

Testing Ecuador's Rights of Nature: Why Some Lawsuits Succeed and Others Fail

Craig M. Kauffman and Pamela L. Martin

Paper Presented at the International Studies Association Annual Convention
Atlanta, GA, March 18, 2016

For eight years, scholars have celebrated Ecuador's auspicious move to include rights of Nature (RoN) in its 2008 Constitution. The constitution pledges to build a new form of sustainable development based on the Andean Indigenous concept of *sumak kawsay* (*buen vivir* in Spanish), which is rooted in the idea of living in harmony with Nature. The Preamble "celebrates" Nature (Pachamama) and presents a guiding principle for the new development approach: that humans are part of Nature, and thus Nature is a vital part of human existence.¹ Ecuador's constitution presents *buen vivir* as a set of rights for humans, communities, and Nature, and thus portrays RoN as a tool for achieving sustainable development.

While much is written on the ethical arguments regarding RoN (and *buen vivir*), very few studies analyze how RoN might be implemented. This paper begins to fill the gap by analyzing the application of RoN in Ecuador, the world's first country to grant Nature constitutional rights. These rights immediately conflicted with the Ecuadorian government's plans to expand large-scale mining and oil extraction to finance development projects. Numerous lawsuits were filed to protect Nature's rights, including from economic development projects. Given the State's plan to fuel economic growth through increased extractivism, including in fragile and protected ecological areas, Ecuador constitutes a "hard case" for implementing RoN. This paper presents a conceptual framework for understanding the tools and pathways through which Ecuador's RoN are applied in practice and the reasons why these rights are upheld in some cases and not others.

Ecuador's experience is important because of its interaction with a global movement promoting RoN internationally. No longer a fringe idea advocated only by a handful of radical activists and leftist governments, RoN has become more mainstream. This counter norm is expressed in venues as diverse as U.S. municipal ordinances, New Zealand's treaties with its Mauri population, Supreme Court decisions in India, Pope Francis' new encyclical, UN General Assembly resolutions (including a 2015 resolution to develop RoN jurisprudence), and the recent Paris Climate Talks, where RoN was advocated as a tool for curtailing fossil fuel emissions. In 2012, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)—the world's oldest and largest global environmental organization—made RoN "the fundamental and absolute key element for planning, action and assessment...in all decisions taken with regard to IUCN's plans, programmes and projects" (IUCN 2012, 147-148). It and other organizations are part of a new global governance network dedicated to implementing RoN as a means for living in harmony with Nature.²

¹ Pachamama is a sacred deity revered by Indigenous people in the Andes that is commonly used to represent Nature, analogous to the concept of Mother Earth in English.

² The Gaia Foundation, Global Alliance for the RoN, Wild Law UK, Navdanya Foundation in India, and the Indigenous Environmental Network are but a few examples of organizations working to promote a global dialog on

To facilitate their efforts, RoN advocates created a new international governing institution—the International Tribunal for the Rights of Nature. This “people’s tribunal” investigates, tries, and decides cases involving alleged violations of the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth, adopted at the 2010 World People’s Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth in Bolivia.³ Proposed by Alberto Acosta, President of Ecuador’s Constituent Assembly, the idea was inspired by the International War Crimes Tribunal and the Permanent Peoples’ Tribunal, established by citizens to investigate and publicize human rights violations.⁴ Just as these tribunals provided social pressure to create and strengthen international human rights law, the International Tribunal for the RoN is meant to foster international RoN law.

The above anecdotes show how RoN jurisprudence is simultaneously developing in Ecuador and internationally. This paper uses the Ecuadorian case as a lens for analyzing the interaction between global and local governance, and to explore several questions with global ramifications. Given that Ecuador’s constitutional RoN have not yet stopped large-scale extractive projects, do they still matter, and if so, how? And what lessons does Ecuador’s experience have for those working to implement RoN legislation in other countries and in international fora?

Global Foundations of the RoN Movement

The idea of RoN has roots in both Western and non-Western thinking, and has been expressed by writers from every continent. A common thread uniting these various traditions is the need to see humans as part of Nature, rather than separate and apart. American priest and RoN scholar Thomas Berry argued “the planet Earth is a single community bound together with interdependent relationships” (Berry 2006, 149-150).

For millennia, Indigenous communities worldwide have similarly viewed the human experience as part of the planetary experience. According to Ecuadorian Indigenous leader and former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Nina Pacari (2009, 35), the Indigenous *cosmovisión* that surrounds the concept of buen vivir and RoN in the Ecuadorian and Bolivian constitutions is a natural outgrowth of the relationship of humans to Mother Earth. Viewing human welfare as intertwined with the welfare of all Earth ecosystems means that development must be based on “ecological foundations” that recognize the integral processes of the biosphere and the need for harmony and balance among all elements of the system (Gudynas 2011, 445). This principle informs not only the concept of buen vivir in Ecuador, but also the global RoN movement, now organized through the Global Alliance for the Rights of Nature.⁵

the subject. Regarding IUCN, see http://www.iucn.org/news_homepage/news_by_date/?11070/Its-not-just-people-Nature-has-rights-too (accessed March 11, 2016).

³ <http://therightsofNature.org/wp-content/uploads/FINAL-UNIVERSAL-DECLARATION-OF-THE-RIGHTS-OF-MOTHER-EARTH-APRIL-22-2010.pdf> (accessed February 19, 2016).

⁴ Nobel Prize winner Bertrand Russel created the International War Crimes Tribunal in 1966 to investigate human rights abuses committed against Vietnamese peoples resulting from U.S. military intervention in Vietnam (Republic of Ecuador 2008, 3). Inspired by the Russell Tribunal, law experts and rights activists established The Permanent Peoples’ Tribunal to investigate and provide judgments on violations of human rights around the world (Duffett 1968).

⁵ See <http://therightsofnature.org> (accessed March 11, 2016).

For RoN advocates, market structures treating natural resources as objects for human exploitation are a root problem. To rectify this, they are calling for a new body of law, now called Earth Jurisprudence, which privilege maintaining the integrity and functioning of the whole Earth community in the long term over the interests of any species (including humans) at a particular time. Such laws balance property rights against the rights of all living things to exist and live in a healthy and sustainable environment (Cullinan 2011).

Global networks to develop and promote Earth Jurisprudence began forming in the 1990s, initially around Indigenous movements mobilizing to protect Mother Earth. Inspired by Berry's writings, the London-based Gaia Foundation collaborated with Berry to hold the first international conference on Earth Jurisprudence in 2001. This conference convened lawyers, environmental leaders, educators from South Africa and the United States, and Indigenous peoples in the Canadian Arctic and the Colombian Amazon (Bell 2001). Throughout the early 2000s, institutions and centers for Earth Jurisprudence formed in the UK, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, the US, and elsewhere. In 2006, the Center for Environmental Legal Defense (CELDF) helped citizens of Tamaqua, Pennsylvania, write the world's first local RoN ordinance.⁶

In 2007, global efforts to promote Earth Jurisprudence fed into Ecuadorians' constitution-writing process. Having read about Tamaqua's RoN ordinance, Ecuadorian RoN advocates collaborated with CELDF lawyers to draft proposed RoN articles for Ecuador's constitution. These articles adapted and strengthened Tamaqua's municipal RoN ordinance.⁷ Given the global-local connections through which Earth Jurisprudence is developing, examining Ecuador's successes and failures can provide insights for understanding the future of RoN at both local and global levels. The next section sets the stage for this analysis by describing the political context in which Ecuador's RoN legislation was crafted.

Politics of Ecuador's Rights of Nature

In 2006, Rafael Correa was elected president after a decade of extreme political and economic instability. Correa rose to power on the promise to fundamentally remake Ecuador's political and economic system, supported by a new political movement called Alianza PAIS. A loose collection of leftist academics, Indigenous, and other social movement activists, the movement was held together largely by a desire to replace neoliberal economic policies with an alternative development approach. A key step was rewriting the country's constitution in 2007.

The process of writing Ecuador's new constitution was remarkably participatory. Civil society submitted over 3,000 proposals, which were considered by the Constituent Constitutional Assembly (Greene 2015). This process provided a window of opportunity for RoN activists to influence national legislation. Ecuadorian RoN advocates (primarily Indigenous and environmental activists and lawyers) collaborated with US environmental lawyers from CELDF to draft proposed RoN articles. They found a powerful ally in the constituent assembly's president, Alberto Acosta, a well-known economist and former Energy Minister who was

⁶ <http://celdf.org/2015/08/tamaqua-borough/> (accessed February 25, 2016).

