



Research article

JNL: <https://ijlcw.emnuvens.com.br/revista>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54934/ijlcw.v4i1.127>

INTEGRATION OF “PLANETARY APPROACH” AND “PLANETARY JUSTICE” WITHIN THE ARCTIC OCEAN GOVERNANCE SYSTEM TO EMBRACE THE ROLE OF NON-HUMAN NATURE IN PROTECTING THE ARCTIC MARINE ENVIRONMENT

Sabrina Hasan ⁱ

East China University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai, China

Article Information:

ABSTRACT | 摘要 | RESUMEN

Received

February 3, 2025

Revised

February 27, 2025

Accepted

March 10, 2025

Published

May 5, 2025

Keywords:

arctic marine environment, arctic ocean governance, planetary approach, planetary justice, role of non-human nature

The Arctic region has drawn attention from around the world due to its distinct environment and susceptibility to climate change. The need for an effective system of governance that goes beyond anthropocentric viewpoints is more pressing than ever as human activities in the region increase, from resource exploitation and shipping to tourism. The incorporation of a “planetary approach” into the Arctic Ocean Governance System is examined in this paper, which represents a crucial paradigm change for safeguarding the Arctic marine environment. The paper further explores how the concepts of “planetary approach” and “planetary justice” can be integrated into the Arctic Ocean governance system to embrace the role of non-human nature in protecting the Arctic marine environment. In addition, the paper analyses how the “planetary approach” with a broader mandate can implement best practices in Arctic Ocean governance.

FOR CITATION:

Hasan, S. (2025). Integration of “Planetary Approach” and “Planetary Justice” within the Arctic Ocean Governance System to Embrace the Role of non-Human Nature in Protecting the Arctic Marine Environment. International Journal of Law in Changing World 4 (1), 24-41. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54934/ijlcw.v4i1.127>

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, there has been an increasing focus on the governance of the oceans, as they are threatened by anthropogenic activities such as shipping, tourism, illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, ocean acidification, exploitation of deep-sea resources, black carbon emissions, transboundary pollution from land-based activities, and more.[25] Although the global community has taken numerous initiatives over the past decade, the global environmental governance system remains anthropocentric. The targets and goals set under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have reached the deadline for their achievement by 2020, and the next targets to be achieved by 2030 and 2050 have also been updated. According to the UN report Global Biodiversity Outlook 5, none of the Aichi targets have been achieved, but some of the targets, such as target 11, have been partially achieved.[42] The reports also indicate that the 2030 SDGs cannot be achieved unless effective measures are taken to protect biodiversity.

As the ocean covers more than 70 percent of the Earth, it is more vulnerable to risks and challenges. One example is the Arctic Ocean (AO), which is facing serious environmental issues. Climate change and drastic ice melt over the past 22 years have caused sea levels in the Arctic to rise by an average of 2.2 millimetres per year.[41] Records have shown that the Arctic sea ice area was down to 2.8 million square miles in July 2020, leaving the Northern Sea Route ice-free earlier than previously recorded.[8] As a result, climate scientists predict that the Arctic could be ice-free by the summer of 2035, and these predictions were reinforced by a study published in *Nature Climate Change*.[23] Due to these changes, the AO has become an anthropocentric source of economic prospects for shipping, fishing, tourism, etc. In particular, the Northwest Passage, which is connected to the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, has become a potential sea route, hence, it is very important to establish a proper governance system for AO [40], that would include a planetary approach to global and AO governance ascertaining the role of non-human nature in global and AO governance. Hence, the main goal of this paper is to critically evaluate the current legal frameworks governing the Arctic and make an argument for the inclusion of a planetary approach. This approach highlights the need to preserve the fragile equilibrium of the Arctic and the interdependence of ecosystems by acknowledging the intrinsic value of non-human nature.[7] The scope includes looking at potential legal implications, governance problems, and reform ideas to strengthen the area against growing environmental concerns.

