Sortuz. Oñati Journal of Emergent Socio-legal Studies
Volume 13, Issue 1 (2023), 38–68
ISSN 1988-0847

Anthropocentrism vs ecofeminism: How should modern environmental law be reformed?

Aga Natalis*
Ani Purwanti*
Teddy Asmara*

Abstract:

The lack of progress that has been made in legal civilization is reflected in the current status of environmental regulation. This failure is rooted in values and views, which the present study intends to address through ecofeminism and responsive legal theory. Specifically, this study addresses the values and perspectives that led to this failure. The research uses a transformative paradigm and socio-legal studies, and the study's findings are provided in this article. Inadequate environmental regulations lead to injustice, often perpetuated by the anthropocentric viewpoint of humanism, which places a higher priority on human interests than the environment. Despite the government's best attempts to address environmental concerns, the ecological crisis is still ongoing due to the restrictions imposed by the development of modern environmental law. It is essential for environmental policy to preserve its credibility and to fulfil the requirements of both people and the natural world. This can be accomplished with the help of responsive legal theory and ecofeminism, which advocates for a new human identity that is reverent towards nature and intertwined with it. As a result of their sexual and biological functions, women have close contact with nature; therefore, they must be engaged in the legislative process to guarantee a comprehensive approach to environmental law.

Keywords:

Renewal of the National Legal System, ecofeminism, responsive law, modern environmental law, anthropocentrism, oppression.

We express our deepest gratitude to everyone at Universitas Diponegoro for helping make this study a reality.

* Corresponding author: Aga Natalis. Doctoral Program, Universitas Diponegoro, Jalan Imam Bardjo, S.H., No. 1, Semarang City, Central Java 50241, Indonesia. Email address: aganatalis@students.undip.ac.id

* Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro, Jalan dr. Antonius Suroyo, Tembalang, Semarang City, Central Java 50275, Indonesia.

* Faculty of Law, Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati, Jalan Terusan Pemuda No.01 A, Cirebon City, West Java 45132, Indonesia.

Resumen:

La falta de progreso en la civilización jurídica se refleja en el estado actual de la regulación ambiental. Este fracaso se origina en valores y perspectivas, que el presente estudio intenta abordar a través del ecofeminismo y la teoría jurídica sensible. Específicamente, este estudio aborda los valores y perspectivas que llevaron a este fracaso. La investigación utiliza un paradigma transformativo y una metodología socio-jurídica feminista, y los resultados del estudio se proporcionan en este artículo. Las regulaciones ambientales inadecuadas llevan a la injusticia, a menudo perpetuadas por la perspectiva antropocéntrica del humanismo, que otorga una mayor prioridad a los intereses humanos que al medio ambiente. A pesar de los mejores esfuerzos del gobierno para abordar las preocupaciones ambientales, la crisis ecológica sigue en curso debido a las restricciones impuestas por el desarrollo de las leyes ambientales modernas. Es esencial que la política ambiental preserve su credibilidad y cumpla con los requisitos tanto de las personas como del mundo natural. Esto se puede lograr con la ayuda de la teoría jurídica sensible y el ecofeminismo, que aboga por una nueva identidad humana que sea reverente hacia la naturaleza y esté entrelazada con ella. Debido a sus funciones sexuales y biológicas, las mujeres tienen un contacto cercano con la naturaleza; por lo tanto, deben estar involucradas en el proceso legislativo para garantizar un enfoque integral en la ley ambiental.

Palabras clave:

Renovación del Sistema Jurídico Nacional, ecofeminismo, ley sensible, ley ambiental moderna, antropocentrismo, opresión.

1. INTRODUCTION

The lack of understanding and knowledge about environmental laws in the country is a growing concern, as it leads to ineffective implementation and enforcement (Sánchez-Ocampo *et al.* 2022). This results in various negative impacts on the environment, such as forest fires and the climate crisis. The phenomenon of forest fires in Kalimantan and Sumatra is particularly concerning, as it is a major contributor to environmental degradation and the loss of biodiversity (Andini *et al.* 2018).

The situation is further complicated by the fact that environmental laws are not expressive enough to address the challenges faced by the country. This leads to a situation where people are unaware of the laws and regulations governing the environment, and the government is unable to effectively enforce them. This lack of understanding and awareness is further compounded by the fact that women have been excluded from the political process, both nationally and locally. This means that their perspectives and experiences are not taken into account in the development and implementation of environmental laws (Cassotta 2019).

The International Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) program is an example of a global effort to address environmental issues (Rendón Thompson *et al.* 2013). However, some research suggests that this program may

not benefit men and women equally, as women are often excluded from the political process. This is reflected in the implementation of the program, as some countries, such as Nepal, have implemented the program successfully, while others, such as Cameroon, have faced difficulties due to limited access points and a lack of standardization (Khadka *et al.* 2014, Larson *et al.* 2015).

The situation in the country highlights the need for a more comprehensive and effective approach to environmental law implementation. This requires greater awareness and understanding of environmental laws and regulations, as well as a more inclusive political process that takes into account the perspectives and experiences of all stakeholders, including women. This can be achieved through education and outreach programs, as well as the development of effective enforcement mechanisms.

The process of developing environmental law is ever in flux and must be able to adjust to the shifting power dynamics of society (Ruhl 1997). This requires taking into account the historical backdrop of a country, the current state of the environment and the conditions in its surrounding areas, as well as the hopes and dreams for a future in which environmental rights are maintained for everyone. These initiatives must take into consideration the connection between environmental law and oppression (Spyke 2002).

One of the most significant obstacles that current environmental legislation must overcome is its inability to adequately handle the numerous problems that are caused by the environment in its current state (Dechezleprêtre and Sato 2017). Because environmental issues are frequently intricate and interconnected, environmental law must be flexible enough to address a wide range of difficult situations successfully. This was only sometimes the situation (Bodin 2017). The state of the environment has continued to deteriorate because, in many cases, environmental legislation has failed to address environmental challenges appropriately (Howes *et al.* 2017). As a result, environmental law still needs to protect the environment. This is partly because environmental legislation has only sometimes been able to keep pace with the changing environment and the challenges that come along with it (Ruhl 2010).

The purpose of this article is to analyse and comprehend the relationship between modern environmental law and oppression, to analyse and comprehend the failures of Environmental Law in the modern environment, and to analyse and comprehend the ecofeminist critique of the relationship between environmental Law, Anthropocentrism, and oppression in order to integrate responsive legal theory into the development of modern environmental law.

Anthropocentrism and ecofeminism are two opposing ideas contributing to the ongoing discussions on how current environmental law needs to be revised (Droz 2022). The former is an example of an anthropocentric viewpoint, which places a higher value on human interests than those of the environment. On the other hand, the latter is an example of an ecological, feminist viewpoint, which emphasises the interconnectedness of human and non-human beings and the significance of appreciating nature for its own sake. In recent years, there has been a growing recognition that environmental degradation is largely the result of anthropocentric values and that an approach that is more ecologically centred is required to address the current ecological crisis. This realisation comes from the realisation that a more ecologically-centred approach is required (Sessions 1974).

Since the dawn of Western culture and philosophy, anthropocentrism has stood out as a defining characteristic of this approach (Purser *et al.* 1995). According to this school of thought, people are the most important thing in the world, and the natural world is only a resource that should be used to advance human interests (Kopnina *et al.* 2018). This viewpoint is mirrored in the development of current environmental law, which has concentrated on preventing the destruction of the environment while safeguarding human health and safety. However, this strategy has yet to solve the current ecological catastrophe effectively. This is because it does not consider the environment's inherent value or the effects that human actions have on organisms that are not human (Martin *et al.* 2016).

On the other hand, Ecofeminism is a critique of the prevalent anthropocentric perspective and an argument for a more holistic and ecological approach to environmental law (Palmer *et al.* 2014). Ecofeminism is an environmental movement that began in the 1970s (Radel 2009). The feminist critique of the androcentric bias in Western culture and philosophy, which has favoured masculine values and experiences over those of women and nature, serves as the foundation for this perspective (Plumwood 1996). Ecofeminism acknowledges the interconnection of human and non-human organisms and advocates for the necessity of valuing nature for what it is in and of itself, as opposed to valuing it only for the benefits it provides to humans as an instrument (Hawkins 1998).

Ecofeminism and responsive legal theory offer a structure that can be utilised in revising contemporary environmental legislation. The transformative paradigm of ecofeminism, which acknowledges the interdependence of human and non-human beings, offers a foundation for environmental law that prioritises the protection of the environment and promotes ecological justice (Mathews 2014). This foundation can be found in ecofeminism's recognition of the interdependence of human and non-human beings. On the other hand, responsive legal theory advocates for an approach to environmental law that is more participatory and inclusive. This method involves all stakeholders in the legislative process, including women, who have a close relationship with nature due to their sexual and biological functions (Gaard 2015).

As the ecological catastrophe continues to deepen, there is an immediate and critical need for environmental law reform (Kotzé and Adelman 2022). Despite the government's best attempts to address environmental issues, the limitations of the existing legal framework have become increasingly obvious in recent years. Values and points of view that are anthropocentric contribute to the environment's continued degradation. An approach that is more environmentally based is required to solve this problem. Reforms to contemporary environmental law centre on the incorporation of ecofeminism and responsive legal theory, both of which emphasise the inalienable worth of the natural world and the significance of adopting an approach that is both all-encompassing and welcoming to a diverse range of perspectives.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The use of the transformative paradigm and socio-legal study in this research is essential to understanding the relationship between environmental law and oppression and developing a more responsive environmental law that considers the experiences and perspectives of

marginalised communities. This research aims to understand how environmental law and oppression are related to one another.