⁷ Author interview with Ben Price of Community Environmental Legal Defense Fund (CELDF) via telephone, 8 October 2014.

sympathetic to the idea. While RoN was not universally supported in the assembly, Acosta ensured that it was included in the final draft, which Ecuadorian voters approved in 2008.

Ecuador's 2008 constitution is the world's first to treat Nature as a subject with rights. Chapter 7 grants Nature the rights to exist, to maintain its integrity as an ecosystem, and to regenerate "its life cycles, structure, functions and evolutionary processes." Nature also has the right to be restored if injured, independent of human claims for compensation. Moreover, the constitution empowers any person to enforce these rights in court on behalf of Nature (Article 71). Finally, Articles 71-73 require the State to enforce and protect RoN, particularly from damage caused by extractive industries, including through preventive action. RoN was one of several constitutional elements designed to move the country away from a neoliberal development approach toward an alternative approach rooted in the Indigenous concept *sumak kawsay* (*buen vivir*).

Once the constitution passed, attention turned to creating the secondary laws and institutions needed to give form to constitutional principles. President Correa immediately launched a public campaign to pass a mining law that greatly expanded existing mining operations and initiated new sites. Correa argued the State could ensure socially and environmentally responsible mining practices. Moreover, profits from mining and oil extraction were necessary to develop a post-fossil fuel energy sector, reduce poverty, and expand access to education, healthcare, and other public goods. For Ecuador's government, these goals constituted *buen vivir*.

Indigenous and environmental activists fiercely criticized the law, saying it violated the constitutional rights of Indigenous communities to prior consultation and the RoN. They accused the government of coopting and twisting the meaning of *buen vivir*. Correa responded by calling them "childish environmentalists" (cited in Dosh 2009). Passage of the Mining Law in January 2009 prompted tens of thousands of Indigenous, community-rights, and environmental activists to protest nationwide. Tensions reached a boiling point in September 2009 after the government proposed a Water Law that opponents argued similarly violated constitutional rights for nature and Indigenous communities. Ecuador's government cracked down, and by 2011 had arrested nearly 200 Indigenous leaders, charged with terrorism for protesting mining activities.⁸ The government also closed several organizations leading the protests, including the Development Council of Indigenous Nationalities and Peoples of Ecuador and the environmental NGO *Acción Ecológica*.⁹

Given the State's priority on exploiting natural resources to fuel social development, the government put no effort into creating the secondary laws and institutions need to strengthen and give form to constitutional RoN principles. Environmental lawyers and activists drafted a secondary RoN law, but decided not to submit it to the National Assembly, given the hostile political context. Consequently, efforts to apply RoN in Ecuador occurred in a highly politicized context, with relatively little institutional structure beyond general constitutional principles. Yet, while some efforts failed, others succeeded in developing RoN jurisprudence. The following

⁸ "ONG: 189 indígenas están acusados de terrorismo y sabotaje," *El Tiempo*, July 19, 2011, available at <http://www.eltiempo.com.ec/noticias-cuenca/73360-ong-189-inda-genas-esta-n-acusados-de-terrorismo-y-sabotaje/> (accessed February 25, 2016).

⁹ *Acción Ecológica's* legal status was subsequently reinstated amid international pressure.

sections catalogue these efforts and present a framework for analyzing this variation in success and failure.

Tools & Pathways for Applying RoN

The case descriptions and analysis provided below are the product of a combined one year of in-country fieldwork (2014-2015) and several years of literature review to collect primary documents, media reports, as well as interviews with participants in the lawsuits (plaintiffs, defendants, lawyers, judges), government representatives (national and subnational), corporations, Indigenous and environmental organizations involved in RoN, among other actors. We also attended international RoN Tribunals and observed various meetings of the Global Alliance for the Rights of Nature over the past several years. While primarily conducted in Ecuador, we also conducted research in the US with digital or telephone interviews to include case studies in other countries and in international fora. Information collected was validated through triangulation, comparing primary court documents, interviews, news reports, and observation when applicable.

Legal Tools

We identified four legal tools through which RoN is applied in Ecuador. Given the lack of institutionalization, RoN in Ecuador is mostly applied through three types of lawsuits (constituting three of the four “tools”). The first two involve lawsuits seeking protection of RoN guaranteed in the Constitution and the Organic Law of Constitutional Guarantees. These lawsuits (processed through civil and constitutional courts) ask that damaged ecosystems be restored (a form of restitution for Nature) and/or that preventive action be taken to prevent expected future violations. The most common constitutional lawsuits are those requesting “protective action” to uphold RoN. Other constitutional lawsuits seek to overturn laws and executive orders that violate the constitution’s RoN clauses.

Criminal lawsuits provide a third legal tool. Such lawsuits seek punishment for “environmental crimes” outlined in the country’s Penal Code and are processed through criminal courts. Unlike constitutional lawsuits, which seek restorative justice (by restoring ecosystems), criminal lawsuits seek punishment of guilty parties. The fourth tool is not a lawsuit, but rather administrative action by a government agency to uphold RoN. For example, the Ministry of Environment has invoked RoN to justify punitive action (e.g., fines, removal of licenses, and eviction of companies from ecological reserves) and restoration of damaged ecosystems.

Cases and Pathways

We identified 13 cases where the above legal tools were used to protect RoN. In several cases, lawsuits were combined with administrative action. Table 1 summarizes these cases and identifies whether or not RoN were successfully applied (i.e., a judge upheld RoN or the government implemented an administrative action to protect RoN). Of the 13 cases, 10 efforts to apply RoN succeeded while three efforts failed. The cases suggest that the pathway through which efforts to apply RoN are channeled influences the prospects for success.

