains as **sacred and healing entities**, deeply embedded in their cosmology and health practices. These cultural paradigms mirror modern ecotherapy but remain under-recognized in contemporary legal discourse.
- **Policy Invisibility of Green Mental Health Approaches**: Despite a rising mental health burden in India—especially in urban and adolescent populations—**ecotherapy remains absent** from the National Mental Health Programme and allied health policies. Nature-based interventions are not part of formal treatment protocols, and mental health remains largely biomedical in approach, overlooking the ecological dimension of healing.
- **Urban Inequities in Green Access**: Access to green spaces in Indian cities is **deeply unequal**, stratified by income, caste, and geography. Urban planning continues to prioritize infrastructure over ecological well-being. According to the Urban Green Space Index (ISRO), most Indian cities fall **far below WHO standards** of green space per capita. This creates a **structural exclusion** of the urban poor from nature's psychological and physiological benefits, raising concerns of environmental justice and spatial inequality.

3. Legal and Policy Recommendations

To address these gaps and realize the transformative potential of the right to nature in India, the following legal and policy interventions are proposed:

- **Integrate Ecotherapy into Public Health and Urban Design**: National and state health policies should **recognize ecotherapy** as a legitimate preventive and therapeutic tool. Urban design guidelines must mandate the inclusion of green corridors, therapeutic gardens, and eco-sensitive public spaces, especially near schools, hospitals, and prisons. Partnerships between the AYUSH Ministry, Health Ministry, and Housing/Urban Affairs Ministry can institutionalize this integration.
- **Enact a "Green Rights Charter" at the National Level**: A comprehensive Green Rights Charter should be introduced through legislation or executive action. This Charter would codify rights such as:
  - Access to safe and inclusive green spaces
  - Right to participate in environmental governance
  - Right to benefit from nature for health and well-being
  - Protection of natural elements as co-subjects of rights

- **Judicial Recognition or Constitutional Amendment for the "Right to Nature"** The judiciary can extend Article 21 jurisprudence to explicitly include the **right to nature** and ecotherapy-based entitlements. Alternatively, a **constitutional amendment** could introduce a new article or clause, similar to Article 21A (Right to Education), affirming nature access as a constitutional right fundamental to health and dignity.
- **Affirm the Cultural Rights of Tribal and Forest-Dwelling Communities** Implementation of the **Forest Rights Act, 2006** should be expanded to explicitly recognize **ecospiritual and therapeutic connections** with nature as protected cultural rights. Legal and administrative frameworks must honor Indigenous environmental knowledge not only for conservation, but for community healing and autonomy.

India stands at a critical juncture where it can evolve from fragmented environmental regulation to a **rights-based, health-integrated, and culturally inclusive environmental framework**. By affirming the right to nature, Indian law can harmonize environmental protection with constitutional values of justice, dignity, and well-being—offering a model of ecological citizenship for the Global South.

Towards a Legal Architecture of Green Rights

The formal recognition of the **right to nature** demands a cohesive and enforceable legal framework—one that reflects ecological realities, upholds human dignity, and ensures access to nature's therapeutic, cultural, and spiritual values. This section outlines the essential **components**, **state obligations**, and **challenges** involved in constructing such a framework. Moving beyond environmental protection, a "Green Rights" paradigm situates nature as both a **site of healing** and a **subject of justice**, calling for legal innovation at constitutional, statutory, and policy levels.