The transformative paradigm is a theoretical framework used to analyse and challenge society's dominant structures and systems that contribute to social inequality, oppression, and environmental degradation (Mertens 2007). This analysis and challenge are accomplished through the utilisation of the transformative paradigm. This paradigm emphasises the need for change, transformation, and the empowerment of marginalised communities. Additionally, it provides a critical prism through which to examine the relationship between environmental law and the experiences of these populations.

On the other hand, socio-legal study is an interdisciplinary area that draws from various social and legal theories to comprehend the connection between the law, society, and the environment (Cotterrell 1997). It is essential to understand how law contributes to or challenges the systemic oppression of marginalised communities, as this field acknowledges that the law is not neutral and impartial but is shaped by social, cultural, and political forces. In addition, this field acknowledges that studying how the law contributes to or challenges the oppression of marginalised communities is essential.

This study makes use of the transformative paradigm and socio-legal study in order to investigate and understand the shortcomings of current environmental law in terms of how it addresses the experiences and points of view of marginalised communities, as well as to investigate and understand alternative legal theories that may be of greater assistance to these communities.

The research begins by examining the relationship between modern environmental law and oppression. It then argues that modern environmental law has been shaped by anthropocentric values that prioritise human interests and values over the needs of the environment and non-human species. This is done to demonstrate that anthropocentric values have shaped modern environmental law. This anthropocentric perspective has contributed to the systemic oppression of vulnerable communities, especially those disproportionately affected by environmental degradation and environmental injustices, such as women, people of colour, and indigenous communities.

The research then investigates the ecofeminist critique of modern environmental law. It argues that this critique offers a valuable perspective on the relationship between environmental law, oppression, and the necessity for transformation. The research concludes that the ecofeminist critique of modern environmental law should be taken seriously. According to ecofeminism, it is essential to shift away from anthropocentric values and towards an eco-centric perspective that prioritises the needs of the environment and non-human species, which argues that modern environmental law has failed to recognise the interconnectedness of all life and the environment. Ecofeminism also argues that modern environmental law has failed to recognise the interconnectedness of all life and the environment.

The research also investigates alternative legal theories, such as the transformational paradigm, which may be of more use to underserved groups and help contribute to formulating environmentally friendly legislation that is more relevant to contemporary concerns. The transformative paradigm acknowledges that the law needs to be reformed to

challenge the dominant structures and systems in society that contribute to oppression. It also proposes an approach to environmental law that is more holistic and interdisciplinary, taking into account marginalised communities' experiences and perspectives.

3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MODERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND OPPRESSION

Law is not just a philosophy of construction but an empirical construction that exists in the real world and is influenced by those who have the power to create it, shape it, and use it to advance their agenda. Those who support the agenda will see the laws passed as a "wing of protection", while those in the lead will see the same laws as "tools of repression".

In the end, the law acquires its authority in the form of threats of violence so that the law will oppress. At the same time, the law is a tool to prevent chaos, which in itself can become violence and aid. This goes beyond the content of the law, which can be oppressive, protective, or enabling on a case-by-case basis.

The use of moral rhetoric has a significant function in legal and political contexts, namely linking specific public policies with pre-existing constituents of moral commitment. When discussing laws and policies, the misuse of moral language allows the passing of immoral and detrimental laws to vulnerable groups regarding environmental Laws, nature, women, animals, and human subordinates who are harmed. Regardless of whether politics should be indeed in harmony with morality or not, the appeal of language provides an additional reason for voters to agree or disagree with politics, besides the context of recognising that law is an instrument used by a group of people to perpetuate the dominance of a particular group, which makes law—sometimes considered immoral because of oppression (Stalnaker 2017).

In the case of environmental Law, immoral and oppressive laws will result in environmental injustice, arising from the fact that specific human communities or groups experience a certain level of environmental risk. Growing concern over unequal environmental burdens and growing evidence of racial and economic injustice led to the emergence of grassroots campaigns advocating justice. Philosophers adopted this concept in the 1990s, and later sociologists, economists, and politicians became interested. Today, the international movement for environmental justice is growing, emerging from various struggles, events, and social movements worldwide.

Environmental injustice is influenced by integration due to the anthropocentric perspective that dominates the "humanistic perspective" on nature throughout the history of human civilisation. Anthropocentrism places intrinsic value on humans themselves, or they place much greater intrinsic value on humans. The protection or promotion of human interests or welfare over the interests of non-humans is almost always justified. Therefore, humans have little or no moral responsibility for non-human nature.

Anthropocentrism is also known as the "house paradigm". According to Eckersley (1990), the house paradigm views the universe as a storehouse of resources with only instrumental value. The belief is that humans are the pinnacle of evolution and the only place to find value and meaning. The main feature of Paradigm House is 'Human' or 'Human Welfare Ecology'. The House Paradigm is built on the foundation of traditional Western ethics,

characterised by patriarchal values that undermine the order of human relationships and the universe (Thomas-Pellicer *et al.* 2016).

One of the pioneers of the house paradigm was Aristotle, who said that nature created everything specifically for the benefit of humans and that the value of non-human things in nature is only instrumental (Bodnar 2018). In general, the anthropocentric position expresses what is wrong with the cruel treatment of non-humans, except for the extent to which such treatment can lead to dire consequences for humans (Kopnina *et al.* 2018). As said by Brady (2017), Immanuel Kant, for example, showed that acts of cruelty to dogs could encourage humans to develop traits impervious to cruelty to humans. Thus, Anthropocentrism fundamentally admits some of the non-intrinsic flaws of anthropogenic environmental damage.

Aristotelian metaphysics and a specific cosmology whose conceptions can be applied in such a way as to allow the arrangement of all things in order of excellence. The House Paradigm is considered a paradigm that some humans believe in due to the influence of "science" and "religion". One of them is the presence of the concept of "The Great Chain of Being". Everything except God has some measure of intimacy. For example, fundamentally, frogs lack perfection as they only observe and do not reason beings. This vague idea of an ontological scale must be combined with the zoological and psychological hierarchies suggested by Aristotle. The result was a change in the conception of the plan and structure of the world, which began in the Middle Ages until the end of the 18th century; philosophers, most scientists, and indeed most educated people accepted them. No questions asked (Vezina 2007, Lu 2017).

The Great Chain of Beings is a system that regulates that all things are under God and that humans occupy the centre of the great chain between angels and animals. At the lowest level of the chain are things that cannot be called creatures and are further away and Distance from God, and humans, like minerals, belong to the non-creature realms that are considered to have lost their lives.

According to this system, all life on earth forms and is found in a chain of perfections, from the simplest to the most perfect, namely God. Humans occupy the position closest to the Most Perfect in the chain of perfection of the past life; this means that humans occupy the top of the chain of creation. Therefore, they are considered superior to all other creations, including understood nature.

René Descartes pointed out that humans have a special place among all living beings because humans have a soul that allows them to think and communicate with God; on the other hand, animals are inferior creatures to humans because man with machines only shepherds animals). Descartes' opinion is known as "Cogito Ergo Sum" (I think. Therefore, I exist). Consistent with this view, Immanuel Kant said that only humans are rational beings, so humans are permitted to use non-rational beings such as animals to achieve the goals of human life because non-human beings and all other natural entities do not choose to be a slave to a certain amount of money, to achieve moral goals. Based on this understanding, humans have no moral obligation or responsibility to other creatures. Based on this understanding, the relationship between humans and the environment is in a circle of domination that leads to oppression (Rocha 2015, Hertogh 2016). As Camenzind (2021), Kant, we are only permitted to slaughter animals painlessly; the "violent and cruel treatment

of animals" is forbidden. We are permitted to use work animals as power sources, but we must not use them beyond their capacities. With his prohibition of animal use in "agonizing physical experiments for the sake of mere speculation" or: 'in sport' (*als ein Spiel*).

A human-dominated environment with increased societal and economic vulnerability to extreme events and natural variability. Messerli *et al.* (2000), in their article entitled "From nature-dominated to human-dominated environmental changes Author links open overlay panel", explain that human oppression in the environment is so massive, marked by changes in technology and agricultural practices that contribute to creating a society that is better able to withstand the effects of extreme climates. Messerli (2000) created the concept "The Timeline of Environmental Changes" to support this claim.

According to Messerli (2000), environmental conditions are characterised contextually, primarily by locally adapted and integrated processes, unlike the environment of urban industry, which has an increasing and widespread impact on air, water and soil at levels regional and global. At this critical time in Earth's history, human impacts are affecting all aspects of the planet's various ecosystems for up to a century, with possible further acceleration in the rate of environmental change, resource use, and people's vulnerability for people and people. And vulnerability to changes in the relationship between nature and humans from the past and present to a future full of uncertainties. It is becoming increasingly clear that significant changes in ecosystems from the local to the global level are influenced by human activities creating much higher levels of complexity through the interaction of processes that fall within the realms of natural science and social Sciences. This implies the need to bridge the gap between the two scientific cultures to advance human understanding of contemporary driving forces and their rapidly changing impact on Earth's ecosystems. The acceleration of these environmental changes at different spatial scales, but especially at alarming time scales: the most significant ecosystem changes in human civilisation, occurring in the last 50 years, is unprecedented in the history of the Earth. Given continued population growth, economic development, urbanisation, industrialisation and resource use, it is clear that human impacts on ecosystems worldwide will continue to increase over time. 'to come up.