Table 1: Ecuador's Rights of Nature Cases

| RoN Case | Legal Tool | Pathway | Years | RoN Applied? | Claimants | Defendants | Case Description | Sentence |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------|----------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| Mining Law Challenge | Lawsuit challenging constitutionality of law | Civil Society | 2009 | No | CONAIE (Indigenous Movement) & Community water councils | 2009 Mining Law | The lawsuit challenged the constitutionality of the 2009 Mining Law, which set conditions for expanding mining in Ecuador. The lawsuit argued the Mining Law violated “articles of the Constitution granting rights to nature and explicitly to water,” as well as several indigenous and community rights (e.g., right to prior consultation). The lawsuit asked the Constitutional Court to invalidate the Mining Law and at a minimum prohibit mining in fragile areas, including protected areas, water sources, wetlands, and páramos (high Andean grasslands). | In 2009, the Constitutional Court upheld the Mining Law’s constitutionality, noting that the law requires procedures designed to avoid environmental damages (e.g., environmental impact assessments, water treatment, reforestation, etc.). The Court also ruled that Article 407 of the constitution grants the State the authority to make exceptions to constitutional restrictions on mining in environmentally sensitive areas when the government declares this to be in the national interest. |
| Tangabana Paramos | Constitutional lawsuit for protective action | Civil Society | 2014 - Present | No | Environmental activists (Yasunidos Chimborazo, Acción Ecológica) & indigenous pastorate of Chimborazo | ERVIC S.A. (private company owned by retired military captain, Carlos Rhor Romeno) | The lawsuit was filed to remove a pine tree plantation placed in the Paramo of Tangabana and to restore the paramo ecosystem. The plantation was created by ERVIC through a reforestation program administered by the Ministry of Agriculture (MAGAP). However, an accord between MAGAP and the Ministry of Environment (MAE) prohibits pine plantations in paramo ecosystems. The lawsuit claims the pine plantations violate the rights of the paramo to maintain its vital cycles and to be restored when degraded (Art. 71-72). It also alleges violations of the rights of defenders of nature (Art. 71) resulting from intimidation by ERVIC against community members. ERVIC said the plantation was legal since it was authorized by MAGAP. | In first instance, the judge denied the protective action on procedural grounds, saying (1) the claimants did not prove their ownership over the land, and (2) the claimants’ evidence was invalid because it was not presented with its respective testimony. The claimants appealed, saying (1) ownership of land is irrelevant since the constitution allows anyone to bring a suit on behalf of Nature; and (2) the judge’s evidentiary procedure was applicable only to criminal lawsuits and not required in constitutional lawsuits. When appealed, the Provincial court upheld the local court’s ruling. In 2015, the claimants appealed to the Constitutional Court, alleging previous court decisions were not rooted in constitutional law. The case is under review. |
| Vilcabamba River | Constitutional lawsuit for protective action | Civil Society | 2010 - 2011 | Yes | Nori Huddle and Richard Fredrick Wheeler (local landowners) | Provincial government of Loja | Loja provincial government dumped debris from road construction (without an environmental impact study) into the Vilcabamba River, causing the river’s flow to increase and change its path. This produced flooding, especially during heavy rains, and other damage to local ecosystems and landowners’ property. Landowners sued on behalf of the Vilcabamba River to have the river and surrounding ecosystems restored. | In 2010, the first-instance judge denied the protective action, saying it lacked legal standing. The case was appealed to the Loja Provincial Court of Justice in 2011. This Court ruled the suit did have legal standing due to the constitution’s RoN provisions. Importantly, the judge ruled the claimants did not have to prove damage to themselves, but only damage to Nature. The judge ruled in favor of the Vilcabamba River and ordered the Provincial Government to restore the ecosystem through measures specified by the Ministry of Environment. |
| Condor-Mirador Mining Project | Constitutional lawsuit for protective action | Civil Society | 2013 | No | A collection of indigenous movements, environmental and human rights NGOs, and community organizations | Ecuacorriete (mining company); Ministry of Non-renewable Natural Resources; Ministry of Environment (government) | The lawsuit seeks protective action on behalf of Nature against the Condor-Mirador Mining Project, Ecuador’s first, large-scale, open-pit mining project, located in a biodiversity hotspot. The suit presented scientific studies (including those by the mining company) showing the open-pit mine would cause the total removal of various ecosystems, including the habitats on which endangered endemic species rely, likely causing the extinction of one or more species (thus violating RoN). Other violations relate to contamination of watershed ecosystems with heavy metals and toxins. The suit requests suspension of the project and a more thorough environmental impact assessment. | In first instance, the judge ruled the Condor-Mirador project did not violate RoN because (1) the mining project would not affect a protected area (although a Ministry of Environment assessment showed it would), and (2) that civil society’s efforts to protect Nature constituted a private goal, while Ecuacorriete (a private company) was acting in favor of a public interest, namely development. Ruling that the public interest takes precedent over a private interest, the judge denied the protective action. The claimants appealed to the Provincial Court of Pichincha but lost. No further legal action was taken. |
| Galapagos Shark Fin | Criminal lawsuit | Civil Society | 2011 - 2015 | Yes | The Conservation Sector of the Galapagos Marine Reserve; Sea Shepherd (environmental NGO); Prosecuted by Galapagos National Park | Captain of the fishing boat Fer Mary and 11 crew members | On July 19, 2011, the Ecuadorian Coast Guard Isla San Cristobol boarded the fishing boat Fer Mary and her 6 smaller crafts inside the Galapagos Marine Reserve. They found 357 sharks (94% of total catch) and 1335 hooks forming a long line (palangre) that extended 30 miles. Shark fishing is prohibited in the Galapagos Marine Reserve. The Marine Reserve’s Conservation Sector, led by then Sea Shepherd attorney, Hugo Echeverria, filed a criminal lawsuit against the captain and crew, invoking RoN to defend the rights of the sharks in the Galapagos Marine Reserve. While the Conservation Sector was not permitted to speak for the sharks in court, they submitted an amicus brief. In addition to its successful application of RoN, this case raises the procedural question of who can represent nature in the court system. Ecuador’s constitution (Art. 71) states anyone can, but this judge only permitted Galapagos Park prosecutor to try the case. | In December 2011, the judge in the Galapagos declared himself noncompetent and in April 2014 the case was moved to the 9th Tribunal Criminal Court in Guayaquil. In July 2015, the tribunal ruled in favor of the sharks, a first for upholding the rights of sharks. The judges found the captain and crew of the fishing vessel guilty of poaching sharks in Galapagos, a protected area and a UNESCO World Heritage Site. They sentenced the captain of the Fer Mary to two years in prison, and each crewmember to one year. The verdict also ordered the confiscation of the six accompanying motor launches, as well as the destruction of the Fer Mary. |

| RoN Case | Legal Tool | Pathway | Years | RoN Applied? | Claimants | Defendants | Case Description | Sentence |
|---------------------------|--|------------|----------------|--------------|--|--|---|--|
| Secoya Palm Plantation | Administrative action | Government | 2010 - 2011 | Yes | Galapagos National Park, Galapagos Government Council; Judicial Unit of San Cristobal | Secoya Indigenous Community | In 2010, the Secoya community in canton Shushufindi negotiated with the company Palmeras del Ecuador to create an African palm plantation. With financing from the National Financing Corporation (CFN), the community cut 180 hectares of native forest to establish the plantation. The community was unaware they needed permission from the Ministry of Environment to cut native forest and failed to obtain it beforehand. | In 2011, the Ministry of Environment fined the Secoya community \$375,000 to pay for restoring the logged area. It justified the action by citing violations of the RoN (Articles 10, 71-73) and Article 78 of the Forest Law. |
| Cayapas Shrimper | Administrative action and constitutional lawsuit for protective action | Government | 2011 | Yes | Santiago García Llore, Provincial Director of the Ministry of Environment in Esmeraldas | Manuel de los Santos Meza Macías, owner of Marmeza shrimp company | In 2010, the Ministry of Environment (MAE) began removing shrimp companies illegally operating in three ecological reserves created to protect mangrove ecosystems. In 2011, Manuel de los Santos Meza Macías issued a lawsuit against MAE for a Protective Action to prevent the removal of his shrimp company, Marmeza, from the Cayapas ecological reserve (Canton Eloy Alfaro). In first instance, the judge ruled that MAE's effort to remove Marmeza constituted an infringement on Mr Meza's constitutional rights to property and to work, and ruled Marmeza could remain in the reserve. MAE appealed, but the provincial court upheld the decision on September 9, 2011. MAE then appealed to the Constitutional Court, arguing that the Provincial Court's ruling violated the constitution by not considering the rights of nature and by placing the economic interest of an individual above that of nature. MAE sued for Protective Action to prevent implementation of the Provincial Court decision. The specific question before the Constitutional Court was whether the Provincial Court's ruling violated the right of due process guaranteed by Art. 76, no. 7 of the Constitution. | The Constitutional Court acknowledged that the rights of nature are transversal in Ecuador's constitution, affecting all other rights. It ruled that by not examining whether there was a violation of the rights of nature, the Provincial Court ruling violated constitutional due process and was invalid. The Constitutional Court granted MAE the protective action, annulled the Provincial Court sentence, and ordered the Provincial Court to re-try the case, but this time including the rights of nature in its decision. |
| Esmeraldas Illegal Mining | Administrative action and constitutional lawsuit for protective action | Government | 2011 | Yes | Ministry of Interior (lawsuit for protective action); Administrative action by multiple agencies | Artisanal miners lacking government concessions | Following the 2009 Mining Law, the government announced plans to crack down on unauthorized artisanal mining. In May 2011, the Ministry of Interior petitioned the 22nd Criminal Court of Pichincha to authorize the Ministry to take extraordinary "precautionary measures" to combat unauthorized mining in the cantons of Eloy Alfaro and San Lorenzo, Esmeralda province. Citing reports by various universities and government agencies showing extreme environmental degradation, particularly the contamination of water with heavy metals and toxins, the Ministry of Interior argued these mining activities violated the RoN, particularly the rights of water. Citing Articles 71-74 of the constitution, the Ministry asked the court to order preventive action, including the destruction of equipment found in illegal mining sites. | On May 20, 2011, the court approved the request and ordered the Armed Forces and other government agencies to conduct operations to control illegal mining to uphold RoN. President Correa immediately issued Executive Decree 783, declaring a state of exception in San Lorenzo and Eloy Alfaro and ordering a military operation, carried out on May 21. Nearly 600 soldiers seized and destroyed more than 200 pieces of heavy mining equipment, including those that local miners had rented from third parties. In subsequent years, similar operations were repeated in Esmeraldas and replicated in other provinces, including Zamora-Chinchipec, Morona Santiago, and Napo. |
| Macuma-Taisha Road | Administrative action, and criminal lawsuit | Government | 2014 - Present | Yes | Ministry of Environment (administrative action); Attorney General (criminal lawsuit) | Provincial Government of Morona-Santiago (administrative action); Marcelino Chumpi, Prefect of Morona-Santiago Province (criminal lawsuit) | In 2001, the Ministry of Environment (MAE) issued an environmental license to construct a road to canton Taisha, province Morona-Santiago, to enable oil extraction. The Ministry of Transport and Public Works began construction, which later stalled. In 2009, indigenous protests against the 2009 Mining Law erupted in Morona-Santiago (an indigenous leader was killed in the conflict). In 2010-2011, Taisha canton and the provincial government passed ordinances citing the RoN to prohibit extractive industries, exacerbating conflict with the national government. In 2011 the provincial government took over construction of the road to Taisha to reduce the community's isolation (it is the country's only canton without road access). In 2014, following another indigenous uprising against the government's extractivist policies, MAE initiated administrative action against the provincial government, alleging non-compliance with an environmental license in building the road. MAE accused the government of violating of the rights of soil and water due to indiscriminate logging and discarding waste in rivers. Also, the Attorney General filed a criminal lawsuit against Prefect Marcelino Chumpi alleging "crimes against the soil" (Art. 252 of Criminal Code). Chumpi denies the charges and alleges political persecution. | Regarding administrative actions, MAE revoked the provincial government's environmental license, fined Prefect Marcelino Chumpi \$70,000, and sent the military to decommission equipment used in road construction, prompting violent clashes with community members seeking to protect the equipment. Evidence for the criminal lawsuit was submitted to the District Attorney in late 2015 and as of early 2016 was considering whether to prosecute. |

