https://doi.org/10.62585/ilhr.v2i1.84

Journal of International Law & Human Rights

Volume and Issues Obtainable at Centeriir.org
Journal of International Law & Human Rights
ISSN (Print): 3007-0120 ISSN (Online): 3007-0139
Volume 2, No.1, 2023
Journal Homepage: http://journals.centeriir.org/index.php/jilhr

Center of Innovation in Interdisciplinary Research

International Environmental Law and Multiculturalism: A Case Study on Critical Perspectives of Human and Non-Human Relations

Muhammad Kashan Jamshaid[1] **Ashna Rehman**[2] **Mahrukh Tanveer**[3]
Muhammad Jahanzaib Aslam[4]

[1]Advocate, Lahore High Court Lahore, Pakistan. E-Mail: kashanjamshaidawan@gmail.com
[2]Lecturer, Department of Law, The Islamia Univesity of Bahawalpur, Pakistan. E-Mail: ashnarehman4@gmail.com
[3]Lecturer, Department of Law, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan. E-Mail: mahrukh.tanveer@iub.edu.pk
[4]LLM Scholar, University of Stirling, Scotland, UK. E-Mail: mjahanzaibaslam1122@gmail.com

Article History
Received:19-07-2023
Accepted:20-08-2023
Published:27-09-2023

Keywords:
Environmental law
Multiculturalism
Human relations
Environment
International law

Funding
This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Abstract
International environmental law is anthropocentric and has an economic orientation; it has made significant progress in handling humans' exploitative and destructive relationship with nature. This research examines alternative concepts of international environmental law and how and whether they are possible by combining many viewpoints on the interaction between humans and nature. The paper addresses the benefits and importance of local lifestyle in international environmental legislation by focusing on Eduardo Castro's idea of multilateralism. Different types of lives have different relationships with nature as well as different concepts of it. The methodological move is necessary to investigate the reality of types of life that contradict the conventional Western understanding of nature and culture. This approach has the power to shift international environmental law behind anthropocentrism and provide solutions for resolving the conflict between developmental concerns regarding ecological conservation and the long-term survival of species.

Corresponding Author's Email: mjahanzaibaslam1122@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.62585/ilhr.v2i1.84

I. Introduction

We must devise ways to mitigate the impacts of climate change, or at the very least, find answers, to which the planet is facing. As a result, there is spreading the awareness that we need to devise new tactics to deal with the turmoil around us. There is no doubt that the manner and degree to which countries have been able to address the problem of ecological and climatic disasters constitute a significant challenge within the framework of international environmental law. However, another issue with the real international environmental law norms, standards, and guidelines governs environmental behavior in many international situations (Lucia, 2019). Every activity, such as new legislation or technological advancements, essentially depends upon one type of life in the West, despite heroic attempts to accomplish the goals (Garver, 2021). It shows human connections are ended from nature and objectifying it may nonetheless strengthen human attachments to it (Kotzé, 2017). In the Western lifestyle, the self-reflective analytical turning points are feasible, but the social system that makes this possible is still based upon the ideas of capitalism and on the economy, which hold that everything has a monetary worth, even the earth.

Since international environmental policy is mainly concerned with an economic process to provide solutions to rescue the globe, it is not effective as a tool to accommodate or reduce ecological damage. Examining this problem through the lens of current progress in traditional anthropology is the focus of this research. Using data from the environmental field, this article explores the interactions between people and other members of the Earthly ecosystem. It makes the case that we should stop taking nature and ourselves for granted. By doing this, we may be able to modify our regulatory tools to more accurately reflect our realization that we inhabit nature rather than merely being close to it (Vilaça, 2016). Particularly to address these questions, this research employs the contemporary anthropological idea of Amerindian perspectivism.

A concise way to describe this theory is a doctrine centered on expanding humanity toward different types of species with whom social connections have been created, against Western naturalism, wherever humans and non-humans differ greatly in terminologies of traditional features (Viveiros, 2012). Perspectivism maintains that the true differences amongst the various people are their bodily inconsistencies. Because it suggests multilateralism as an alternative to multiculturalism, perspectivism is distinct as a theoretical paradigm(Castro, 2012). This research declares that, in the context of international environmental law, a multilateralist concept such as this one may provide a more helpful framework for reassessing moral ties between humans and animals. Unlike multiculturalism, which maintains that there is a coalition of environment and diversity of civilizations, multilateralism recognizes the unity of nature and plurality of bodies (Wright, 2020).