Because scientists now say we have entered a new era, the Anthropocene epoch, an era in which our species, humans, became the most potent force on the planet. Current climate change and species extinction are driven by human activities and the substantial ecological footprint of our species.

Our self-regulating planet has provided us with a stable climate for 10,000 years (Rockström *et al.* 2009). Weather disasters and extreme weather events have claimed lives, such as floods in Thailand in 2011 (Marks 2015) and Pakistan in 2010 (Warraich *et al.* 2011), forest fires in Russia, more frequent and intense cyclones and hurricanes, and severe droughts are examples of how humans have messed up the climate system (Petrova 2011). Humans have driven 75% of biodiversity to extinction due to industrial agriculture (Kastner *et al.* 2021). Between 3 and 300 species are driven to extinction every day (Cardillo *et al.* 2005). How the planet and humans evolve in the future will depend on how we understand the impact humans have on the planet.

Mies and Shiva (2014) explained that modern science was the idea of the "fathers of destruction" for the first time. To make a new machine, they do not need a human woman

as a mother. This idea brings us to a fundamental critique of modern science, which knows neither feelings, morals, nor responsibility: to produce these technologies, they have required violence in all their avatars. Women all over the world, since the dawn of patriarchy, have also been treated like nature, without rationality, their bodies functioning in the same instinctive way as other mammals. Like nature, they can be oppressed, exploited and dominated by humans. The tools for this are science, technology and violence. The destruction of nature, new weapons, genetic engineering, modern agriculture and other modern inventions are all "masterminds" of this supposedly worthless reductionist science.

These various forms of domination and oppression are the destructive cogs of the Anthropocene born out of human hubris and arrogance. This is seen in the efforts of scientists to carry out geoengineering, genetic engineering and synthetic biology as technological improvements to the climate crisis, the food crisis and the energy crisis. However, they will only exacerbate old problems and create new ones. We have seen it with genetic engineering: it should increase food production but does not increase yields; it should reduce the use of chemicals but increase the use of pesticides and herbicides; it is supposed to control weeds and pests, but instead creates superweeds and super pests (Bratspies 2013).

For adherents of Anthropocentrism, the law has an important role, but at the same time, it also requires many changes. Humans have a central role in Anthropocentrism, not because nature will only be valuable if it is valuable to humans, but because what it does impacts global change. This human centrality means that social relations, values and the use of the power play a central role in this Era. Because the law reflects these social relations, values and power, the law has an essential role in Anthropocentrism (Wibisana 2021).

Law in the anthropocentric conception was created as an autonomous institution centred on regulations that have an efficient basis because the law is your source for legitimising power. Regulations constrain judges; the scope of their discretion is restricted by the increasing number of regulations that invite complexity and create consistency problems. A regulatory orientation tends to limit the accountability of the judicial system. The law is finally considered as taming repression but remains attached to the idea that the law is, above all, a means of social control. This autonomous law, in the case of human and environmental relations, then the law is an instrument for humans to control the use of environmental resources (Warassih *et al.* 2020).

One form of influence of Anthropocentrism in modern environmental law is reflected in the first article of the 1972 Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment, which reads (Singh 2008):

> Man is both creature and maker of his environment, which provides him with physical sustenance and offers him the possibility of intellectual, moral, social and spiritual development. Both aspects of man's natural and artificial environment are essential to his well-being and the enjoyment of fundamental human rights, the right to life itself. In the long and tortuous evolution of the human race on this planet, a stage has been reached where man has acquired the power to transform his environment in countless ways through the rapid acceleration of science and technology and on an unprecedented scale.

According to Kotzé and French (2018), the Stockholm Declaration represented a "catalyst" in the development of modern environmental law, that the Declaration is deeply rooted in "the ontology of masculinist anthropocentrism" and that the ethic underlying the Declaration that the environment belongs exclusively to man must be protected only to ensure the well-being, prosperity and interests of man, this is by what law aspires of the modern environment.

The concept of sustainable development, a central paradigm of modern environmental law, was first announced in the 1987 Brundtland Report as the ability of humans "to make development sustainable to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs." According to this definition, sustainable development prioritises people and their needs over environmental protection. The Rio Declaration of 1992 reaffirmed Principle 1: "people are at the centre of attention for sustainable development." Principle 3, which sets out the "right to development" to be realised by respecting the "development needs of future generations," reaffirmed the anthropocentric approach that sees conservation as a means to ensure human well-being. The Johannesburg Declaration of 2002 followed a similar approach, as reflected in strengthening the notion of sustainable development (Hsu 2018).

The notion of sustainable development originating from Western ideologies will become universal through the principles of global environmental law, of particular concern because of the damage that the adoption of such an ideology will bring to nature. The conception that includes the Western understanding of nature is perhaps the most destructive of all components of Western ideas. Unlike other conceptions of nature, which stress that nature and humans are interconnected, this western ideology emerged with the idea of a separation between humans and nature, which led to dominance. Their role is based primarily on the perspective of freedom to harm resulting from understanding nature as something separate and an object to be governed by human civilisation. The successful dissemination of Western ideologies on nature is manifested where the idea of sustainable development forces us to reconsider our understanding of human relations with nature. The concept requires thinking about human civilisation as distinct and contrary to nature and that existing natural resources will be controlled for the benefit of human civilisation (Geisinger 1999).

The concept of sustainable development is not only a reflection of the successful export of Western ideology; it is also a powerhouse of ideological imperialism in which Western values that are not possessed or accepted by other countries are imposed on them by applying the principles of environmental law. For example, in some traditional societies in Africa, there is a recognition and acceptance that all components of nature are interdependent. Using the term "life force", Tempels (1959) describes the interconnectedness of natural entities as a reason to treat nature with respect. This understanding is based on the idea that there is power that flows from God to gods and spirits, from ancestors to humans and all other creatures of nature. Which form the relationship between all the creatures of nature, one of which is by law. However, legal norms do not necessarily express universally shared principles in environmental law. Thus, as critics of Western ideological hegemony argue, the spread of Western ideas has eradicated the notion of nature held by other cultures, including the notion of environmental law (Geisinger 1999).

If modern environmental law is still formed based on 'human centrism', then what Gumplowicz says is true, that law is still based on the subjugation of the weak (nature) by the strong (the humans), and the law is an arrangement of definitions formed by those who are strong (humans) to maintain their power over the weak (nature) (Natalis 2020). Within this environmental law, subjective rights are provided for persons, organisations or economic actors. This right is then perceived as norms that govern relations between humans or between humans and objects. In such a legal understanding, the environment is something or, even more technically, all parts of the environment except humans are objects (e.g. animals, plants). The environment is considered to have no rights, as it can be possessed and used, destroyed or protected.

The modern environmental law that has been written and put into practice is frequently criticised for contributing to the perpetuation of oppression in various ways. This can be seen in the unequal distribution of environmental impacts, the marginalisation of communities that are most affected by environmental degradation, and the failure of environmental law to address the root causes of environmental problems. All three of these issues can be seen as contributing factors.

To begin, current environmental law has frequently come under fire for the disproportionate distribution of environmental damages that it creates. Degradation of the environment, such as air and water contamination, frequently negatively impacts disadvantaged groups unable to protect their legal rights effectively. For instance, low-income areas and communities of colour are more likely to be positioned close to toxic waste sites. This results in increased exposure to dangerous substances and increased risk to one's health. This is a glaring illustration of environmental racism, which is the situation in which communities of colour bear a disproportionate share of the burden caused by environmental hazards.

Second, current environmental law needs to address the underlying factors contributing to environmental issues adequately. Environmental law has focused on mitigating the effects of environmental degradation rather than preventing it. This is because this approach has been taken rather than addressing the systemic problems that contribute to environmental degradation, such as the extractive economic model. After all, it is easier. This method contributes to the perpetuation of oppression because it pays less attention to the fundamental factors that contribute to environmental issues and instead emphasises the symptoms that these factors produce.

Third, the marginalisation of groups most affected by environmental degradation has occurred as a direct result of the inability of current environmental law to address the fundamental factors that contribute to environmental deterioration. Indigenous groups, for instance, are frequently subjected to land and resource exploitation, displacement, and the erosion of their cultural traditions. Environmental law has not been able to address these challenges fully and has not offered appropriate protection for indigenous populations, frequently viewed as obstacles to economic progress.

In the end, current environmental law has been roundly condemned for the widespread belief that it cannot adequately address the worldwide scope of environmental issues. The issue of climate change, for instance, affects the entire planet and calls for a worldwide response. Due to its primary emphasis on national problems, current environmental law

needs to be revised to handle the global scope of environmental difficulties adequately. This is a result of the law's narrow concentration on issues at the national level.