1. Components of a Right to Nature

To transform the abstract idea of "green rights" into concrete legal entitlements, the right to nature must be defined through **multidimensional components** that reflect human-nature interconnectedness:

- **Access to Green Spaces**: Every individual should have equitable access to public parks, forests, riverbanks, and natural corridors—especially in urban settings where green exclusion mirrors socio-economic disparity. Legal mandates for minimum green coverage per capita, akin to the WHO's recommendations (9–10 sq.m. per person), must be instituted.
- **Freedom from Environmental Degradation**: Protection from air and water pollution, toxic exposure, deforestation, and biodiversity loss forms the **negative aspect** of the right to nature. This aligns with international norms such as the **UN-recognized right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment**.
- **Right to Benefit from Nature's Therapeutic Value**: Ecotherapy—forest bathing, green exercise, nature-based rituals—should be explicitly acknowledged as a **health-related right**. Legal systems must move from treating nature as a passive backdrop to recognizing its **active role in physical, mental, and emotional well-being**.
- **Protection of Sacred Natural Sites**Recognizing **sacred groves, rivers, and landscapes** as cultural and spiritual commons is central to the right to nature, particularly for Indigenous and forest-dependent communities. Legal safeguards must protect these sites from desecration and commercial exploitation.

These components ensure the right to nature is not merely environmental, but **ecological, therapeutic, and cultural** in its scope.

2. State Obligations

The realization of green rights necessitates a **duty-bearing State**, responsible for legislating, implementing, and monitoring access to and protection of natural spaces:

- **Legal Safeguards Against Privatization of Commons**: The doctrine of **public trust** must be codified to prevent enclosures and privatization of forests, lakes, rivers, and urban commons. Community access must be prioritized over elite recreational or extractive interests.
- **Public Health Integration of Ecotherapy Programs**: Ministries of Health and AYUSH should develop ecotherapy protocols within **national health schemes**, particularly in mental health outreach, addiction recovery, and prison rehabilitation. Green prescriptions, as used in countries like Finland and the UK, should be adapted to India's socio-cultural context.

- **Green Urban Planning and Participatory Ecological Governance**: Urban planning must integrate **Nature-Based Solutions (NBS)**, including green belts, vertical gardens, community parks, and urban forests. Environmental impact assessments (EIA) should include metrics for **human-nature interaction**. Local communities must participate in ecological governance through legally empowered **ward committees and biodiversity boards**.

State obligations must move beyond conservation toward **active facilitation of ecological wellbeing and nature access**, particularly for marginalized communities.

3. Challenges and Cautions

Building a legal architecture for green rights is not without challenges. As with many progressive rights, implementation risks being derailed by **political economy constraints and normative ambiguities**:

- **Commodification of Nature under Neoliberal Regimes**: The global trend of **market-based environmentalism** (e.g., eco-tourism, carbon offsets, green gentrification) risks turning nature into a commodity accessible only to the affluent. Legal frameworks must guard against this by **separating nature's utility from its market value** and ensuring free public access.
- **Balancing Development with Ecological and Cultural Integrity**: Infrastructure and industrial projects often override ecological considerations. The legal right to nature must develop **substantive tests of proportionality** to evaluate whether development can proceed without **irreversible harm to ecosystems and cultural landscapes**.
- **Risk of Tokenism without Enforcement Mechanisms**: Rights that exist only on paper—without institutional accountability, clear justiciability, or public participation—may foster symbolic compliance. Strong **enforcement mechanisms**, including environmental ombudsmen, citizen suits, and court-monitored green audits, are essential.

A robust legal framework must be **resistant to greenwashing**, enforceable through courts and institutions, and responsive to the **intersectional needs of health, ecology, and justice**.

A BLUEPRINT FOR LEGAL REFORM

A well-designed legal architecture of green rights will require **interdisciplinary approaches** across environmental law, public health, urban planning, and constitutional theory. This right must be situated within a **decolonial and ecocentric paradigm**—acknowledging not only human rights to nature but also **nature's own right to exist, thrive, and heal**. Codifying such rights at the national level can foster **ecological citizenship**, advance therapeutic justice, and create a more resilient and equitable society.

CONCLUSION: REIMAGINING RIGHTS FOR PLANETARY AND PERSONAL WELL-BEING

The recognition of a **right to nature** marks a transformative step in reimagining the relationship between law, the environment, and human well-being. It compels a departure from the anthropocentric, utilitarian frameworks that have long governed environmental discourse and invites a **therapeutic and ecocentric paradigm**—one in which nature is not merely protected, but also honored as a site of healing, dignity, and justice.