Adopting a “planetary justice” policy could emphasize the importance of protecting the environment and its resources. Closer application of the concept of “planetary justice” to global and Arctic marine environmental governance would promote the harmonization of human activities and marine ecosystems within a system of global cooperation, strike a better balance between conservation and sustainable use, and consider both economic and environmental interests, with the latter taking precedence when conflicts arise.[7] In addition, more rigorous and stronger monitoring and governance systems are needed, for which regional or global cooperation is required, and this paper discusses how these could be achieved by applying the “planetary approach”. The paper further argues that the approach is not about having an absolute shift from the current approaches but rather including and understanding the role of non-human nature within global politics for mitigating the challenges caused by anthropocentric influences. The planetary approach seeks to bridge the gap between people and nature and perceive them as interconnected. Thus, it links numerous, extremely disparate disciplines and facilitates communication among them.[10, 15] Hence, a new view of international relations that is based on post-anthropocentric theories and empirical research is required [46] for global marine environmental governance and the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity, harmonious coexistence between humans and nature must be promoted to embrace the role of non-human nature.[39]

Accordingly, the paper examines Arctic Ocean governance issues through the compilation and interpretation of relevant international, regional, and national regulatory instruments, reports, and scientific publications. The research conducted is based on a doctrinal analysis of current laws and policy instruments with sociological and other considerations. In addition, this paper explores how the concepts of “planetary approach” and “planetary justice” can be integrated into the Arctic Ocean governance system to build “planarization,” what the implications would be, and how the “planetary approach” with a broader mandate can implement best practices in Arctic Ocean governance. Based on the analysis and arguments, this paper guides the form of recommendations for integrating new approaches and concepts, and how global cooperation can ensure a balance of interests. This paper not only identifies and analyses the legal challenges faced by the current Arctic Ocean governance system but also highlights how traditional practice has caused harm to the global environment. Concluding with the analysis, it makes recommendations to States, focusing on the Arctic States, as well as the international community, as the issue concerning any part of the Planet is global in nature and interconnected.

2. ARCTIC OCEAN GOVERNANCE

The Arctic Ocean is surrounded by five coastal states (Norway, Denmark/Greenland, Russia, Canada, and the United States of America (USA)), leading coastal states to assume a special role in AO governance.[38] The Arctic coastal states issued a declaration in 2008, the “Ilulissat Declaration”, through which they expressed their rights, duties, and stewardship responsibilities for the AO and conceded that there was no further need for the development of a new international regime.[30] In addition, Arctic coastal states acknowledge that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) provides a “sound foundation for responsible management” (Ilulissat Declaration, 2008). Although UNCLOS sets guidelines for resource management, environmental protection, and marine boundaries, its effectiveness in adapting to the Arctic’s rapid changes is limited. The primary focus of UNCLOS is state interests, and the complex interdependencies that exist within the Arctic ecosystem are not fully addressed. Moreover, the issues concerning AO are no longer regional in nature, as the rest of the planet is also connected to it. Concerning the governance claimed by coastal states that the existing legal system is suitable for the governance of the sea, it can be argued that the “Ilulissat Declaration” has lost some of its legitimacy.[40] The Arctic Council, which consists of eight Arctic states, is not an international organisation but an intergovernmental forum to regulate the Arctic Ocean activities; it lacks the legal personality of an international organisation under international law.[49] In addition, diplomatic issues among Arctic states and gaps in AO governance laws and regulations have raised concerns about creating an effective governing system.

The world’s marine areas, which cover more than 70% of the Earth’s surface, need to be properly governed, but the existing governing system is unable to meet the challenges. Activities in the Arctic are governed by a complicated web of international treaties, national laws, and agreements. A closer look reveals that these frameworks frequently place human goals, economic advancement, and geopolitical considerations ahead of ecological integrity. The Arctic Council, for example, prioritises sustainable development above a comprehensive global strategy. The Arctic is one of the last pristine ecosystems on Earth with rich biodiversity that provides stability to its vital ecosystem and marine environment, but is now threatened due to a variety of factors.[29] There are numerous shortcomings in the current governance structure. Among the main issues are a lack of procedures acknowledging the intrinsic value of non-human beings, insufficient emphasis on biodiversity conservation, and inadequate methods to address cumulative

environmental damage. Ecological balance must be given top priority in government, as evidenced by recent events like oil spills and migratory route interruptions.

Despite existing international laws and regulations to protect the marine environment and its resources, countries fail to cooperate, implement existing laws, have tools or measures to monitor marine activities, and adequately administer and manage MPAs, among others.[26] In this sense, consideration of an approach that advances goals and objectives for giving equal treatment to non-human nature in contrast to anthropocentrism within the framework of existing and future regulatory instruments is a *sine qua non*.[38, 43] In addition, improved approaches and tools are needed to monitor and quantify anthropogenic activities for the protection of the Arctic marine environment and its resources and to provide information to policymakers and people about its value in environmental, social (including cultural), and economic terms.[6, 22] Hence, this paper examines the importance of the planetary approach to global and Arctic governance means and how it can contribute to the promotion of meaningful Arctic Ocean governance, considering the protection of non-human agents such as marine biodiversity.