Nature portrays the omnipotence in-between multiculturalism, while the subject represents the particular. In multilateralism, on the other hand, the subject composes the global while nature holds on the shape of particular. Because every person is a potential hub of awareness with the ability to apprehend all other people by their unique and independent traits and capabilities, the cosmos is replete with diverse viewpoints (Chakrabarty, 2021). It is now simpler to find common ground among different parts of international law that address maintaining healthy, natural, and safe environments where persons may coexist peacefully with animals while causing the least amount of disturbance to their way of life. However, global environmental

tribunals have not yet been challenged to take into account the way of existence of local peoples as a framework for creating normative relationships, preferring to see them as an item. This article seeks to elucidate how the consideration of diverse points of view might have played a major role in shaping the evolution of contemporary global environmental law. The main argument of this research is that global environmental law has to encounter an epistemic revolution to meet the ecological and climatic concerns of our day. The first American worldview was derived from the experiences of indigenous civilizations in Latin America.

However, it does provide an opportunity for methodological and epistemic modifications to international environmental law. A thorough investigation of the presence of varied life forms that are at odds with Western concepts of civilization and nature may become feasible because of a modification (Saul, 2016). Perspective also demonstrates the cohabitation of these shapes of life with classic Western shapes, which necessitates a methodological change in the way normative forms and different living situations which seen. Therefore, the study argues that a multilateral approach to human-nonhuman interaction—which focuses on the ideas of individuality and the public—may prove to be a productive path for the progress of international environmental law reform. Multiculturalism provides a unique, non-anthropocentric approach to the roles, interactions, and behavior of humans and animals around the globe. Given the present climatic regimen we live in, all are crucial factors to take into account (Birrell & Matthews, 2020). Primarily, the study looks at how native life forms could provide a different viewpoint for reevaluating how environment and culture interact globally. The basic theme of this study is how the interplay among human and animal entities influences the application of global environmental law. It first highlights the importance of establishing close links between international environmental law and laws that affect indigenous people. Second, the Amerindian point of view provides new insights into individuals that might be useful in reevaluating animals' legal individuality. This has been a divisive topic, especially in light of the acceptance of some non-human phenomena, such as rivers and animals, as valid legal issues in recent decades (Latour, 1999). Finally, the Amerindian point of view sheds new insight into how native conceptions may reinterpret the public, as Western political and legal traditions describe it. Prioritizing native discourses in discussions on the interactions between animals and humans and is pivotal because these discourses serve as a kind of resistance against deeply embedded discursive shapes of colonialism (Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, 2017). Emphasizing, the contribution of the local routine of life to rules governing interactions between people and animal creatures offers a chance to challenge the uniform Western vision that has informed international environmental law up to this point (Natarajan & Khoday, N.D.). This research seeks to elucidate sometimes-disregarded interpretations of a story involving humans and unidentified alien entities that provide several viewpoints on our potential interactions with extraterrestrial entities. In an attempt to abstain from the appropriative brutality of stories, this article highlights the chances that using concepts from Amerindian perspectivism, which is based on multiculturalism, opens new lawful perceptions of a relationship with a planet made of humans as well as nonhumans. Nevertheless, because of this, this research will begin as follows.

The first portion looks at how the world's present environmental regulations are not up to the task of solving the urgent ecological issues of the day. Among them, include the law's focus on economically motivated means of minimizing environmental effects and its emphasis on

human protection. This is a prime example of the uniform, mostly Western perspective that serves as the foundation for international environmental law. The article goes on to summarize the major concepts of American perspective theory and discuss how these concepts enable us to reevaluate some of the core principles that environmental law is based on. The next section goes on to describe how an American perspective especially, the idea of multilateralism—may provide new insights into how to handle the problems of personhood, public interest, and rights in global environmental law. It eventually examines the details of American perspectivism to analyze the normative implications of fusing global environmental legislation with native ways of living. This seriously challenges our understanding of modernity (Unece, 1998). Finally, the study suggests that a multilateralist attitude such as this might serve as a basis for reassessing international environmental regulations in a way that permits a reevaluation of the relationships among many objects in what we say is nature. Environmental law may become more effectively embedded in the lives of people and more successful in achieving societal goals if it allows elements of other life forms to contribute to the development of its fundamental notions.