| RoN Case | Legal Tool | Pathway | Years | RoN Applied? | Claimants | Defendants | Case Description | Sentence |
|-----------------|--|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|---|---|--|---|
| Dead Condor | Criminal lawsuit | Government | 2014 | Yes | Provincial Director of Environment Ministry in Napo Province | Manuel Damián (hunter) | In June 2013, the Ministry of Environment (MAE) rescued an injured Andean Condor (knicknamed "Felipe"). After rehabilitating it, in July MAE released it into the wild, but monitored its activities. In April 2014, MAE discovered the Condor dead with bullet wounds in Napo province. The hunter was arrested in November 2014 at his home in Azuay province after posting pictures with the dead Condor on social media. MAE submitted the evidence to the District Attorney in Azuay, who charged Damián with violating RoN. Citing Articles 14, 83, 73, and 395 in the constitution (relating to RoN), the suit argued that since Andean condors are in danger of extinction, killing one threatens Condors' right to exist. The First Court of Criminal Guarantees of Azuay heard the case. | The court convicted Damián. Because he was a senior (61 years old), the court reduced the 1 year mandatory minimum sentence to six months in prison. |
| Dead Jaguar | Criminal lawsuit | Government | 2013 - 2014 | Yes | MAE | Luis Alfredo Obando Pomaquero (hunter) | In 2012, a photograph was posted on a Facebook page showing several people posing with a dead jaguar. An environmental activists reported the picture to the Ministry of Environment (MAE), which investigated and determined that Luis Alfredo Obando had killed the jaguar. In 2014, the Director of MAE in Napo Province filed criminal charges against Obando for a "crime against Nature." The lawsuit cites Art. 247 of the Criminal Code, which identifies crimes against wildlife, a category of crimes against Nature. | In first instance, the lawsuit was heard by the Criminal Court of Guarantees of Napo. On June 23, 2014, the court convicted Obando to ten days in prison and ordered him to pay damages to the Ministry of Environment. Obando appealed the ruling to the Provincial Court of Justice of Napo. The provincial court rejected Obando's appeal and, due to aggravating circumstances, increased the sentence to six months in prison. Obando appealed the ruling to the National Court of Justice, which rejected the appeal and upheld the six-month sentence. |
| Biodigestor | Constitutional lawsuit for protective action | Legal Epistemic Community | 2009 | Yes | Collection of 16 community members from canton Santo Domingo de los Colorados | Juan Rivadeneira, Director of the Company PRONACA | Beginning in 2003, citizens of the canton Santo Domingo de los Colorados complained to national government ministries about water, air, and soil contamination produced by a large-scale pork processing plant owned by the agroindustrial company PRONACA. After government administrative actions did not solve the problem, in 2009 claimants filed a lawsuit for protective action, requesting a stoppage of 6 new biodigestor machines that PRONACA was installing to process the release of methane gas caused by intensive pig farming. While the lawsuit noted the negative impacts on flora and fauna, as well as aquatic systems above and below ground, it did not invoke RoN. Rather, claimants argued that PRONACA's actions violated their constitutional rights to Health and a Safe and Clean Environment. It was the judge who applied RoN in the case. | The Constitutional Court heard the case in 2009. After stating that it is the role of the court to protect citizens and their rights, the judge ruled against the proposed protections and stoppage of the biodigestors. However, the judge ruled that the case involved potential violations of the rights of nature that needed to be protected. Invoking Articles 71-72 of the constitution, the judge ordered the creation of a commission to audit and monitor the biodigestors, water usage waste management to ensure that the rights of nature, citizens, and communities would be protected. The ruling is significant in that the court acknowledged its right to invoke constitutional articles regarding Rights of Nature even when claimants did not specifically indicate such rights. |
| Santa Cruz Road | Constitutional lawsuit for protective action | Legal Epistemic Community | 2012 | Yes | Collection of 18 citizens from canton Santa Cruz | Autonomous Municipality of Santa Cruz represented by Mayor Leopoldo Bucheli Mora and lawyer Olimpido Ismael Morales | The case involves efforts by the municipal government of Santa Cruz, Galapagos Islands, to expand Charles Darwin Ave. (the main boulevard adjacent to a marine reserve area). In 2012, a group of 18 citizens, mainly business owners, filed a lawsuit for protective action to prevent construction, fearing it would disrupt business during high tourist season. The 2nd Temporal Civil and Mercantile Court, Galapagos, heard the case. The claimants did not make an environmental argument, much less invoke RoN. Rather, they made a procedural argument, noting the municipal government lacked the necessary environmental license for construction. The Mayor argued that the decentralized rights of municipal governments allowed them to continue work to avoid tourism issues. | While the judge agreed the municipality lacked the proper license, he also noted that the case involved the RoN, and ruled these must be factored into any solution. The judge noted the construction area constituted a species habitat, and the road crossed a migratory path for marine iguanas and other species. Invoking RoN (Articles 71-73), and citing the Vilcabamba case as precedent, the judge ordered that construction be suspended until the municipality conducted an environmental impact assessment that would guarantee that construction was carried out in a way that would protect species habitat in Academy Bay and the Marine Reserve, particularly during migration season. The judge placed a voluntary agreement between the parties to a) submit the proper documents for completion of the environmental legal requirements, and b) begin work in September after the tourist season. The case establishes further precedent regarding the court's duty to protect nature, even above the autonomous rights of decentralized municipalities. |

We identified three pathways for implementing RoN in Ecuador: (1) civil society pressure, (2) government action, and (3) application by the legal epistemic community (i.e., judges). These pathways differ not only by the type of actor, but also their motivation. Civil society actors were motivated by normative principles and invoked these in their struggle to protect Nature. As might be expected, Ecuador's government acted instrumentally, invoking RoN when it served its purpose and ignoring RoN when it challenged government policies. Consequently, government positions look quite hypocritical, particularly on mining (described below). By contrast, judges' actions were often neither normative nor instrumental, but rather rooted in the routine application of law. One of our most interesting findings, which we explore below, is that RoN jurisprudence is being developed in Ecuador by judges who are not environmentalists, but who simply feel a professional responsibility to interpret and apply the law in its entirety. The following three sections analyze these pathways.

Pathway 1: Norm-Driven Civil Society Pressure

Given the successful passage of RoN in 2008, Indigenous movements and environmental NGOs were initially optimistic that Ecuador was turning away from extractivist-based development. These hopes were dashed when the government passed the 2009 Mining Law and moved quickly to expand industrial mining. Eager to protect the gains they had made, civil society activists invoked the constitution's RoN provisions to challenge the government's extractivist development agenda through lawsuits for protective action.

The success of civil society pressure is mixed. Three of their five lawsuits have failed. Two factors likely explain these failures and constitute the principle obstacles to implementing RoN. First, the contentious relationship between RoN activists and the government meant some lawsuits were highly politicized. Judicial sentences consequently focused on navigating the politicized environment rather than on implementing the specifics of the law.¹⁰ Second, most lawyers and judges simply lacked knowledge of RoN and how to interpret it. The idea that individual and corporate property rights must be curtailed in some cases to uphold Nature's rights was not only foreign to most judges, but ran counter to their legal training. As a result, judges in civil society suits have generally ruled that economic development activities are protected by individual rights (e.g., property rights, right to work) that supersede Nature's rights.