This evolving right integrates multiple domains: it affirms the **intrinsic worth of ecosystems** (as seen in Earth Jurisprudence and Rights of Nature), acknowledges the **mental and physical health benefits of natural exposure** (validated by ecotherapy research), and asserts a **constitutional and legal obligation** to secure equitable access to natural environments. It bridges gaps between **public health policy, urban design, indigenous knowledge, and environmental jurisprudence**, offering a holistic framework to address interconnected global crises: ecological degradation, urban alienation, and mental health disorders.

The recognition of nature as both **subject and healer** invites legal systems to expand the notion of rights and justice—no longer confined within human boundaries but embracing the **interdependence of planetary and personal well-being**. In doing so, it not only redefines human rights for the 21st century but also **calls for a juridical ethics that respects nature as co-equal in the legal order**.

In the Indian context, where ecological philosophies are deeply embedded in cultural traditions and constitutional jurisprudence has shown willingness to innovate, this right offers immense potential. A **Green Rights Charter**, a constitutional amendment, or judicial recognition under Article 21 could operationalize this vision, grounding environmental justice in both **therapeutic necessity and ecological morality**.

Ultimately, the right to nature is not a luxury or a rhetorical aspiration. It is a **legal imperative for survival, healing, and intergenerational justice**, demanding urgent recognition in national and international frameworks.

REFERENCES:

1. Berry, T. (1999). *The great work: Our way into the future*. Bell Tower.
2. Bratman, G. N., Daily, G. C., Levy, B. J., & Gross, J. J. (2015). The benefits of nature experience: Improved affect and cognition. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 138, 41–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.02.005
3. Breslow, S. J., Sojka, B., Barnea, R., Basurto, X., Carothers, C., Charnley, S., ... & Levin, P. S. (2016). Conceptualizing and operationalizing human wellbeing for ecosystem assessment and management. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 66, 250–259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016.06.023
4. Cullinan, C. (2011). *Wild law: A manifesto for Earth justice* (2nd ed.). Chelsea Green Publishing.
5. India. Supreme Court. (1991). *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1991 SC 420.
6. India. Supreme Court. (1997). *M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath*, (1997) 1 SCC 388.
7. Louv, R. (2008). *Last child in the woods: Saving our children from nature-deficit disorder*. Algonquin Books.
8. Maller, C., Townsend, M., Pryor, A., Brown, P., & St. Leger, L. (2006). Healthy nature healthy people: 'Contact with nature' as an upstream health promotion intervention for populations. *Health Promotion International*, 21(1), 45–54. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dai032
9. Pereira, L., Davies, K., den Belder, E., Ferrier, S., Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S., Kim, H., ... & Zgambo, O. (2020). Developing multi-scale and integrative nature–people scenarios using the Nature Futures Framework. *People and Nature*, 2(4), 1172–1195. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10146
10. Sempik, J., Hine, R., & Wilcox, D. (2010). *Green care: A conceptual framework*. Loughborough University.
11. UN General Assembly. (2022). *The human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment* (Resolution A/RES/76/300).
12. UN Human Rights Council. (2021). *Resolution 48/13: The human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment*.
13. UN. (n.d.). *Harmony with Nature Initiative*. https://www.harmonywithnatureun.org/
14. World Health Organization. (2016). *Urban green spaces and health: A review of evidence*. WHO Regional Office for Europe. https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/321971/Urban-green-spaces-and-health-review-evidence.pdf
15. Zapata-Ríos, G., & Armenteras, D. (2018). Recognizing rivers as legal persons: A new path for conservation. *Ecological Applications*, 28(6), 1479–1481. https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.1789
16. Constitutional Court of Colombia. (2016). *Judgment T-622/16 (Atrato River Case)*.