4. FAILURE OF MODERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

Environmental law describes a network of written and customary laws that deal with the impact of human activities on the natural environment, also known as environmental and natural resource laws, centring on the idea of environmental pollution (Dernbach and Mintz 2011). Environmental law deals with managing specific natural resources and environmental impact studies. Environmental law plays an essential role in protecting humans, animals, habitats, and natural resources. There are no regulations on pollution, pollution, hunting, or even disaster management without environmental Laws. Without this environmental law, the government cannot punish those who mistreat the environment.

In dealing with issues of complexity and uncertainty of socio-ecological systems, there has been an attempt to match legal principles with adaptive governance approaches that emphasise the need for principled abstraction to guide the direct policy-making process and establish normative principles and principles—feedback in adaptive practice. Thus, environmental law can evolve with changing and emerging issues in complex systems through adaptation at different scales. While there is no simple solution, protecting vulnerable public values requires a constant balance between flexibility and legal certainty (Rijswick and Salet 2012).

Environmental law has evolved in the history of modern human civilisation; at least, it can be divided into four epochs known as "the evolution of modern environmental law". In each of these eras, legislators continued to rely on certain assumptions with inaccurate models of the relationship between man and nature. In Era I, environmental law was based on the "use of natural resources" objective. This environmental law emerged over 200 years between the beginning of the 17th century AD and the end of the 19th century AD (Kaswan 1997). Environmental Law in Age I was based on anthropomorphic beliefs in nature and its resources intended for productive use by humans (Tam 2019). America's westward expansion, for example, was driven by the idea that rational humans would use the land and natural wealth of the new continent. US parliamentarians at the time considered the use of natural resources a virtue. This belief system emerged a concept of ownership of property (land) and the regime of shipowners that helped facilitate the exploitation of nature. The central idea of private property rights in land became an integral part of the economy of the United States in the 19th century (Hammond 2007).

The emergence of land ownership laws encourages a hasty attitude in exploiting natural resources (Rose 2009). The next charge is to extract, develop, and use natural resources, which leads to resource depletion and often problems regenerating renewable natural resources. Era I environmental law reflected a high rate of "discount" on natural resources, where future value was traded off in favour of the present (Grimble and Wellard 1997).

The idea of property rights grew out of the national ideals of sovereignty and resistance to tyranny that dominated the thinking of all nations at that time, for example, American ideals before and immediately after independence from the British Empire. Colonisers tied the idea of freedom to private ownership of land and natural resources, as institutions were

built on private property regimes that allowed immigrants to become homeowners, giving the individual his dignity. The colonisers cleared and utilised the land with the embellishment of inviolable human rights.

Environmental Law in Era I stated that humans are separate and separate from nature, and therefore they regard to nature, Earth, and objects as gifts to humans so that humans can quickly obtain, possess, and control them. Humans do not consider that the Earth will not be able to sustain natural resources forever because in the development of Era I of Environmental Law, humans did not conceive the boundaries of the universe but instead had a unique focus on exploitation. Domination, ownership, and most importantly, consistent use of resources according to Lock's theory of private property.

In Era II, Environmental Law aims to achieve "Conservation". Era II environmental law seeks to ensure that future generations will always use natural resources so that current uses must be balanced with the needs of future generations. In the late 19th century, these conservation ideals emerged as part of the progress of the environmental law reform movement, which was reflected in the land policies of many countries. Conservation law, however, continues to be driven anthropomorphically by what is in humanity's best interests. This law is obeyed in the belief that nature will be used productively in the future.

Environmental law should be a "servant" for humans to manipulate natural resources to serve human interests (Macrory 1992). At that time, humans were still driven by the notion of superiority and exceptionalism. Humans assume that higher entities can and should control and even adapt. Natural processes only ensure that nature will continue to meet human needs today and in the future. The primary purpose of conservation law is not to achieve a balance between humans and nature but to control natural resources for human consumption and economic prosperity (McMurry and Ramsey 1986).

Another remaining hypothesis concerns the notion of a "rational man". Law Era II aims to encourage "homo economicus", rational decision-making that supports economic welfare in the past, present and future; this is called "community optimisation". What is unique about Era II is that there has been a growing awareness that uncontrolled use of resources will eventually accelerate the boundaries of the planet. while the conservation law limits its use. However, on the other hand, private property rights continue to be strengthened to exploit natural resources through mechanisms permitted in environmental law.

In Era III, environmental law entered the stage of preservation which was firmly rooted in environmental law. Era III is the premise of anthropocentric nature, which is in a natural state and almost gives semi-religious value to humans. This perceived advantage is the deeply personal and often mystical feeling humans have for nature. Recognition of nature's benefits to humans is achieved through laws requiring species to be protected and placed in national forests, national parks, national nature reserves, and wild rivers. In the Wilderness Act of 1964, Congress defined *wilderness* as a place that provides exceptional opportunities for solitude or a primitive and available type of recreation (Bramwell 1989, Steinhoff 2020).

Humans are closely related to the universe. Humans also recognise that it is vitally important to care about preserving wilderness, wildlife and endangered species, and some of their habitats because an emotional appreciation, not an economic one, of these benefits

follows their existence. John Muir, an American naturalist and founder of the Sierra Club, describes the connection to nature found during his first summer exploring the Sierra Nevada by saying (Young 2013):

> Never have I seen such a beautiful landscape, the inexhaustible richness of the majestic mountains. I screamed and stirred in a wild wave of ecstasy. When exposed, the whole body feels the beauty, like feeling a campfire or bonfire. The sun, penetrating through the eyes and the whole flesh like radiant heat, gives a beautiful, passionate pleasure - an inexplicable light.

Nature in its natural state provides spiritual and aesthetic benefits to humans, but society is also concerned about the harmful exploitation of natural resources and the environment that affects human health and well-being. What seems most troubling are activities that hurt the quality of the human environment (Epstein 1987).

This anthropocentric emphasis is particularly evident in laws designed to combat the overexploitation of natural resources, such as air and water. In addition, many Era III conservation laws emphasised the need to protect public lands from development due to anthropocentric virtues.

Era III of environmental Law is not only shaped by anthropocentric ideals but emphasises that conservation is also based on the belief that if nature is left as it is its origin, nature will eventually correct itself and reach a kind of balance favourable to man. In other words, nature will return to a state considered desirable and beneficial as a complex adaptive system by preventing traces of human work. Ecosystems do not exist in a constant state of equilibrium but are affected by various changes in the relationship between man and nature. By focusing on localised areas, environmental spaces, and natural objects, Era III environmental law may well have denied that diversity and heterogeneity in the universe are essential for the sustainability of an ecosystem.

Era IV Environmental law was an era of "protection" that began in the second half of the 20th century and continues to this day. In Era IV, the environment was protected, especially air, surface water, soil and groundwater. The catalyst for environmental protection law can still be termed anthropocentric based on assumptions about the inherent separation between man and nature. Era IV, humans realised that when humans pollute and poison natural resources, it will also harm humans. Era IV environmental law assumed that humans could be governed to control morphic tendencies to poison the environment by regulating human behaviour in the environment.

Anthropocentric assumptions about human separation and superiority also continued to be present in Era IV (Brooks and Jones 2017). The separation is reflected in environmental ethics, which at the same time elevates the human position to a moral recognition in a superior position. Another characteristic of Era IV environmental law is the desire to achieve environmental management objectives more economically and efficiently. Humans are driven by a selfish need to maximise their well-being, especially economic well-being. Today's environmental laws offer an economic model that humans should know how to behave and be directed about what not to do. Otherwise, humans will instinctively exploit resources for their benefit and maximise welfare according to the "homo economicus" model.

Despite the country's efforts to protect the environment, our planet suffers from environmental crises, including climate change, resource depletion, species extinction, ecosystem damage, air pollution, and water and soil. Despite universal recognition of serious environmental problems and a growing list of laws designed to address these problems, the reality is that environmental problems persist and even worsen. Legal protection of the environment is considered a failure because it usually includes some characteristic issues, such as Anthropocentrism. After all, the goal is to protect the interests and benefit of humans, not the environment in which humans live (Laitos and Okulski 2017).

Environmental law perpetuates human superiority and expression over nature. Laws are formed based on the idea that humans are separate from nature and assume that humans are ultimately not limited by nature itself, as humans are seen as superior and somehow isolated from nature. The law is based on an unrealistic model of nature, where nature is seen as simple, as a system that does not work closely does not regulate itself. Additionally, this law uses an unrealistic model for humans where humans are driven by traditional economic traditions' "homo economicus" model (Bohórquez Arévalo and Espinosa 2015).

According to the study UNEP Frontier published in 2016, one of the most significant environmental concerns that the world is currently facing is a growing concern over zoonotic illnesses. Because animals are the source of 75% of all infectious diseases, there is a growing possibility that a new disease will spread from animals to humans. One example is the recent breakout of the disease known as COVID-19. This new reality is the outcome of a phenomenon called "The Great Acceleration" of global environmental change (Steffen *et al.* 2011). This phenomenon marks the entry of the Earth into the era known as the Anthropocene, in which the acts of humans have a considerable impact on the ecosystems of the Earth.

The degradation of natural habitats, deforestation, climate change, and the loss of biodiversity defines the era known as the Anthropocene. Each of these factors contributes to an increased risk of zoonotic illnesses. As seen by the transmission of the COVID-19 disease from animals to humans, the illegal trade in wildlife and the degradation of habitats for wildlife have made it simpler for diseases to be transmitted from one species to another.