The Condor-Mirador lawsuit illustrates the problems of politicization and lack of knowledge. In 2010, Indigenous and environmental activists realized the political situation would not allow them to strengthen RoN through secondary laws. They therefore tried to strengthen RoN by establishing case precedent. After spending two years searching for the perfect case—a high profile case involving a clear, unambiguous, large-scale violation—RoN activists decided on an open-pit mining project known as Condor-Mirador.

In March 2012, the Ecuadorian government signed a contract with the Chinese-owned mining company Ecuacorriente to establish the country's first, large-scale, open-pit mining project in a sector of the Amazonian province Zamora-Chinipe known as "Condor-Mirador." The mining concessions cover 38 square miles and will include an open-pit mine expected to measure 2.5

¹⁰ We are indebted to Hugo Echeverría for this insight.

miles in diameter and .7 miles deep (Sacher 2011, 6). The project's environmental impacts are particularly problematic because it exists in one of the most biodiversity-rich areas of the planet home to several endangered endemic species, particularly some amphibians close to extinction. Also, the project is located in the watersheds for two rivers used for irrigation and consumption, and which constitute habitat for various animal and plant species.

The mining company's own environmental impact study acknowledged that the open-pit mine would cause impacts listed as RoN violations in the constitution. These include the total removal of ecosystems, including the habitats on which endangered endemic species rely, likely causing the extinction of one or more species (Thurber and Noboa G. 2010, PDF 374). Also, contaminating surface and groundwater with heavy metals and toxic products would be catastrophic for surrounding watershed ecosystems (Sacher 2011, 16-17). Article 73 of Ecuador's constitution explicitly requires the State to "apply preventive and restrictive measures on activities that might lead to the extinction of species, the destruction of ecosystems and permanent alteration of natural cycles." Moreover, the constitution clearly establishes the precautionary principle; activities likely to produce these outcomes must be stopped and re-designed. RoN activists therefore saw Mirador as a promising case for creating RoN jurisprudence.

In January 2013, a collection of Indigenous movements, environmental and human rights NGOs, and communities near the mine jointly filed a constitutional lawsuit for protective action to the 25th Civil Court in Pichincha province.¹¹ The defendants included Ecuacorriente and the Ministry of Non-Renewable Natural Resources for signing the mining contract, and the Ministry of Environment for granting an environmental license. The lawsuit alleged that these actions constituted RoN violations since scientific studies showed the mining project would likely produce environmental impacts explicitly prohibited in the constitution (e.g., destruction of whole ecosystems, extinction of species, and degradation of water ecosystems, which enjoy special protection due to water being a precondition for life).¹² The suit also noted articles in the constitution and the Law of Jurisdictional Guarantees and Constitutional Control that require the State to take preventive action against potential RoN violations, even amid uncertainty. The suit asked the Court to suspend the Condor-Mirador project and order a new environmental impact study that would address impacts on the project's drainage into watersheds.

The judge ruled that the Condor-Mirador project did not violate RoN for two principle reasons, both of which reflect dubious interpretation of the constitution's RoN clauses. First, the judge ruled that since the mining project would not affect a protected area, the environmental damage would not violate the RoN. This decision was problematic for two reasons. First, an audit by the Ministry of Environment's Comptroller showed the project did intervene in the Protected Forest of the Cordillera del Cóndor (Controlaría General del Estado 2012). More important, the constitution clearly states that all Nature has rights, not just Nature found in protected areas. The

¹¹ Organizations filing the suit included three indigenous movements (CONAIE, ECUARUNARI, CONFENIAE); two human rights NGOs (La Comisión Ecuémica de Derechos Humanos and Fundación Regional de Asesoría en Derechos Humanos (INREDH), the environmental NGOs Acción Ecológica, Fundación Pachamama, and CEDENMA; and five individuals representing local communities.

¹² The lawsuit cited Articles 71-74, 396, 406, 12, 15, 66.2, 276, 282, and 413 of the Constitution and Articles 10 and 32 of the Law of Jurisdictional Guarantees.

judge also argued that civil society's efforts to protect Nature constituted a private goal, while Ecuacorriente (a private company) was acting in favor of a public interest, namely development. Ruling that the public interest takes precedent over a private interest, the judge ruled against the claimants. Putting aside the perverse logic of this argument, it contradicts the constitutional principle that Nature's rights are both independent of societal interests and of equal value.

Civil society appealed the decision in the Provincial Court of Pichincha but lost.¹³ They blamed their loss on a lack of judicial independence. Their allegation is supported by a 2010 memo circulated among judges by Alex Mera, National Judicial Secretary, on behalf of President Correa (obtained by the authors). The memo decries the "illegitimate abuse of protective action provided for in the Constitution" to challenge public works projects, which "has meant a grave setback against placing the general interest over particular interests" (Mera Giler 2010). Arguing that "this situation has meant an enormous opportunity cost for the country," the memo presents instructions from President Correa that any judge approving a preventive action against a State project must personally reimburse the State for "damages and harm" incurred as a result of suspending the project. Government bureaucrats will determine the amount of damages owed.

Concluding they would never get a fair ruling under the current government, RoN activists chose not to appeal the Condor-Mirador case to the Constitutional Court. Rather, they appealed the case to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, where it is under review. Many RoN activists decided not to bring more lawsuits in Ecuador for fear of establishing negative jurisprudence that could weaken the gains made in the Constitution. They focused instead on mobilizing support for RoN within Ecuadorian society.

Some Ecuadorian environmental lawyers disagree that the main problem is a lack of judicial independence.¹⁴ Rather, they say most judges do not understand RoN and do not know how to interpret them or balance them against other constitutional rights. The lawsuit for protective action against a pine tree plantation in the páramos of Tangabana illustrates this problem.¹⁵

The Tangabana case relates to a 200-hectare monoculture plantation established by the private company ERVIC with funding from Ecuador's Ministry of Agriculture (through a reforestation program meant to increase carbon sequestration). ERVIC's owner, retired military captain Carlos Rhor, extended the plantation beyond his property into páramos collectively owned by a local Indigenous community. Community members were concerned because the páramos serve as the catchment area for their watershed. Pine trees are notoriously water intensive and known to seriously degrade the hydrological flow in páramo ecosystems. For this reason, Ecuador's Ministry of Environment prohibits reforestation projects in native páramo. Community members turned to the environmental NGO Acción Ecológica for help. While Acción Ecológica feared bringing another suit after Condor-Mirador, they took a risk. Since protecting páramo

¹³ Ecuador's court system is organized according to its administrative structure. Most proceedings begin in municipal-level courts (called "First Instance Courts"). Provincial Courts are "Second Instance Courts" that serve as appellate courts for first instance matters. Each Provincial Court is divided into specialized courts for different branches of law (e.g., civil, criminal, and constitutional). The National Court of Justice is the main court that hears cases of cassation and revision of appeals.

¹⁴ Hugo Echeverría, author interview, Quito, September 17, 2015.

¹⁵ Páramos are high Andean grasslands that capture and store moisture from the air and regulate the flow of water to lower areas.

ecosystems was an explicit government policy, they saw this as a chance to create positive RoN jurisprudence through a case that would not be politicized.

In November 2014, a collection of RoN activists (represented by Yasunidos Chimborazo and Acción Ecológica) and the community's pastorate filed a lawsuit for protective action in the Judicial Court of Colta (a canton in Chimborazo province). The judge ruled against the claimants on procedural grounds. The ruling demonstrates the judge's lack of understanding of RoN. First, he noted that the claimants did not own the affected land (community members were not signatories to the suit due to fear from intimidation by ERVIC). The judge ruled that since the claimants could not prove they themselves were harmed, they could not bring suit. He failed to understand that, since RoN exist independently of human interest, Article 71 of the constitution allows any person to bring a suit on behalf of Nature, including those not personally affected by RoN violations. The judge also ruled that the claimants had not demonstrated an existing damage that needed to be repaired. However, this is not necessary under the Law of Constitutional Guarantees, which authorizes preventive action to protect RoN before harm is committed.

Finally, the judge ruled that evidence submitted by the claimants (e.g., affidavits and scientific studies showing the damage pine trees cause to páramo ecosystems) was invalid because it was not presented with the respective witness testimony, a process required in criminal lawsuits. Rather, the claimants' lawyers submitted the evidence with sworn affidavits, as permitted in constitutional lawsuits by the Law of Constitutional Guarantees. According to the claimants' lawyer, ignorance of the different procedural requirements for different kinds of lawsuits is a common problem in small municipalities like Colta.¹⁶ Such places often have a single, "multi-competent judge" with general training to receive any kind of lawsuit. For practical reasons, such judges are often specialists in criminal suits and lack expertise in constitutional lawsuits. This provides a significant obstacle in highly complex cases like constitutional RoN cases.