II. Human and Non-Human Relations: challenges and prospects of Contemporary International Environmental Law

The majority of ecological problems facing our earth nowadays stem from a range of uncontrolled and unplanned industrial growth across the globe (The World Bank, 2017). Since the 1970s, countries have attempted to address these issues, like deforestation and climate change, by enacting international environmental law, or normative instruments, to minimize industrial activities to lessen their negative impacts on the environment. Nonetheless, some people fault these environmental restrictions and their inability to achieve their stated goals. This has exacerbated the frequency and intensity of ecological disasters and environmental problems rather than resolving them. The failure of environmental regulation serves as a stark reminder of the disconnection between our understanding of nature's interconnectedness and the necessary protective measures. Therefore, to more effectively address the present global issues, people's perspectives of themselves as components of the many ecosystems that make up our environmental settings need to change. Such a change might manifest as different approaches, behaviors, or beliefs. Making the necessary changes to our existing environmental standardized framework to meet the demands of the earth may be one of these options.

Primarily, environmental legislation has to reject the well-established anthropocentric viewpoint that prioritizes money in the interaction between people and the environment. This point of view contends that a thorough overhaul of the moral and legal systems that govern human conduct and relationships with the natural world is necessary to address the present ecological crises more effectively. We must reevaluate the principles, which regulate our interaction with nature and our unique place in it when we draw inspiration from other living beings. Despite this, international environmental regulations have made great strides in developing frameworks to address a variety of environmental issues and calamities that affect modern civilization. However, it has not been able to achieve many of its environmental preservation goals. It is crucial to evaluate environmental policy critically in light of its flaws, as Philippopoulos Mihalopoulos contends. Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, environmental law needs to become ontologised, that is, it must consider the diverse ways that individuals live

their lives and perceive the world around them (Sagoff, 2008).

It needs to become more material, meaning that in addition to its material effects on the world, environmental law must be carefully considered in terms of its effects on the various bodies it affects. Furthermore, he contends that environmental laws need to be mineralized, or that is, they need to recognize that human action and non-human activity may both be drivers of environmental change. Finally, Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos contends that for environmental law to effectively understand and address contemporary ecological concerns, it must become proper in the working situation. It must recognize that, although humans are not the only species affecting the environment, humans play a major role in its transformation and not require evidence of a causal relationship. International environmental law must take into consideration the inhuman, that is, mineralized parts of nature which also modify nature. These include the potential for human fossilization in the future and human interactions with other non-human materials like deep Earth and the oceans. Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos's critical analysis of the situation of environmental law today highlights the need for more complexity.

The necessity to discover solutions to reconcile the basic contradiction between economic-based regulatory frameworks controlling human use of the environment and the subtleties of our existence within it is the lesson of ever-more complicated environmental law. Modern environmental regulations must continue to be a critical legal framework that moves between the all-or-nothing of environmental law and the zone of tension as Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos puts it. As a result, modern laws will always fall short of their objectives of preventing or lessening ecological catastrophes. One example of this chaos is the multiple failures of the various conventions in Paris, Kyoto, etc., and the subsequent conventions of groups over the past few decades (Cunha, 2009). The field of international environmental law faces several obstacles, chief among them being the dominance of language emphasizing rights and responsibilities, just like other areas of international law. This makes sense since the goal of environmental preservation has always been to save endangered and unusual species from harm so that future generations of humanity may continue to live on Earth. It was, therefore, by definition, an anthropocentric objective. The normative laws that have been developed up to this point have focused on requiring private, public, and individual actors to act in a way that avoids damaging the environment overall.