However, there has been a significant cause for concern regarding the inability of environmental legislation to meet the difficulties presented by the Anthropocene period effectively. Environmental law was not intended to deal with the extent of the changes brought about by the Anthropocene. As a result, it has been unable to successfully prevent the loss of natural ecosystems and the trafficking of animals. Because of this, we are currently in a "terra incognita," also known as an unknown destination, in which the results of human acts are a mystery.

COVID-19 is a relatively insignificant aspect of the bigger problem that the Anthropocene poses. It should serve as a wake-up call to the globe to take prompt action to address the environmental challenges brought about by the Anthropocene era. It is necessary to maintain wildlife habitats and biodiversity to lessen the likelihood that zoonotic illnesses will emerge in the future, which is important for the health and well-being of people and the planet as a whole.

5. Ecofeminist Critique of Anthropocentric and Oppressive Modern Environmental Law: An Effort to Renew Modern Environmental Law in Indonesia

The ideals of modern environmental law, oriented toward human happiness and well-being, or "human-centrism", are the main critiques of Ecofeminism. Bradley (2012) said the thought of human rationality, which led him to his understanding of balance, order and harmony in nature, should hamper human ambition to determine the parameters of sustainable development. However, in the Era of modern environmental law, which was influenced by the development of the House Paradigm system popularised by Rene Descartes, with an understanding of mind-body dualism and the assumption that humans are superior beings (Descartes 1641). When humans control and regulate their actions towards the environment through environmental law, humans are not burdened with moral responsibility for what they do to nature (Zein and Setiawan 2017). This thought influenced all aspects of modern environmental law, including the perpetuation of capitalism, imperialism and speciesism.

Ecofeminism is a branch of philosophy that considers the relationship between human oppression and the environment as a basis for analysis and practice. Ecofeminism was developed by the French writer, namely Françoise d'Eaubonne (1974) in her book titled "Le Féminisme ou la Mort" in 1974. Ecofeminism asserts that a feminist should not place women in a dominant position of power but requires an egalitarian and collaborative society where there is no dominant group. The analysis of Ecofeminism explores the relationship between women, nature, culture, religion, literature, and iconography and discusses the parallel relationship between the oppression of nature and the oppression of women (Estévez-Saá and Lorenzo-Modia 2018). Parallel relationships are not just about seeing men as culture and women as nature, and how men dominate women and humans dominate nature. Ecofeminism insists that women and nature should be respected (Hawkins 1998, Ingman 2005).

Until now, scientific experiments using animals for the development of science and human benefit have been supported and influenced by the male house paradigm, which gradually led to the rise of modernity, also led to the division of labour and the rise of capitalism, which has contributed to man's greatest sin against the environment. The Renaissance period brought about a revival of humanistic thinking which does not mean humanism or acting humanely. The dualistic of Cartesio/Descartes objectivism developed by René Descartes is one of the main philosophies of our time, which laid the foundations for an instrumental use which resulted in the human exploitation of nature (Cross 2018).

Susan Bordo (1996) say Cartesio/Descartes's philosophy is most important in promoting male thought and provoking reactions to feminist thought. Such thinking can be called Anthropocentrism, which treats what is outside of human beings as inferior, which leads to the subordination of all things involved as part of nature.

Ecofeminism has described several connections between women's pressures and nature that are important in understanding why environmental issues are feminist issues and vice versa (Jackson 1993). Ecofeminism can be used as an understanding to address environmental issues, including legal reforms that discriminate against women and nature. For example, the way women and nature have historically been conceptualised in the

Western intellectual tradition has resulted in the devaluing of everything, especially when it comes to women, emotions, animals, nature, and the body; it is simultaneously increasing the values linked to increasingly oppressive men, peoples, cultures and minds. One of the tasks of Ecofeminism is to challenge and transform any form of oppression through feminisation and naturalisation or by motivating women to become the main drivers for overcoming environmental problems in the modern Era (Gaard 2011).

The connection between Ecofeminism and the environment is created by documenting the environmental impacts of pollution and degradation on women's lives and the environment (Gaard 2011). Many authors note that toxic pesticides, chemical wastes, acid rain, radiation and other types of pollutants are the first to affect women, such as the reproductive system and children. This dangerous chemical was first tested on animals in the laboratory to determine the level of toxicity. This practice, coupled with the enormous environmental costs of animal husbandry and the meat-eating tradition of becoming a global phenomenon, certainly demonstrates the link between environmental degradation and speciesism. Ecofeminism is based on the idea that the freedom of all oppressed groups must be addressed simultaneously because forming coalitions is essential for one sure thing, namely oppression and domination. Moreover, single women cannot save the environment alone, but they also need the help of men.

Informing the law that governs the relationship between man and nature should be based on the "ethics of care". From the 1980s, experts in Ecofeminism developed a feminist approach based on benevolence and communication between the components of life with issues of moral status in the environment or what is now called environmental ethics (Held 2005). The relationship between humans and the environment is based on an ethic of caring as articulated by Gilligan (1982) in her book "A Different Voice". Gilligan identifies women's conception of morality as something related to journalists' activities, responsibilities, and relationships instead of those more concerned with rights, rules, and abstract ideas. The ethical approach of caring in law offers a more flexible, situational practice, and it is concerned with maintaining the link to keep intact the relationship between the human and all that is external to him.

The ethical approach to caring in environmental law calls on each legislator to formulate these ideas about human-environment relations and appeals to the concept of ethical concern and situational responsibility (Instone 1998). By applying the ethic of environmental protection that is then articulated in law, experts in Ecofeminism argue that while the theory of natural rights that existed before made an essential contribution to the development of a just law for the environment, there are still many things that are inadequate and cannot be applied to the environment (Kings 2017). However, one of the problems is that it involves claiming that the environment is in many ways similar to humans, that the environment is self-contained and possesses human-like intelligence, and that he is therefore entitled to legal rights. While the environment undoubtedly has an ever-changing purpose, it is not easy to equate the environment in general with rational, proprietary human beings, consequently human beings as true rights-holders. Therefore, the field of law requires a new ethic that recognises that the environment is not the same as humans but is still entitled to moral respect. The ethics of care holds that humans have a moral responsibility to all components of life with which humans can communicate, regardless of the difference between the environment and humans, but the two are inseparable (Ghoshal 2005).

A country's legal system may take a traditional approach and understand nature as an object or thing that can and should be measured. For Ecofeminism, however, the law is not just a set of norms, but a constructive aspect, which means that the legal system is free to choose between legal concepts to solve social, economic and ecological problems (Levit *et al.* 2016). On the other hand, the law can also place the subject of the right to the environment and thus give the environment a subjective right to resolve ecological conflicts. Laws made by humans only regulate humans because laws made by humans are not binding on the environment.

Laws made by humans only regulate humans because laws made by humans are not binding on the environment. Laws made by humans only limit and regulate how humans should treat the environment, not how the environment should treat humans. For example, humans can make laws to regulate the building of suitable houses to anticipate earthquakes, but artificial laws cannot regulate nature not to move the plates so that earthquakes do not occur, or humans can make regulations to overcome the adverse effects of a particular virus. Nevertheless, the law cannot regulate a virus that prevents something from evolving.

Efforts to form laws that govern the relationship between humans and the environment can refer to the theory of evolution, according to which everything has its purpose, so laws made by humans must respect that purpose. The law that will be put in place must consider man's relationship with all external to him, including the environment, by favouring sympathy. Since the law functions as a social engineering tool, then such a law will guide humans toward the ethical treatment of the environment (Potts 1982).

The story " The Dead Fish " will analogise the logic used by Ecofeminism on how the law should regulate the relationship between man and the environment will be analogised in the story "The Dead Fish". The King is very fond of Pisces, and the King wants to ensure maximum happiness for the Pisces. The King was very wealthy, and everything he used was made of gold, as the whole palace was endowed with abundant gold adornments. One day, the King believed that if the Fish wanted to be genuinely prosperous, then the Fish should be surrounded by gold, just like the King. The King ordered the Fish to be removed from the pond and placed on a gold plate. The following day the King went to see the Fish, and all his joy ceased, for the Fish was dead (Sahoo 2015).

The story depicts the human being played by the King as a law-giver who wrongly determines which law is suitable to regulate the relationship between humans and the environment, thus assuming that all happiness or prosperity is universal. The problem is that development, prosperity, and happiness are entirely pure and vary from place to place, being, and community to community. Ecofeminism assumes that development or empowerment cannot be forced, as it can only be encouraged, so in order to construct and incorporate the concept of Ecofeminism into the realm of Law, Ecofeminism emerged as "ecofeminist jurisprudence" to uphold and construct laws to regulate the development of relationships between humans and the environment through the preservation of originality and efforts to ensure that the law responds not only to "human-centrists", but to all the components of "eco-centrist" life.

Nonet and Selznick (2001) explain that Responsive Law seeks to maintain an understanding of what is essential to its integrity while taking into account new forces in its environment. Doing this builds on a path of integrity and openness to support each other even in times

of conflict. Responsive law sees social pressure as a source of knowledge and opportunities for self-correction. To assume this posture, an institution needs to be guided by objectives. Goals set standards against which to critique established practices, setting the stage for change. At the same time, if taken seriously, they can control administrative discretion and thus reduce the risk of institutional transfer.