Acción Ecológica appealed the decision to the Provincial Court of Chimborazo. However, the judge refused to consider new evidence, meaning Acción Ecológica could not submit the evidence of RoN violations that the first-instance judge had ruled inadmissible. Lacking the necessary evidence, the provincial judge ruled the claim inadmissible and denied the appeal. The claimants' lawyer, Pablo Piedra, lamented "our constitutional rights were once again violated because of a procedural issue."¹⁷ In September 2015, Piedra filed an appeal before the Constitutional Court, alleging a violation of due process. The case awaits consideration.

Despite these failures, there are successful cases of civil society lawsuits that similarly illustrate the importance of judicial knowledge and politicization of cases. The first successful civil society RoN lawsuit was filed by two Americans, Nori Huddle and Richard Fredrick Wheeler, who own land along the Vilcabamba River in Loja province. While widening a nearby road, Loja's Provincial Government discarded excavated material and construction debris into the river. Blockages altered the river's path and increased its flow, causing large floods that increased the risk of landslides, damaged local ecosystems, and reduced local landowners' access to land and water. Desperate to save their land, Huddle and Wheeler sued the provincial government on

¹⁶ Pablo Piedra, author interview, Quito, September 18, 2015.

¹⁷ Ibid.

behalf of the Vilcabamba River. As a constitutional lawsuit on behalf of Nature, the suit did not seek restitution to Huddle and Wheeler, but only the restoration of the river's natural ecosystem.

After losing in municipal court, Huddle and Wheeler appealed to the Provincial Court of Loja. In March 2011, the provincial court ruled in favor of the Vilcabamba River, making it the world's first successful RoN lawsuit. According to RoN activists, the favorable sentence was influenced by the fact that the judge was a friend of the claimants' lawyer, who educated the judge about the constitution's RoN provisions and provided guidance on how to interpret them.¹⁸ The judge's education on RoN may partially explain why this case succeeded. The judge's ability to focus on interpreting the law correctly was no doubt helped by the fact that the case involved a mundane issue like provincial road construction, and not a nationally politicized issue like mining.

Similar cases exist in the Galapagos Islands, where a Special Law and Marine Protected Area create unique criminal and civil codes for protecting this World Heritage Site.¹⁹ In July 2011, the Ecuadorian Coast Guard boarded the fishing vessel *Fer Mary* and her six smaller crafts within the Galapagos Marine Reserve. They found 357 sharks without fins, representing 94% of the total catch in the storage area, and 1335 shark hooks strung in a 30-mile line with specific characteristics used for capturing sharks. Sharks are a protected species and fishing them inside the Galapagos Marine Reserve is an environmental crime under the Galapagos Law and Penal Code of Ecuador.²⁰ In September 2011, members of the Science and Conservation Sector filed a criminal lawsuit against the *Fer Mary* captain and crew for crimes against Nature. However, the judge claimed he was not competent to hear the case and moved it to Guayaquil, on Ecuador's mainland. In interviews, members of the park and government community commented that the judge felt threatened and that it was difficult for him to choose a "fish over a human's ability to feed his family and continue a career he has been doing over a lifetime."²¹ Aside from delaying the case, it also meant that the suspects were released from detention and the next hearing would take place 982 km away from the crime scene. The *Fer Mary*, however, remained impounded in the Galapagos.

From June 2012 through August 2014, the case was transferred to Guayaquil and awaited trial. Proceedings began in May 2015 and in July 2015 the court ruled in favor of the sharks. The judge sentenced the captain of the *Fer Mary* to two years in prison, and crewmembers to one year each. The verdict also ordered confiscation of the six accompanying motor launches, as well as the destruction of the *Fer Mary*. In his verdict, Judge Franco Fernando cited Constitution Chapter 7, Articles 71-73 related to RoN. The first conviction of an environmental crime in 14 years of Galapagos law, the case set a precedent for sanctioning shark finning and other crimes against Nature in the Galapagos (Franco Fernando 2015). Despite the successful ruling, the judge did not permit the Conservation Sector to represent the sharks in court, but only speak for Nature

¹⁸ Natalia Greene, author interview, Quito, September 30, 2015.

¹⁹ Article 258 of Ecuador's Constitution specifies the function of this region to protect the principles of patrimonial conservation through the concept of *Buen Vivir/Sumak Kawsay*. Article Three of the Special Law of the Galapagos outlines principles for governing the islands including: "An equilibrium among the society, the economy, and nature; cautionary measures to limit risks; respect for the rights of nature; restoration in cases of damage; and citizen participation."

²⁰ Sea Shepherd, January 19, 2012, "Galapagos Judge Suspended Over *Fer Mary* Case," available at <http://www.seashepherd.org/news-and-media/2012/01/19/galapagos-judge-suspended-over-fer-mary-case-1321>.

²¹ Interviews with Galapagos National Park officials, April 2014, San Cristobal, Galapagos.

through an amicus brief. As attorney Hugo Echeverria explains, a remaining hurdle in RoN application is establishing that, according to Article 71 of the constitution, anyone has the right to speak for Nature.

Together, the civil society cases suggest that activists' efforts to advance RoN norms are most successful when the cases are not politicized. As a counter-norm, RoN is not yet strong enough to undermine the State's extractivist development agenda. While lack of judicial knowledge also remains a problem, efforts by civil society to educate and train judges on RoN law may be producing incremental normative development, as we discuss below. Interestingly, this normative change is also occurring through instrumental action by the State.

Pathway 2: Policy-Driven Government Action

RoN jurisprudence in Ecuador is being developed in large part through government action. Six of the 13 RoN applications were initiated by the State, all successfully. Moreover, the State employed the full array of legal tools: constitutional lawsuits for protective action, criminal lawsuits, and administrative action. While often motivated by instrumental policy considerations, we argue these actions are strengthening RoN in Ecuador, perhaps unintentionally, by establishing precedent and raising the profile and awareness of RoN among judges. The government's use of RoN to combat unauthorized mining illustrates instrumental state action.

There has long been unauthorized, "artisanal" mining in provinces like Esmeraldas and Zamora-Chinchipe. When Ecuador's government decided to pursue industrial mining, it initiated efforts to eliminate unauthorized mining. The desire to regulate all mining was undoubtedly one motivation. But the crackdown also responded to community appeals for state action to address the environmental damage caused by illegal mining. By 2010, various governmental and university reports showed that unauthorized mining had seriously degraded 140,000 hectares of land and released high levels of toxins into water sources in the cantons Eloy Alfaro and San Lorenzo (Esmeraldas province). Citing these reports, in May 2011 the Ministry of Interior requested that the 22nd Criminal Court of Pichincha approve preventive action. Citing Articles 71-73 of the constitution, the request argued that the State's duty to protect RoN, in this case the rights of water, justified extraordinary measures, including "the destruction of all items, devices, tools, and other utensils that constitute a serious danger to Nature."²²

On May 20, 2011, the court approved the request and ordered the Armed Forces, National Police, and other government agencies to collaborate in operations to control illegal mining to uphold RoN. That same day, President Correa issued Executive Decree 783, declaring a state of exception in San Lorenzo and Eloy Alfaro and ordering a military operation to combat mining in the cantons. The next day, nearly 600 soldiers seized and destroyed more than 200 pieces of heavy mining equipment, including those that local miners had rented from third parties.²³ Over the next several years, similar operations were repeated in Esmeraldas and replicated in other provinces, including Zamora-Chinchipe, Morona Santiago, and Napo.

²² Letter sent by Minister of Interior José Serrano to Judge Juan Pablo Hernández Cárdenas of the 22nd Criminal Court of Pichincha, May 20, 2011.

²³ "Fuego a maquinaria de mineras en Esmeraldas," *El Universo*, May 24, 2011, <http://www.eluniverso.com/2011/05/24/1/1447/fuego-maquinaria-mineras-esmeraldas.html>.

While the government's use of RoN to combat unauthorized mining seems hypocritical given its refusal to acknowledge RoN in the Condor-Mirador case, instrumental State use of RoN may have longer-term consequences that may strengthen RoN jurisprudence. For example, the precedent set by the State's action in Esmeraldas is now institutionalized in the country's 2014 Penal Code. Title IV, Chapter 4 identifies a series of crimes against Nature, and Article 551 legalizes the destruction of private property to protect the RoN against such crimes. While the original intention was to consolidate State control over mining, the law theoretically can be used in other circumstances.