However, the objective has been to secure the survival and maintenance of the living species that are essential to the balance of this environment (Viñuales, 2018). It sets out the rights and obligations for affected beings to get involved in decision-making activities, which are dangerous to our environment. International environmental law has made significant progress in developing procedures to guarantee that environmental preservation is suitably matched with the demands of contemporary capitalism, in addition to providing rights and duties for a broad variety of individuals or human-controlled entities. One discovers, for instance, that environmental impact assessments (EIA) (Sands & Peel, 2018) with varying degrees of success or failure, are both conditions by contemporary global environmental law to make sure that environmental safety is organized by capitalist procedures that match environmental safety with little economic harm. These systems operate on the premise that the environment might be segmented into parts and that market forces may set prices for the services it offers to humans (Tănăsescu, 2020). This demonstrates how the logic of the trade economy underpins all methods, including the political and legal ones, used to lessen the influence of people on

the environment. International environmental legislation is defined by capitalism, which continuously evaluates conservation and environmental safety initiatives in terms of their highest level of efficacy and affordability. Another consequence of doing this is that we start to assume we know all there is to know about our environment and natural ecosystems, which all seem to mesh well with the Western way of life (Autres, 2004). However, it disregards how non-Western lifestyles interact with their environment. It is possible to cherish them and yet have them stripped far away of their ecological and ultimate spiritual base.

III. The Procedural and Regulatory Boundaries of Contemporary International Environmental Law Discussion

Environmental law tried to link economic interests and development with environmental protection, as reflected primarily by the contemporary forming of the rule of sustainable development. However, it still ignores the differences of current system generates and necessitates an understanding of the relationship between humans and the environment (Koskenniemi, 2006, Para. 103). The foundation of international environmental law is the basic division of humankind from the natural world, with all of its connections to other areas of international law, such as commerce, investment, and human rights (Bodansky, Brunnée & Rajamani, 2017). Beginning in the 1980s, there was a growing economy which meant allowing law to evolve exactly as a tool to achieve specified goals, particularly international environmental law. According to Vito de Lucia, international environmental law is self-reflexively conscious of its flaws, and this feature of the law is crucial (Svampa, 2015). Environmental law, according to De Lucia, has changed, but it still understands where the issue lays and that solutions are outside of its reach. The primary root of this problem, in actuality, is the way that humans have progressively and intentionally distanced themselves from the natural world via the application of law, particularly positive law.

This is particularly true in terms of how people interact with the natural environment. It enabled the concept of nature protection to be seen as a subject of law as opposed to a method by which significant degrees of subjectivity are applied to all natural processes. Generally, this disparity has created challenges that have, as said earlier, contributed to the rise in inequality along with separated international environmental regulations from ever-more-zealous endeavors—that is, activities that go over environmental conservation. This has to change with the emergence of new legal ontologies in the Anthropocene, the emerging geological regions in which we find ourselves (Berry, 2002). More and more individuals are realizing that concepts like property and sovereignty—basic concepts in Western legal frameworks—have distinct normative connotations for non-Western legal systems. As shown by Viñuales, the idea of the subject and the object of the legal system are used arbitrarily as global extracting from European legal customs. They frequently do not measure up to those of native groups in other parts of the world, such as Latin America. These variations are significant. In addition to asking what role international law plays in the Anthropocene, they also ask if the law still has a place in uniting various worldviews and ways of life concerning interactions among humans and non-humans in the environment under the umbrella of a common normative framework. To this end, legal studies may find interesting directions to follow in current social and traditional anthropology to help them reconcile the inevitable conflicts that arise between varieties of normative settings.

IV. Ontological and Epistemological Varieties in International Environmental Law and Amerindian Perspectivism

Much of the discourse that has been established about the relationship between humans and the environment stems from a long history of colonialism that used violence to drive away cultural and indigenous information and ways of life. One of the basic features of Amerindian perspectivism, which is also partially situated in what some refer to as the ontological turn in anthropological research, is that by changing the way we view the division between nature and culture. It allows every individual to specify an image of their selves in which we do not recognize ourselves; we can express an epistemology that runs counter to those based on colonial terms. To overcome these cultural divisions, the ontological shifts in the anthropological branch offer strong tools and force us to find appropriate epistemological means of interacting with other ways of life (Birrell & Matthews 2020).

Although this approach has its limitations, it is still true that questioning the onto-epistemological places that currently underpin the environmental law that has been established opens up new possibilities for rethinking how humans fit into the wider world and how our relationships with other species (non-human) might be rearranged. The world's opposition to a world-renowned image of environmental conservation has spread throughout the world. Consequently, considering the basis of world environmental law in terms of diverse ontologies has a powerful decolonial perspective. The colonial feature of a widely propagated division between humans and nature has also produced a difference in the behavior of Global North as well as Global South approaches to nature protection. This is precisely what Amerindian perspectivism suggests, and the subsequent sections will provide the theoretical foundation for reconsidering the inadequacies of contemporary environmental legislation.