3. IMPLICATIONS OF A PLANETARY APPROACH IN THE ARCTIC

Based on environmental law and ecological ethics, the planetary approach asserts that nature has intrinsic value that is apart from human use. Drawing on the writings of environmental philosophers like Arne Naess and Aldo Leopold,[9] this strategy has developed into a legal framework that questions the conventional anthropocentric understanding of environmental protection. This strategy goes beyond human interests in the Arctic and recognises the intrinsic value of non-human nature. Incorporating a global perspective into Arctic governance is not just a matter of philosophy but also a pragmatic requirement. The complex interactions between different species that are essential to preserving the fragile balance are what define the Arctic environment. Maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem services and protecting the area from permanent environmental harm all depend on acknowledging the fundamental value of non-human nature.[31] The reason for adopting this method is further supported by the scientific agreement regarding the interdependence of Arctic ecosystems (The eight Arctic governments signed the Agreement on Enhancing International Arctic Scientific Cooperation on May 11, 2017, in Fairbanks, Alaska; the Agreement entered into force on May 23, 2018). Legal systems governing the Arctic must

expressly recognise and protect non-human entities in order to close the current gaps. Changes should recognise the rights and interests of Arctic wildlife and plants, moving beyond anthropocentric viewpoints.

It is critical to establish explicit measures for the preservation of keystone species and their habitats, as these are vital to the resilience of ecosystems. Giving non-human elements legal standing is a novel idea in environmental law that needs to be carefully considered. The paper suggests a legislative framework that acknowledges the rights of the environment and permits appointed stewards or guardians to speak on behalf of ecosystems in court. Taking inspiration from global precedents that have awarded legal status to rivers [38] and ecosystems, the Arctic's distinct ecological significance demands a comparable designation.[18]

The planetary approach promotes applying and interpreting the law in a more inclusive way. From a global perspective, UNCLOS ought to consider state concerns as well as foster a deeper comprehension of the interdependence of Arctic ecosystems.[3] This entails giving non-human creatures' rights, like those of marine organisms and ecosystems, legal weight. Furthermore, the planetary perspective demands that the exclusive economic zones (EEZs) delineated by UNCLOS be re-evaluated. The fluidity of Arctic habitats may be better captured by more creative boundary delineation than the conventional method of using fixed coordinates.[33] Territorial and resource rights require a more flexible and dynamic approach in order to reflect the evolving circumstances in the area.[33] Article 234 gives Arctic coastal states the power to create laws designed especially for areas covered in ice inside their EEZs. The purpose of these entitlements is to prevent, reduce, and manage marine pollution that results from ships travelling through ice-covered areas when extremely hazardous weather makes navigation extremely dangerous. Nonetheless, there is disagreement on the application of Article 234, especially when it comes to the US and other coastal states in the Arctic, such as Russia and Canada.[44] The United States contends that such exclusions should not obstruct the freedom of the high seas during innocent (or transit) passage, whereas Canada and Russia defend the right to bar ships from their territorial sea or EEZ based on local restrictions based on Article 234.[47]

Moving from single-species management to ecosystem-based management is required by the planetary approach.[45] In order to give the resilience and health of entire ecosystems precedence over individual species or resources, legal frameworks need to be reorganised. This methodology fosters a more sustainable equilibrium and is consistent with the interdependent character of Arctic ecosystems.[48] Traditionally divided between the environmental, economic, and social domains, Arctic governance calls

for a more coordinated strategy. The creation of legal frameworks that support interdisciplinary cooperation would guarantee that choices consider the complex effects on both human and non-human entities.[5] The anthropocentric theory that states that only humans have legal rights is refuted by the planetary approach. A critical first step towards attaining planetary justice in Arctic governance is the recognition of the rights of non-human entities, such as ecosystems or particular species, within legal frameworks.[1] Although the planetary approach has strong theoretical foundations, there are real-world obstacles that must be overcome before it can be put into practice. The challenges of incorporating a holistic viewpoint within the confines of current legal frameworks must be addressed by legal scholars and legislators.