On the other hand, lack of purpose is the basis of rigidity and opportunism. A formalistic institution subject to rules is not ready to recognise what is at stake in its conflict with the environment. It is likely to adapt opportunistically because it lacks criteria for rationally reconstructing outdated or inappropriate policies. Only when an institution is instrumental can there be a combination of integrity and openness, rule and discretion. Therefore, responsive law presupposes that goals can be made sufficiently objective and authoritative enough to control the making of adaptive rules. Concretely, they must get involved and coexist.

On the question of the development of environmental law, the responsive legal theory requires that the law always be sensitive to community development, with a predominant character, namely to offer more than just procedural justice, to be justice-oriented, to lend attention to the public interest, and more than that of putting forward substantial justice.

The responsive type of law recognises the existence of legal pluralism. One of the impacts of legal pluralism is the vast possibility of participating or being considered in the legislative process itself. In this way, the legal field enters the political dimension, where political considerations are the summum bonum in forming legal instruments. In other words, the human participation and consideration of the environment that Ecofeminism must base on the “ethics of care” becomes a vehicle for a group of people or organisations to influence the law's form and operation. An essential aspect of political considerations on the relationship between humans and the environment is that the environmental law that will be produced represents the interests and needs of human and environmental subjectivity.

Cultural Ecofeminism, for example, encourages associations between women and the environment. They argue that women have a more intimate relationship with nature due to their gender roles (e.g., family caregivers and food providers) and biology (e.g., menstruation, pregnancy, and lactation). Accordingly, cultural ecofeminists believe that such associations enable women to be more sensitive to the sanctity and degradation of the environment. They suggest that society should value this sensitivity as it establishes a more direct relationship with the natural world with which humans must coexist.

The proximity of women and nature shows that the participation of women in the elaboration of environmental law is essential since women, through experiences like nature, must be used as actors in the elaboration process until the environmental law assessment stage, as developed by Wilson in how the reasoning of women and men in terms of the abortion legislation is closely linked to environmental issues (Anderson 1996). Men tend to use a traditional legal approach prioritising conventional, abstract, objective and legalistic ways of thinking, so the resulting law will not be effective because men do not understand the issues facing women and nature. Hence, the resulting law is outside the realm of personal experience. Such a law will never solve the main problem, so Wilson recommends that the development of laws, especially concerning the involvement of women's experiences, also represent the experience of oppression lived by nature.

The involvement of women in the development of environmental law is significant; as Marx and Engels (1935) said:

> Men make their own history, only they do it in a given environment which conditions it and on the basis of already existing effective relations, among which economic relations, however influenced they may be by others, political and ideological, are still ultimately decisive, forming the common thread that runs through them and alone leads to understanding.

The prevalent anthropocentric worldview, which regards the environment primarily as a resource for human use and exploitation, has significantly impacted the development of environmental legislation throughout its history. On the other hand, this viewpoint has resulted in the deterioration of the environment and the destruction of ecosystems. The ecofeminist perspective has arisen as a response to this problem. It acknowledges the links between humans and the natural world and emphasises the significance of preserving the natural world.

The evolution of contemporary environmental law can be understood as the product of a dynamic interaction between the natural environment and the economic, political, and ideological structures already in place. The current environment is characterised by the deterioration of the natural world and an increasing awareness of the imperative to preserve it. The pre-existing economic interactions, such as the push for economic expansion and the exploitation of natural resources, have impacted the formation of environmental legislation. Nevertheless, political and ideological ties, such as the influence of ecofeminist concepts, have also had a part in creating modern environmental law.

Because of this, to reform current environmental law, it is vital to understand the interplay between the natural environment, economic relations, political relations, and ideological relations. This requires not only an understanding of the dominant anthropocentric perspective and its limitations but also of the ecofeminist perspective and its potential to promote a more sustainable and holistic approach to environmental law. In addition, this requires a recognition of the limitations of the dominant anthropocentric perspective.

Responsive law is an innovative legal framework that acknowledges the inherent value of all forms of life and gives the means to safeguard those forms of life. This method of interpreting the law acknowledges that non-human beings cannot speak for themselves. As a result, it demands that human beings take on the responsibility of advocating for the rights of non-human beings. To achieve this goal, human beings need to be guided by a strong moral code and be willing to let go of their anthropocentric perspective in favour of adopting a new identity that is ecocentric, more inclusive and centred on the natural world.

The view that humans are the most important species on the earth and that the natural world exists purely for their benefit is known as anthropocentrism. Anthropocentrism is a form of anthropocentrism. This perspective is not only restrictive, but it is also harmful to the natural world and the various animals that live in it. This viewpoint is called into question by the concepts of responsive legislation and ecofeminism, which acknowledge the worth inherent in all forms of life and the significance of preserving the natural world for its reason.

For responsive law to be successful, it must be coupled with a robust ecological and feminist foundation. Only then will it be effective. Ecofeminism acknowledges the interdependence of all life forms and the imperative to preserve the natural world for the environment's sake. It is conceivable to construct a legal system that is not only more inclusive but also more sustainable by integrating this perspective with the legal framework of responsive law. Such a system would safeguard not just the rights of humans but also the rights of all other species. Changing people's thoughts and attitudes towards the environment and other species is one of the most significant obstacles that must be overcome to put responsive law into effect. To eliminate anthropocentrism, there must be more than just a reform in the law; there must also be a transformation in people's values and beliefs. This requires constant lobbying and education, as well as a willingness on the part of individuals and communities to accept a new identity that is more ecocentric and inclusive of a wider range of perspectives.

6. CONCLUSION

The impression that the law may sometimes be used as a "weapon of oppression" is one-way environmental law is tied to the phenomena of oppression. Recognising that a group of people may utilise the law to maintain their domination over another group is vital. As a result of the fact that the law can lead to oppression, it is sometimes considered immoral, which is why it exists. Immoral policies that oppress people will certainly result in environmental injustice in the context of environmental law. As a result of the predominance of the anthropocentric perspective over the "humanistic perspective" on nature throughout the history of human civilisation, as reflected in cases of sustainable growth demographics, economic development, urbanisation, industrialisation, and resource use, the impact of humans on ecosystems around the world will continue to increase in the future. Environmental inequity resulting from human integration the first item of the 1972 Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment demonstrates one facet of anthropocentrism's influence on contemporary environmental law. The name of the document was the Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment.

The failure of modern environmental law can be traced back through four epochs of the development of modern environmental law (the evolution of modern environmental law), specifically the Era of Environmental Law I (Use of Natural Resources), the Era of Environmental Law II (Conservation), the Era of Environmental Law III (Preservation), and the Era of Environmental Law IV (Protection). Even though the state has tried to create universal recognition of serious environmental problems and present a list of laws designed to deal with these problems, the fact of the matter is that environmental problems continue to exist and even worsen over time. All phases of the development of modern environmental law are considered to have been unsuccessful. The influence of anthropocentrism in environmental law, which only seeks to protect the interests and well-being of humans rather than the environment in which humans live, is gradually undermining the relationship between humans and nature. Anthropocentrism is the belief that environmental law should only aim to protect the interests and well-being of humans.

Environmental law is developed utilising responsive legal theory, and ecofeminism cultivates a new human identity that is not petty, thankful, loving, and adoring for life as part of a more extensive planetary existence. Both of these concepts are essential to the formation of environmental law. To integrate reactive legal theory into the development of modern environmental law, ecofeminism critiques the relationship between environmental

law, anthropocentrism, and oppression. So far, the development of the environmental law environment has only been oriented toward human happiness and well-being, also known as "human centrism," which has become the primary critique of ecofeminism. Legislators are responsible for ensuring that environmental law is sensitive to humans (human-centrism) and all other aspects of life. According to ecofeminism, environmental law, which regulates the relationship between humans and the environment, must be based on preserving originality (ecocentrism).

To establish current environmental law, legislators are expected to incorporate ecofeminism and responsive legal theory into their work. Because of women's tight relationship with the natural world, legislators must include women in the legislative process and make women the primary players. Because of their gender roles and biology, women have more close contact with nature than men do. These associations make women more sensitive to issues relating to the sanctity of the environment and its deterioration. It is intended that with the participation of women, the modern environmental legislation that has been formed would become an environmental law that is fair for all components of the environment, including living things, non-living things, animals, and plants.

This research needs more empirical data on applying ecofeminist principles in environmental legislation, which is one of the most significant shortcomings of the study. Gathering data on the efficacy of ecofeminist-inspired environmental regulations and their influence on the natural world should be the primary subject of study that will be conducted in the future. This will assist in the ongoing development and refinement of ecofeminist approaches to environmental legislation and will support the implementation of these methods.

In addition, academics of the future need to consider the effects that environmental law changes could have on underrepresented groups, such as indigenous peoples, women, and communities with poor incomes. These communities are frequently disproportionately impacted by environmental deterioration and should be included in the decision-making process about revising environmental laws.

Collaborating with multiple stakeholders, such as environmental groups, legal scholars, and policymakers can help researchers develop their work in this field. This will help to ensure that the research is grounded in the needs and perspectives of these stakeholders and that the findings are relevant to the challenges faced by the environmental law community. This will also help to ensure that the research is grounded in the needs and perspectives of these stakeholders.