The Ministry of Environment also invokes RoN to justify administrative actions that are part of its institutional mission of environmental protection. In some cases, the ministry unilaterally applies sanctions, like fines or the removal of environmental licenses for economic development projects determined to violate the RoN (e.g., Secoya palm plantation and Macas road cases). Other times, the Ministry files criminal lawsuits against individual perpetrators. In 2014, the ministry won two lawsuits against individuals who killed a condor and a jaguar, both endangered species. In justifying its actions, the ministry cited Article 73 of the constitution, which requires the State "to apply preventive and restrictive measures on activities that might lead to the extinction of species..." In both criminal cases, the hunters were sentenced to prison.

The Cayapas shrimp case shows how the Ministry of Environment's incorporation of RoN into its bureaucratic routine is slowly strengthening RoN jurisprudence such that it challenges vested economic interests. Ecuador is Latin America's largest shrimp producer, and shrimpers are a powerful interest group. The expansion of shrimp farms in Esmeraldas province has destroyed much of the province's traditional mangrove forests. In 1995, the government established the Cayapas Ecological Reserve to protect some remaining mangroves. However, forty-two shrimp companies already operating in the area were allowed to stay within the reserve. This exacerbated conflict between the shrimp companies and local communities who relied on the mangrove forests for their sustenance. The government did little until 2008.

In 2008, President Correa issued Executive Decree 1391, which regulated shrimp farmers and made possible their removal from protected areas. Between 2010 and 2012, the Ministry of Environment removed dozens of shrimp companies from three ecological reserves, including Cayapas. In 2011, one shrimp farmer, Manuel de los Santos Meza Macías, sued for a protective action to stop the Ministry's administrative action to remove him. At the hearing, Meza argued that "the economic interest of an individual takes precedence over Nature," and the judge agreed (Corte Constitucional del Ecuador 2015). Citing constitutional protections of private property (Art. 66, no. 26 and Art. 32), the judge ruled that the Ministry of Environment's effort to remove Mr. Meza Macías' shrimp company constituted an infringement on his constitutional rights to property and to work.

After losing its appeal in Provincial Court, the Ministry of Environment appealed to the Constitutional Court, arguing that the lower courts' rulings were unconstitutional since they violated the constitution's RoN clauses. In its appeal, the Ministry argued that it "violated the constitution" for "the judge to place the economic interest of an individual above that of Nature...since the environmental legislation that governs us is oriented around preventing

violations of the rights of Nature.” The Ministry asked the Constitutional Court to rule on this “to establish a precedent that permits us to exercise fully the respect for Nature and for buen vivir, as issues like these concern the whole community and are...nationally relevant” (Corte Constitucional del Ecuador 2015).

On May 20, 2015, the Constitutional Court ruled that RoN and buen vivir are central to the constitution and, therefore, RoN are transversal (e.g., Art. 83 no6 and Art 395 no. 2). This means RoN affect all other rights, including property rights. The Court acknowledged that this reflects “a biocentric vision that prioritizes Nature in contrast to the classic anthropocentric conception in which the human being is the center and measure of all things, and where Nature was considered a mere provider of resources” (Corte Constitucional del Ecuador 2015). The Court ruled that by not guaranteeing the RoN, the lower court rulings violated the constitutional right of due process. The Court overturned the lower court sentences and ordered the case to be retried in the Provincial Court, but this time considering RoN.

Given the government’s frustration with RoN being used to challenge its extractivist agenda, it is ironic that the State has been an influential force for strengthening RoN in Ecuador, succeeding in each of its efforts to apply RoN. While the government often invokes RoN for instrumental purposes, the result has been to build precedent and raise the profile and awareness of RoN among judges. As the next section shows, this has important effects of its own.

Pathway 3: Professional Interpretation by Judges

Unlike civil society pressure through the court system, which utilizes RoN as a tool for legal precedent and RoN norm development, or the executive use of RoN to enforce its policies, the third pathway reflects judges’ professional desire to correctly interpret constitutional law. This pathway involves lawsuits that were not originally about RoN (i.e., neither claimants nor defendants invoked RoN), yet judges unilaterally applied RoN in their sentencing. They simply recognize that RoN is part of Ecuadorian law and their professional standards require them to apply and interpret the law in its entirety.

The first case illustrating pathway 3 began before the 2008 Constitution codified RoN. In 1993, the agro industrial company PRONACA installed a large-scale pork processing plant in the canton Santo Domingo de los Colorados. Over 15 years, PRONACA built 40 factories in the canton that processed millions of pigs and chickens annually. For years, community members denounced the negative effects on the environment, human health, and the local economy. They accused PRONACA of human rights violations and appealed to the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment for help.²⁴ After a decade of study, the Ministry of Environment determined PRONACA was operating without proper legal permission. A 2003 Inter-institutional Technical Commission report confirmed reduced quality of life for populations near the plant, including contaminated local rivers, severe odors, and decreased tourism. The National Council for Water Resources also found that PRONACA did not have legal permission to use subterranean water sources and ordered fines and proper permitting.²⁵

²⁴ Ninth Criminal Tribunal, Processing number 09171-2015-0004, Guayaquil, Ecuador, p. 1.

²⁵ Ninth Criminal Tribunal, Processing number 09171-2015-0004, Guayaquil, Ecuador p. 2.

In 2009, community members filed a lawsuit with the 19th Civil Court in Pichincha province. Community members did not invoke RoN, but argued that PRONACA's actions violated their constitutional rights to Health and a Safe and Clean Environment. They asked for a stoppage of 6 new biodigester machines that PRONACA was installing to process the release of methane gas caused by intensive pig farming. While the judge allowed the biodigestors, she created a commission to audit and monitor the biodigestors to ensure adequate water usage, waste management, and the protection of citizen and community rights. Importantly, the judge based this latter decision on the court's role not only in protecting peoples' and communities' right to live in a clean environment, but also in protecting RoN, including Nature's right to be restored to its ecological state before PRONACA entered the province. This ruling is significant not only for establishing RoN precedent, but also because the court acknowledged its right to invoke constitutional RoN (e.g., Articles 71-72) even when claimants did not invoke these rights.

Another case where judges applied RoN in their sentences occurred in Santa Cruz, Galapagos. In 2012, 18 citizens, primarily business owners, sued the municipal government to stop construction on Charles Darwin Avenue (a main boulevard) during high tourist season (fearing it would hurt business). Their argument rested on the fact that the municipality lacked an environmental license for the project. The mayor argued the municipality had the right to build the road quickly before the tourist high season, regardless of licensing procedure. While the claimants invoked procedural measures, the judge applied RoN in his decision. The judge noted the construction area constituted a species habitat, and the road crossed a migratory path for marine iguanas and other species. Invoking RoN (Articles 71-73), Judge Pineda Cordero ordered that construction be suspended until the municipality obtained an environmental license based on an environmental impact assessment that would guarantee the protection of species habitat, particularly during migratory season.

This case is significant not only for the judge's unilateral application of RoN, but also for placing Nature's constitutional rights over the rights of autonomous, decentralized municipalities. Citing the constitution's precautionary protection measures and the hierarchy of rights, the judge claimed the court's duty to protect Nature took precedence over its duty to protect governments' ability to carry out public works. Equally significant, the judge cited the Vilcabamba case as precedent, suggesting earlier cases brought by civil society contributed to the judge's knowledge of RoN. This and other successful cases suggest RoN is slowly developing as a norm within Ecuador's legal epistemic community, empowering judges to apply RoN even when claimants do not originally ask for it.

Conclusion

Ecuador's experience with RoN shows how RoN norms are developing through a different trajectory than other norms, such as human rights. Ecuador's RoN laws were informed by global thinking, but advanced more rapidly than in other countries or in international fora. Unlike human rights, where international laws and norms diffused down to local levels, strong international RoN laws and norms are not available to domestic activists seeking to pressure the State to abandon its extractivist development agenda (Risse et al. 1999). The classic "boomerang" approach is not available. This is why Ecuadorian RoN activists are at the forefront of global efforts to establish RoN in international law, described in the introduction. Ecuadorian

activists are in the unique situation of using RoN as a tool domestically and advancing it as an emerging norm globally. Their experience therefore has lessons for understanding how new norms develop that are relevant to RoN activists working in other countries and internationally.