V. Nature and its Rights: Creating Amerindian Perspectivism for Re-Enacting International Environmental Law and Indigenous Forms of Life

International law has developed throughout time into a discipline with several specialized subfields, each focusing on unique and often unrelated issues. Often related to fragmentation, this experience marked the beginning of the development of many specialist areas, like international human rights law and environmental law. This also implies that the fragmented form of international law today has moved research away from seeing different topics through the lenses of highly specialized professions (Wagner, 2016). As mentioned earlier, international environmental law and native beings and international law are two of these many areas of competence. These two rather different areas cross significantly in several situations, for apparent reasons (Fausto, 2001). However, different methods have grown increasingly comparable across a wide range of industries, and novel responses to common problems have emerged. There has not been much agreement on how to phrase them within the circumstances of rights related to humans.

Many topics have been the subject of recent discussions, such as whether or not the right to a healthy environment falls under the definition of a basic human right (Lapierre, 1968) and how to preserve native peoples' economic, social, political, cultural, and civic integrity while still adhering to human rights norms. Concerns about how to operationalize these indigenous ways of life in the absence of a framework that is now appropriate to protect their rights remain unaddressed. Because of the advent of new, extensive industries, in the developing states, the

present ecological catastrophe has made it increasingly difficult to articulate local, primarily indigenous communities with contemporary normative structures intended for their protection, like human rights. The scary ratio at which these extracted industries have affected the local lives means that environmental regulation has to take the variety of life into account. There is a sound theoretical discussion for making arguments on the moral and licit frameworks, which dictate how humans should and should not interact with nature. Such a question consists of two sections: normative and descriptive. Most of the suggestions for potential evolutions to justice and environmental conservation have come to explain the latter. This convergence is the focus of another area of law related to the rights of nature.

Many of the new rights of nature and climate change lawsuits have benefited from these rights of nature, which are primarily—though not exclusively—founded on the advancements of planet jurisprudence. The international environmental regulations that had a corporate orientation and look nature as a commodity gave rise to the rhetoric around the rights of nature. In addition to municipal and international environmental law, the topic of the rights of nature involves aspects of classical legal philosophy. It, however, includes many viewpoints from various local groups, including—and maybe most importantly—endogenous peoples, about their relation between humans and the natural world. In reality, there has been a more concerted effort to include, or at least portray, these kinds of existence as viable alternatives to human-environment connections within the framework of the modern rights of nature. The movement discusses giving non-human species in the natural world legal personhood. Numerous national normative frameworks have successfully captured the shifts in academic research. By way of new, laws or case law, certain national governments have begun to acknowledge aspects of aboriginal cosmologies. The two primary approaches used to do this were either acknowledging the legal nature of natural events or giving indigenous ceremonial decision-making procedures considerable leeway. Latin American constitutions, like those of Bolivia and Ecuador, demonstrate how to include indigenous living forms and their cosmological components into reinterpreted environmental regulations. The lawless often see nature as something that should be protected rather than as a force for change, one that may need legal action to preserve its corporeal coherence. For example, despite nature's legal personhood award, operationalizing its protection nevertheless presents challenges. It is certain; that the inclusion of aboriginal cosmologies in constitutional or legal research modifies one understanding of the function of law in regulating human-nonhuman interactions.

VI. Uniting the Public in Support of International Environmental Law and Reassessing individuals for Multiculturalism

Another key contribution of the American perspective is to reconsider how we can incorporate native perspectives into Western judicial systems and the possible formation of what they deem to be the public. Roy Wagner claims that if authorities are what Westerners associate with innovation and independent force, which is a feature of collectivities, then the Westerner is power and does ethics. The indigenous person, on the other hand, does or pays attention to power and is moral. However, we can see that various Amerindian followers will have many political and ethical unions as family. The parakanãs and the arewetés, in Brazil, are examples of this (Fusto, 2001). Different ethnic groups arrange their political parties in unique ways, which we refer to as their public spheres. As a result, the normative framework governing

human and non-human interactions may also vary. Political power always exerts influence on the space that the public articulates itself in Western cultures. Political authorities have been praised in Western nations as being so essential to a society that it is impossible to divorce the political from the notion of power in many ways (Lapierre, 1968). Power is only conceivable in the Western culture in terms of coercion. Therefore, it inevitably falls within the political domain.