References

Anderson, B., 1996. *"Discovery" in Legal Decision-Making* [online]. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-0554-7 [Access 17 February 2023].

Andini, A., *et al.*, 2018. Impact of Open Burning of Crop Residues on Air Pollution and Climate Change in Indonesia. *Current Science,* 115(12), 2259–66.

Bodin, Ö., 2017. Collaborative Environmental Governance: Achieving Collective Action in Social-Ecological Systems. *Science* [online], 357(6352), eaan1114. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan1114 [Access 17 February 2023].

Bodnar, I., 2018. Aristotle's Natural Philosophy. *In:* E.N. Zalta, ed., *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* [online]. Available from: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/aristotle-natphil/ [Access 17 February 2023].

Bohórquez Arévalo, L.E., and Espinosa, A., 2015. Theoretical Approaches to Managing Complexity in Organizations: A Comparative Analysis. *Estudios Gerenciales* [online], 31(134), 20–29. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.estger.2014.10.001 [Access 17 February 2023].

Bordo, S., 1996. The Feminist as Other. *Metaphilosophy*, 27(1/2), 10–27.

Bradley, I., 2012. *God Save the Queen: The Spiritual Heart of the Monarchy*. London: Bloomsbury.

Brady, E., 2017. Regarding Nature: A Kantian Environmental Ethic. *Ethics* [online], 127(4), 967–72. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1086/691578 [Access 17 February 2023].

Bramwell, A., 1989. *Ecology in the 20th Century: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bratspies, R.M., 2013. "Is Anyone Regulating? The Curious State of GMO Governance in the United States." *Vermont Law Review* [online], 37, 923–56. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2278211 [Access 17 February 2023].

Brooks, R.O., and Jones, R., 2017. *Law and Ecology: The Rise of the Ecosystem Regime*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Camenzind, S., 2021. Kantian Ethics and the Animal Turn. On the Contemporary Defence of Kant's Indirect Duty View. *Animals* [online], 11(2). Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11020512 [Access 17 February 2023].

Cardillo, M., *et al.,* 2005. Multiple Causes of High Extinction Risk in Large Mammal Species. *Science* [online], 309(5738), 1239–41. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1116030 [Access 17 February 2023].

Cassotta, S., 2019. The Development of Environmental Law within a Changing Environmental Governance Context: Towards a New Paradigm Shift in the Anthropocene Era. *Yearbook of International Environmental Law* [online], 30(1), 54–67. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/yiel/yvaa071 [Access 17 February 2023].

Cotterrell, R., 1997. Socio-Legal Studies: Between Policy and Community. *In:* R. Cotterrell, ed., *Law's Community: Legal Theory in Sociological Perspective* [online]. Oxford University Press. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198264903.003.0014 [Access 17 February 2023].

Cross, C.L., 2018. Ecofeminism and an Ethic of Care: Developing an Eco-Jurisprudence. *Acta Academica* [online], 50(1), 28–40. Available from: https://doi.org/10.18820/24150479/aa50i1.2 [Access 17 February 2023].

D'Eaubonne, R., 1974. *Le féminisme ou la mort*. Paris: Pierre Horay.

Dechezleprêtre, A., and Sato, M., 2017. The Impacts of Environmental Regulations on Competitiveness. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* [online], 11(2), 183–206. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rex013 [Access 17 February 2023].

Dernbach, J.C., and Mintz, J.A., 2011. Environmental Laws and Sustainability: An Introduction. *Sustainability* [online], 3(3), 531–40. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/su3030531 [Access 17 February 2023].

Descartes, R., 1641. *Meditations on First Philosophy*.

Droz, L., 2022. Anthropocentrism as the Scapegoat of the Environmental Crisis: A Review. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics* [online], 22, 25–49. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00200 [Access 17 February 2023].

Eckersley, R., 1990. *Emancipation Writ Large: Toward an Ecocentric Green Political Theory*. Dissertation. University of Tasmania.

Epstein, J.L., 1987. Parent Involvement: What Research Says to Administrators. *Education and Urban Society* [online], 19(2), 119–36. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124587019002002 [Access 17 February 2023].

Estévez-Saá, M., and Lorenzo-Modia, M.J., 2018. The Ethics and Aesthetics of Eco-Caring: Contemporary Debates on Ecofeminism(s). *Women's Studies* [online], 47(2), 123–46. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/00497878.2018.1425509 [Access 17 February 2023].

Gaard, G., 2011. Ecofeminism Revisited: Rejecting Essentialism and Re-Placing Species in a Material Feminist Environmentalism. *Feminist Formations* [online], 23(2), 26–53. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2011.0017 [Access 17 February 2023].

Gaard, G., 2015. Ecofeminism and Climate Change. *Women's Studies International Forum* [online], 49(March), 20–33. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2015.02.004 [Access 17 February 2023].

Geisinger, A., 1999. Sustainable Development and the Domination of Nature: Spreading the Seed of the Western Ideology of Nature. *Environmental Affairs* [online], 27(1), 43–73. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1369339# [Access 17 February 2023].

Ghoshal, S., 2005. Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* [online], 4(1), 75–91. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2005.16132558 [Access 17 February 2023].

Gilligan, C., 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. London: Harvard University Press.

Grimble, R., and Wellard, K., 1997. Stakeholder Methodologies in Natural Resource Management: A Review of Principles, Contexts, Experiences and Opportunities. *Socio-Economic Methods in Renewable Natural Resources Research* [online], 55(2), 173–93. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-521X(97)00006-1 [Access 17 February 2023].

Hammond, J.C., 2007. *Slavery, Freedom, and Expansion in the Early American West* [online]. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv18zhcwp [Access 17 February 2023].

Hawkins, R.Z., 1998. Ecofeminism and Nonhumans: Continuity, Difference, Dualism, and Domination. *Hypatia* [online], 13(1), 158–97. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.1998.tb01356.x [Access 17 February 2023].

Held, V., 2005. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global* [online]. Oxford University Press. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/0195180992.001.0001 [Access 17 February 2023].

Hertogh, C.P., 2016. Thought Experiment Analyses of René Descartes' Cogito. *Trans/Form/Ação* [online], 39(3), 9–22. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1590/s0101-31732016000300002 [Access 17 February 2023].

Howes, M., *et al.*, 2017. Environmental Sustainability: A Case of Policy Implementation Failure? *Sustainability* [online], 9(2), 165. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/su9020165 [Access 17 February 2023].

Hsu, S., 2018. Framework for Understanding Sustainable Development. In: S. Hsu, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Sustainable Development in Asia* [online]. 1st ed. Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 21–36. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351008204-2 [Access 17 February 2023].

Ingman, H., 2005. Nature, Gender and Nation. *Irish Studies Review* [online], 13(4), 517–30. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/09670880500304485 [Access 17 February 2023].

Instone, L., 1998. The Coyote's at the Door: Revisioning Human - Environment Relations in the Australian Context. *Ecumene* [online], 5(4), 452–67. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/096746089800500404 [Access 17 February 2023].

Jackson, C., 1993. Women/Nature or Gender/History? A Critique of Ecofeminist 'Development.' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* [online], 20(3), 389–418. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/03066159308438515 [Access 17 February 2023].

Kastner, T., *et al.*, 2021. Global Agricultural Trade and Land System Sustainability: Implications for Ecosystem Carbon Storage, Biodiversity, and Human Nutrition. *One Earth* [online], 4(10), 1425–43. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2021.09.006 [Access 17 February 2023].

Kaswan, A., 1997. Environmental Justice: Bridging the Gap Between Environmental Laws and 'Justice.' *The American University Law Review* [online], 47(2), 221–301. Available from: https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/aulr/vol47/iss2/1/ [Access 17 February 2023].

Khadka, M., *et al.*, 2014. Gender Equality Challenges to the REDD+ Initiative in Nepal. *Mountain Research and Development* [online], 34(3), 197–207. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1659/MRD-JOURNAL-D-13-00081.1 [Access 17 February 2023].

Kings, A.E., 2017. Intersectionality and the Changing Face of Ecofeminism. *Ethics and the Environment* [online], 22(1), 63–87. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2979/ethicsenviro.22.1.04 [Access 17 February 2023].

Kopnina, H., *et al.*, 2018. Anthropocentrism: More than Just a Misunderstood Problem. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* [online], 31(1), 109–27. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-018-9711-1 [Access 17 February 2023].

Kotzé, L.J., and Adelman, S., 2022. Environmental Law and the Unsustainability of Sustainable Development: A Tale of Disenchantment and of Hope. *Law and Critique* [online], September. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10978-022-09323-4 [Access 17 February 2023].

Kotzé, L.J., and French, D., 2018. The Anthropocentric Ontology of International Environmental Law and the Sustainable Development Goals: Towards an Ecocentric Rule of Law in the Anthropocene. *Global Journal of Comparative Law* [online], 7(1), 5–36. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1163/2211906X-00701002 [Access 17 February 2023].

Laitos, J., and Okulski, J., 2017. *Why Environmental Policies Fail.* Cambridge University Press.

Larson, A.M., *et al.*, 2015. The Role of Women in Early REDD+ Implementation: Lessons for Future Engagement. *International Forestry Review* [online], 17(1), 43–65. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1505/146554815814725031 [Access 17 February 2023].

Levit, N., Verchick, R.R.M., and Minow, M., 2016. *Feminist Legal Theory: A Primer*. Vol. 74. NYU Press.