When considering Ecuador's high profile lawsuits that challenged the Mining Law and Condor-Mirador project, it is tempting to conclude that Ecuador's RoN laws merely reflect "cheap talk" on the part of the government because it saw little cost and had no intention of enforcing them (Snyder and Vinjamuri 2004). The question then becomes, do such "weak laws" matter and, if so, how? Comparing the full range of RoN cases suggests that Ecuador's constitutional RoN articles do matter in the sense that RoN activists are using them as tools to strengthen RoN jurisprudence and norms in a way that are having real impacts. However, to do so, they have to overcome two main obstacles: (1) the politicization that inevitably occurs around norm contests, and (2) judges' lack of knowledge.

RoN was politicized from the outset because Indigenous and environmental activists used it to challenge the government's economic development strategy. One important consequence was that the secondary laws and institutions that were to strengthen and give form to the constitution's RoN principles were never created. The government ignored this process as it focused on expanding mining. After their legal challenges to mining failed, RoN activists decided not to pursue secondary laws out of fear of weakening the constitutional provisions. This meant that judges had a great deal of power to interpret and apply the constitution's RoN principles. This is why judges' knowledge became so important. The politicization of RoN set the conditions for RoN norm development through the courts.

Since weak international RoN norms meant civil society could not activate the boomerang model to pressure the Ecuadorian state, it is not surprising that civil society lost lawsuits challenging the state's vital interest in economic development through extractivism. Yet, the case comparisons show that norm entrepreneurs within civil society could still develop RoN norms to the extent (1) they could identify local cases less likely to be politicized, and (2) they could identify and/or train judges with the knowledge to accurately interpret RoN laws.

Ironically, the politicization of RoN arguably contributed to RoN jurisprudence by raising the profile of RoN. While civil society did not win highly politicized lawsuits, anti-mining activists used Ecuador's constitutional RoN articles as a tool for mobilizing society and placing RoN on the national agenda, making it a salient issue. The mobilization in response to oil drilling in Yasuní national park is illustrative.

In 2013, Ecuador's government abandoned its proposal to forgo oil extraction in Yasuní in exchange for international donations to finance alternative development. It then announced plans to initiate new oil drilling in the reserve.²⁶ In response, RoN activists launched a national social movement called "Yasunidos." Their media campaign highlighted that drilling in Yasuní would violate the constitutional rights of Nature and of Indigenous communities. Yasunidos organized a campaign to collect signatures to hold a referendum on whether to block drilling in Yasuní. When the National Electoral Council rejected the signatures, activists sued before the

²⁶ For descriptions of the Yasuní-ITT initiative, see Pamela Martin (2011, 2015).

Constitutional Court. The Court did not deny electoral fraud, but also did not mandate a referendum. This outcome increased popular perception that the government's actions were unconstitutional and increased Yasunidos' ability to mobilize society against the government.

The result is that RoN is now a regular part of national discourse. No politician can discuss development, particularly mining and oil, without also talking about RoN. While the government still pursues development through extractivism, it must justify such activities as consistent with the concept of *buen vivir* and the constitutional rights of Nature. Ecuador's government has repeatedly invoked RoN to justify and legitimize its policy agenda, including actions that are politicized and controversial (e.g., actions against unauthorized miners and shrimp farmers). Importantly, the state wins when cases are politicized. Somewhat ironically, this has strengthened RoN norms by accumulating precedent and increasing the knowledge of judges.

The increasing number of successful RoN sentences suggests that judges' knowledge of RoN is expanding, likely due to the combination of the issue's politicization and civil society's efforts to accumulate precedent through non-political cases. To our surprise, the increase in knowledge among judges opened a pathway for applying RoN that we did not initially consider. As judges become aware of RoN laws, they become agents in the development of RoN norms and jurisprudence, not because they are norm entrepreneurs, but because of their professional requirements to interpret and apply RoN according to the law. The fact that Ecuadorian judges are beginning to apply RoN to cases that were not initially about RoN is evidence that RoN is emerging as a norm in the judicial system. This is another way that Ecuador's allegedly "weak" RoN laws matter.

This norm emergence and burgeoning caseload suggest pathways toward successful implementation in other states seeking to codify RoN. Even in states with extractivist policies and economies, such as Bolivia, RoN has the potential to a) emerge as a right equal to human rights and b) change the development dynamic to include a more biocentric approach. In Ecuador, despite its extractivist development agenda, placing RoN as a constitutional right has also heightened its importance and called the legal community, judges, and civil society to re-frame decisions in terms of living harmony with nature, rather than strictly in anthropocentric terms.

Ecuador's experience is informing international efforts to advance RoN. International Tribunals for Rights of Nature that have taken place in Quito and Lima in 2014 and in Paris during the 2015 UNFCCC Climate Talks provide platforms for sharing knowledge and invoking RoN in international and domestic institutions around the world. Laws and ordinances are emerging at various levels of government in countries from the U.S. and Brazil, to Romania, New Zealand and India. Inspired by Ecuador's experience, these efforts are combining into an emerging movement for a Universal Declaration of Nature's Rights. If such a declaration were to occur, it would create a new level of application for RoN beyond the state and thus, open avenues for repercussions when the state does not apply RoN. Our preliminary findings from the world's first RoN lawsuits lay the groundwork for future comparative research on the pathways of implementation of RoN in other states and their implications for a broader norm emergence.

References:

- Bell, Mike. 2001. "Thomas Berry and An Earth Jurisprudence." Yellowknife, Northwest Territories: Inukshuk Management Consultants.
- Berry, Thomas. 2006. *Evening Thoughts: Reflections on Earth as Sacred Community*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Controlaría General del Estado. 2012. "DIAPA-0027-2012, Dirección de Auditoría de Proyectos y Ambiental." Quito, Ecuador: Ministerio del Ambiente.
- Corte Constitucional del Ecuador. 2015. Sentencia No. 166-15-SEP-CC, Caso No. 0507-12-EP, Quito, Ecuador
- Cullinan, Cormac. 2011. *Wild Law: A Manifesto for Earth Justice*. White River, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Dosh, Paul. 2009. "Correa vs Social Movements: Showdown in Ecuador." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 42:21-40.
- Duffett, John, ed. 1968. *Against the Crime of Silence: Proceedings of the Russell International War Crimes Tribunal*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Franco Fernando, Fernando Lalama. 2015. Sentencia No. 09171-2015-000, Tribunal Noveno de Garantías Penales, Guayaquil, Ecuador.
- Greene, Natalia. 2015. "The Politics of Rights of Nature in Ecuador." Webinar sponsored by the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy, New Haven, CT.
- Gudynas, Eduardo. 2011. "Buen Vivir: Today's tomorrow." *Development* 54 (4):441-7.
- IUCN. 2012. *Resolutions and Recommendations, World Conservation Congress*. Jeju, South Korea: IUCN.
- Martin, Pamela L. 2011. *Oil in the Soil: The Politics of Paying to Preserve the Amazon*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- . 2015. "Leaving Oil Under the Amazon: The Yasuní ITT Initiative as a Post-Petroleum Model?" In *Ending the Fossil Fuel Era*, ed. T. Princen, J. Manno and P. Martin. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mera Giler, Alex. 2010. Oficio Circular No. T1.C1-SNJ-10-1689, Presidencia de la República, Quito, Ecuador.
- Pacari, Nina. 2009. "Naturaleza y territorio desde la mirada de los pueblos indígenas." In *Derechos de la Naturaleza: El Futuro es Ahora*, ed. A. Acosta and E. Martinez. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- Republic of Ecuador. 2008. *Constitution of the Ecuadorian Republic*. Available at Political Database of the Americas, <http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Constitutions/Ecuador/english08>, accessed February 14, 2015.
- Risse, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, eds. 1999. *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacher, William. 2011. "Revisión crítica parcial del 'Estudio de Impacto Ambiental Para la Fase de Explotación a Cielo Abierto del Proyecto Minero de Condor Mirador' de la empresa Ecuacorriente, Ecuador." Quito, Ecuador.
- Snyder, Jack, and Leslie Vinjamuri. 2004. "Trials and Errors: Principle and Pragmatism in Strategies of International Justice." *International Security* 28 (3):5-44.
- Thurber, Mark, and Gabriel Noboa G. 2010. "Estudio de Impacto Ambiental Para la Fase de Explotación a Cielo Abierto del Proyecto Minero de Condor Mirador." Quito, Ecuador: Walsh Environmental Scientists and Engineers.