Finally, changing modern tools of public engagement in environmental decision-making procedures is necessary to reconsider public perception in a multilateral setting. As previously mentioned, continuing with local choices significantly influences how people live in other places. Therefore, by considering a variety of interests, political choices need to be made that fade the conventional lines between territorial governments. If one takes into account the potential overall negative consequences on ecosystems, building dams in a single city in a state in the world South, for example, may have a huge influence on people's lives in the Global North. Moreover, the choices made by a small number of countries to mitigate the consequences of climate change have a significant impact on the lives of a large number of people worldwide. Given this interconnection of people and activities, taking into consideration a variety of interests, preventing future ecological disasters, and reducing the damage that human activity brings to the environment all need a reinterpretation of decision-making processes in theory and practice.

VII. Conclusion

There are several approaches to review how contemporary Western legal setup may better represent different life forms and realign human relationships to the natural world by adopting an Amerindian viewpoint. Assigning the label of humanity to everything that is part of a natural environment creates an emerging ontological area on which we may center our interactions and connections. Modern law is largely based on the concept that the legal person may and should originate principally from what has been called human. Whether the law can take into consideration not only the variety of multiculturalism as well as how we might each take the environment differently based on our conception of it, then the basic idea of rights may be utilized to better understand our relationships with our natural environment. In the Anthropocene, we need to finish all anthropos from its placement as the only subject and aim of legal framework. Understanding how aboriginal thought attributes subjectivities and the content of intersubjective relationships might help us develop legal structures that are more in line with contemporary thought and transcend moral concerns.

The Amerindian viewpoint offers fresh ways to reshape the normative landscape to better accommodate human interactions with non-human creatures, but it is not universally relevant to grasp the almost unlimited variety of native experiences that exist globally. Stated differently, perspective helps like a powerful critical instrument to challenge a significant portion of the anthropocentrically and colonially constructed legal conceptions that stem from Western lifestyles. It may be necessary to go outside of the Western world to reorient lawful relations and change our interaction with the natural environment. Perhaps it is time to question a cornerstone of global environmental law. The assumption is that judicial pluralism encompasses the multicultural approach while upholding the concept of a single ontological nature. Instead of accepting only one ontological option, some cultures embrace numerous

ontological possibilities, such as the concept of several natures or the natural acceptance of variety. It is thus preferable to see the term nature as less technocratic. Instead, the concept includes all conditions required for several onto-epistemologies. This is an idea, that allows for an alternate of the elements of the world, how we ought to perceive it, and how we ought to engage with it in a normative manner. Orienting international environmental regulations to different naturalistic interpretations might strengthen the basis for a different form of plurality in the law. Kinds of pluralism wherever provide an adaptable comprehension of individuals, locations, and public.

References

Almeida, M. (2008). A fórmula canônica do mito. *Lévi-Strauss: leituras brasileiras. Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG*, 147-182.

Álvez-Marín, A., Bañales-Seguel, C., Castillo, R., Acuña-Molina, C., & Torres, P. (2021). Legal personhood of Latin American rivers: time to shift constitutional paradigms?. *Journal of*

Human Rights and the Environment, *12*(2), 147-176.

Berry, T. (2002). RIGHTS OF THE EARTH Recognising the rights of all living beings. *RESURGENCE-LONDON-NAVERN ROAD*-, 28-29.

Birrell, K., & Matthews, D. (2020). Re-storying laws for the Anthropocene: Rights, obligations and an ethics of encounter. *Law and Critique*, 1-18.

Coombe, R. J., & Jefferson, D. J. (2021). Posthuman rights struggles and environmentalisms from below in the political ontologies of Ecuador and Colombia. *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment*, *12*(2), 177-204.

Cunha, M. C. D. (2009). *Culture and culture: traditional knowledge and intellectual rights* (No. 272599). Prickly Paradigm.

Danowski, D. (2017). Há mundo por vir?: ensaio sobre os medos e os fins.