Lu, M., 2017. Cosmo-Metaphysics: The Origin of the Universe in Aristotelian and Chinese Philosophy. *Dao* [online], 16(4), 465–82. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11712-017-9572-8 [Access 17 February 2023].

Macrory, R., 1992. The Enforcement of Community Environmental Laws: Some Critical Issues. *Common Market Law Review*, 29(2), 347–69.

Marks, D., 2015. The Urban Political Ecology of the 2011 Floods in Bangkok: The Creation of Uneven Vulnerabilities. *Pacific Affairs*, 88(3), 623–51.

Martin, J.L., Maris, V., and Simberloff, D.S., 2016. The Need to Respect Nature and Its Limits Challenges Society and Conservation Science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* [online], 113(22), 6105–12. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1525003113 [Access 17 February 2023].

Marx, K., and Engels, F., 1935. *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Correspondence, 1846-1895: A Selection with Commentary and Notes*. Trans.: D. Torr. Marxist Library. International Publishers.

Mathews, F., 2014. Environmental Philosophy. *In:* G. Oppy and N.N. Trakakis, eds., *History of Philosophy in Australia and New Zealand* [online]. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 543–91. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6958-8_22 [Access 17 February 2023].

McMurry, R.I., and Ramsey, S.D., 1986. Environmental Crime: The Use of Criminal Sanctions in Enforcing Environmental Laws. *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review* [online], 19(4), 1133–70. Available from: https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/llr/vol19/iss4/3 [Access 17 February 2023].

Mertens, D.M. 2007. Transformative Paradigm: Mixed Methods and Social Justice. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* [online], 1(3), 212–25. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689807302811 [Access 17 February 2023].

Messerli, B., *et al.,* 2000. From Nature-Dominated to Human-Dominated Environmental Changes. *Quaternary Science Reviews* [online], 19(1-5), 459-479. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-3791(99)00075-X [Access 17 February 2023].

Mies, M., and Shiva, V., 2014. *Ecofeminism*. London/New York: Zed Books.

Natalis, A., 2020. Reformasi Hukum dalam Rangka Mewujudkan Keadilan bagi Perempuan: Telaah Feminist Jurisprudence. *Crepido*, 2(1), 11–23. https://doi.org/10.14710/crepido.2.1.11-23 [Access 17 February 2023].

Nonet, P., and Selznick, P., 2001. *Law & Society in Transition: Toward Responsive Law*. New Brunswick: Transaction.

Palmer, C., McShane, K., and Sandler, R., 2014. Environmental Ethics. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* [online], 39(1), 419–42. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-121112-094434 [Access 17 February 2023].

Petrova, E., 2011. Critical Infrastructure in Russia: Geographical Analysis of Accidents Triggered by Natural Hazards. *Environmental Engineering and Management Journal* [online], 10(1), 53–58. Available from: https://doi.org/10.30638/eemj.2011.008 [Access 17 February 2023].

Plumwood, V., 1996. Androcentrism and Anthrocentrism: Parallels and Politics. *Ethics and the Environment* [online], 1(2), 119–52. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/27766018 [Access 17 February 2023].

Potts, L.W., 1982. Law as a Tool of Social Engineering: The Case of the Republic of South Africa. *Boston College International & Comparative Law Review* [online], 5(1), 1–50. Available from: https://lira.bc.edu/work/ns/c1e7ca9e-baf8-4df2-9a7e-05f7bed4f64a/reader/fc0c0134-a233-438d-b0bf-46f50c14fbfa [Access 17 February 2023].

Purser, R.E., Park, C., and Montuori, A., 1995. Limits to Anthropocentrism: Toward an Ecocentric Organization Paradigm? *The Academy of Management Review* [online], 20(4), 1053–89. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2307/258965 [Access 17 February 2023].

Radel, C., 2009. Natures, Gendered. *In:* R. Kitchin and N. Thrift, ed., *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography* [online]. Oxford: Elsevier, 331–36. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044910-4.00573-3 [Access 17 February 2023].

Rendón Thompson, O.R., *et al.,* 2013. Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+): Transaction Costs of Six Peruvian Projects. *Ecology and Society* [online], 18(1), 17. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-05239-180117 [Access 17 February 2023].

Rijswick, M.v., and Salet, W., 2012. Enabling the Contextualization of Legal Rules in Responsive Strategies to Climate Change. *Ecology and Society* [online], 17(2), art18. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-04895-170218 [Access 17 February 2023].

Rocha, J., 2015. Kantian Respect for Minimally Rational Animals. *Social Theory and Practice* [online], 41(2), 309–27. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract201541217 [Access 17 February 2023].

Rockström, J., *et al.* 2009. A Safe Operating Space for Humanity. *Nature* [online], 461(7263), 472–75. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a [Access 17 February 2023].

Rose, C.M., 2009. Liberty, Property, Environmentalism. *Social Philosophy and Policy* [online], 26(2), 1–25. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265052509090153 [Access 17 February 2023].

Ruhl, J.B., 1997. Thinking of Environmental Law as a Complex Adaptive System: How to Clean up the Environment by Making a Mess of Environmental Law. *Houston Law Review* [online], 34, 933. Available from: https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/faculty-publications/526/ [Access 17 February 2023].

Ruhl, J.B., 2010. Climate Change Adaptation and the Structural Transformation of Environmental Law. *Environmental Law* [online], 40(2), 363–435. Available from: https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/faculty-publications/456/ [Access 17 February 2023].

Sahoo, A., 2015. Eco-Feminist Jurisprudence: A Much Needed Change in the Perception of Law. *International Journal of Law and Legal Jurisprudence Studies* [online], 2(6), 207–10. http://ijlljs.in/eco-feminist-jurisprudence-a-much-needed-change-in-the-perception-of-law/ [Access 17 February 2023].

Sánchez-Ocampo, E.M., *et al.*, 2022. Environmental Laws and Politics, the Relevance of Implementing Regulation of the Presence of Emerging Pollutants in Mexico: A Systematic Review. *Water Emerging Contaminants & Nanoplastics* [online], 1(2), 6. Available from: https://doi.org/10.20517/wecn.2021.04 [Access 17 February 2023].

Sessions, G.S., 1974. Anthropocentrism and the Environmental Crisis. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* [online], 2(1), 71–81. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/23261527 [Access 17 February 2023].

Singh, L.K., 2008. *Ecology, Environment and Tourism*. Isha Books.

Spyke, N.P., 2002. The Land Use Environmental Law Distinction: A Geo-Feminist Critique. *Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum* [online], 13(1), 55–98. Available from: https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/delpf/vol13/iss1/2/ [Access 17 February 2023].

Stalnaker, B.L., 2017. Law and Oppression: A Moral Call to Abstain from the Use of Moral Language. *Critical Reflections* [online], 4, 1–15. Available from: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/essaysofsignificance/2017/cr2017/4/ [Access 17 February 2023].

Steffen, W., *et al.*, 2011. The Anthropocene: From Global Change to Planetary Stewardship. *AMBIO* [online], 40(7), 739–61. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-011-0185-x [Access 17 February 2023].

Steinhoff, G., 2020. Interpreting the Wilderness Act of 1964. *Missouri Environmental Law and Policy Review* [online], 17(3), 493–538. Available from: https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/jesl/vol17/iss3/2/ [Access 17 February 2023].

Tam, K.P., 2019. Anthropomorphism of Nature, Environmental Guilt, and Pro-Environmental Behavior. *Sustainability* [online], 11(19), 5430. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/su11195430 [Access 17 February 2023].

Tempels, P., 1959. *Bantu Philosophy*. Paris: Presence Africaine.

Thomas-Pellicer, R., De Lucia, V., and Sullivan, S., eds., 2016. *Contributions to Law, Philosophy and Ecology: Exploring Re-Embodiments* [online]. 1st ed. Abingdon/New York: Routledge. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315723235 [Access 17 February 2023].

Vezina, B., 2007. Universals and Particulars: Aristotle's Ontological Theory and Criticism of the Platonic Forms. *The Undergraduate Review* [online], 3(16), 101–3. Available from: https://vc.bridgew.edu/undergrad_rev/vol3/iss1/16 [Access 17 February 2023].

Warassih, E., Rahayu, D.P., and Faisal, 2020. *Sosiologi Hukum: Suatu Pengantar Dimensi Hukum Dan Masyarakat*. Yogyakarta: Litera.

Warraich, H., Zaidi, A.K.M., and Patel, K., 2011. Floods in Pakistan: A Public Health Crisis. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* [online], 89. Available from:https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.10.083386 [Access 17 February 2023].

Wibisana, M.R.A.G., 2021. *Antroposen Dan Hukum: Hukum Lingkungan Dalam Masa-Masa Penuh Bahaya*. Presented at the Pidato Pada Upacara Pengukuhan Guru Besar Tetap Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.

Young, S.H., 2013. *Alaska Days with John Muir*. Portland: Graphic Arts Books.

Zein, L.F., and Setiawan, A., 2017. General Overview of Ecofeminism. *LAxARS* [online], August, 1–10. Available from: https://redox-college.s3.ap-south-1.amazonaws.com/kmc/2020/May/06/Qi3Wc9clGZWdfOvWRUdk.pdf [Access 17 February 2023].