De Castro, E. V. (1998). Cosmological deixis and Amerindian perspectivism. *Journal of the Royal anthropological Institute*, 469-488.

de Castro, E. V. (2018). *Metafísicas canibais: elementos para uma antropologia pós-estrutural*. Ubu Editora LTDA-ME.

De Lucia, V. (2019). *The'ecosystem approach'in international environmental law: Genealogy and biopolitics*. Routledge.

Descola, P. (2011). L'écologie des autres: l'anthropologie et la question de la nature. *(No Title)*.

Fraser, N., & Jaeggi, R. (2018). *Capitalism: A conversation in critical theory*. John Wiley & Sons.

Garver, G. (2020). *Ecological law and the planetary crisis: A legal guide for harmony on earth*. Routledge.

Grear, A. (2020). Legal imaginaries and the Anthropocene:'of'and 'for'. *Law and Critique*, 1-16.

Holbraad, M., & Pedersen, M. A. (2017). *The ontological turn: an anthropological exposition*. Cambridge University Press.

Kotzé, L. (Ed.). (2017). *Environmental law and governance for the Anthropocene*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Latour, B. (2017). *Où atterrir?: comment s' orienter en politique*. La découverte.

Latour, B. (2017). *Où atterrir?: comment s' orienter en politique*. La découverte.

Lemieux, V. (1970). Jean-William Lapierre, Essai sur le fondement du pouvoir politique. Publications des Annales de la Faculté des Lettres, Aix-en-Provence: Editions Ophrys, 1968, 710 pp. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, *3*(2), 329-331.

Lessenich, S. (2016). *Neben uns die Sintflut: die Externalisierungsgesellschaft und ihr Preis*. Hanser Berlin.

Maniglier, P. (2005). La parenté des autres. À propos de Maurice Godelier. *Critique*, (11), 758-774.

Natarajan, U., & Khoday, K. (2014). Locating nature: Making and unmaking international law. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, *27*(3), 573-593.

Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, A. (2017). Critical environmental law in the Anthropocene. Hart.

Sands, P., & Peel, J. (2012). *Principles of international environmental law*. Cambridge University Press.

Saul, B. (2016). *Indigenous peoples and human rights: international and regional jurisprudence*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Strathern, M. (2020). *Relations: An anthropological account*. Duke University Press.

Svampa, M. (2015). Commodities consensus: Neoextractivism and enclosure of the commons in Latin America. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *114*(1), 65-82.

Tănăsescu, M. (2020). Rights of nature, legal personality, and indigenous philosophies. *Transnational environmental law*, *9*(3), 429-453.

Todd, Z. (2016). An indigenous feminist's take on the ontological turn:'Ontology'is just another word for colonialism. *Journal of historical sociology*, *29*(1), 4-22.

Viñuales, J. E. (2018). The organisation of the Anthropocene: In our hands?. *Brill Research Perspectives in International Legal Theory and Practice*, *1*(1), 1-81.

Weiss, G. (1972). Campa cosmology. *Ethnology*, *11*(2), 157-172.

Wright, K. (2020). Rhythms of law: Aboriginal jurisprudence and the Anthropocene. *Law and Critique*, 1-16.

Books

Vilaça, A. (2016). *Praying and preying: Christianity in indigenous Amazonia* (Vol. 19). Univ of California Press.

Strathern, M. (2023). *Property, substance, and effect: anthropological essays on persons and things*. Hau Books.

Bodansky, D., Brunnée, J., & Rajamani, L. (2017). *International climate change law*. Oxford University Press.

Clastres, P. (1974). *La société contre l'Etat* (Vol. 230). Paris: Minuit.

Dawson, C., Glazier, S., Kavadias, D., Peacock, J., Peng, X., Turner, R., & Wagner, R. (2018). *The intellectual legacy of Victor and Edith Turner*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Eribon, D. (1994). *Claude Lévi-Strauss*. FeniXX.

Graham, N. (2010). *Lawscape: Property, environment, law*. Routledge-Cavendish.

Pottage, A., & Mundy, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Law, anthropology, and the constitution of the social: making persons and things*. Cambridge University Press.

Sagoff, M. (2007). *The economy of the earth: Philosophy, law, and the environment*. Cambridge University Press.