Finding a balance between national interests and the welfare of the planet as a whole is a major task. States may be reluctant to give up exclusive control over resources due to geopolitical and economic factors.[21] It isn't easy to negotiate a common ground that balances national interests with global imperatives. To guarantee adherence to new legal standards, the implementation of the planetary approach calls for strong enforcement procedures.[11] To discourage environmentally hazardous actions and promote responsible behaviour, it will be crucial to set up efficient monitoring, reporting, and punishing systems. Including indigenous perspectives in legal frameworks is a challenge as well as an opportunity. Indigenous knowledge enhances our understanding of Arctic ecosystems, but its integration into legal frameworks necessitates redressing historical injustices and guaranteeing fair participation in decision-making. The current state-centric governance model needs to be re-evaluated in light of the planetary perspective.

Global collaboration is essential, and in order to support a more inclusive and cooperative approach to Arctic governance, changes to international institutions might be required.[12] Even though the status of AO as an enclosed or semi-enclosed sea is debatable,[24] the governance and functioning of the Arctic Council are similar to such. UNCLOS Article 123 emphasises that coastal States should work together to manage the confined or semi-enclosed seas in the region. This provision calls for cooperation in the creation of cooperative scientific research strategies, the execution of environmental protection measures, and the exploration and exploitation of living resources (Article 123 of UNCLOS). Making an analogy, it highlights the value of inclusivity and shared responsibility in the context of the Arctic Ocean, promoting collaboration not just between the Arctic States but also with other interested international organisations.

In order to meet the particular environmental difficulties and ensure sustainable management of the marine resources in the Arctic, a cooperative framework is essential.

The planetary approach to Arctic governance is a call to action for stakeholders, policymakers, and law scholars alike, not just a theoretical concept. The path can be shaped for a more resilient and sustainable future for the Arctic by reinterpreting current legal frameworks, recognising the ethical aspects of decision-making, and adopting a dynamic and inclusive approach.[13] The legal community is at the centre of defining the legal standards that will guide Arctic governance in the future through the challenges of putting a planetary strategy into practice.

4. NEED FOR PLANETARY JUSTICE IN THE ARCTIC

Fundamentally, planetary justice and the planetary approach are closely related.[16] Planetary justice in the context of Arctic governance means considering the health of the Earth as a whole, going beyond anthropocentric viewpoints, and considering the interests of non-human species.[16] The realisation of the inherent value of Arctic ecosystems emphasises the moral necessity of planetary justice in Arctic governance.[20] These ecosystems have intrinsic value in addition to being vital for human well-being, and choices affecting the Arctic must take this ethical aspect into account. The precautionary principle forms the basis of one defence of planetary justice. As Arctic ecosystems are unpredictable and complicated, the government must take a cautious approach, putting the preservation of the Arctic environment ahead of potentially harmful human activity. This principle emphasises the need to safeguard the global commons for the benefit of both current and future generations, which is in line with the larger framework of planetary justice.[32] In addition, planetary justice promotes the incorporation of indigenous viewpoints and knowledge into decision-making procedures. Indigenous groups provide special insights that enhance scientific methods because of their enduring ties to the Arctic environment.[50] An equitable and inclusive governance framework must prioritise acknowledging and honouring the rights and knowledge of indigenous peoples.

The idea of environmental ethics holds that nature is valuable in and of itself, independent of human needs.[19] This means appreciating the intrinsic value of the Arctic's varied ecosystems, wildlife, and vistas. From a legal perspective, recognising the region's non-instrumental worth is necessary in order to incorporate environmental ethics within the framework of Arctic governance.[37, 20] Beyond human interests, the framework for planetary justice calls for legislative measures to protect the Arctic's inherent

worth. This entails questioning established cost-benefit calculations and giving priority to laws that protect the Arctic's distinctive biodiversity, natural processes, and aesthetic appeal. The ethical basis of planetary justice affects how legal rules are developed and interpreted.[27] Policymakers need to consider issues of justice, equity, and fairness in dividing up the advantages and disadvantages of Arctic operations. Considering historical differences in resource use and environmental effects, the concept of common but differentiated responsibilities becomes essential.[49]

In Arctic governance, acknowledging and incorporating indigenous knowledge and rights is essential to planetary justice.[36] With their long history of coexisting with the Arctic environment, indigenous communities provide a distinctive viewpoint that enhances the moral aspects of decision-making. Prioritising the rights of indigenous populations and addressing historical injustices are imperatives for the legal discourse.[21] This involves actively participating in the creation of legal standards that affect their lives and territories, in addition to consultation and consent. Legal frameworks become more sensitive to the complex and situation-specific features of Arctic ecosystems by incorporating indigenous knowledge.

5. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR PLANETARY JUSTICE IN THE ARCTIC

Analysing current international laws governing the Arctic becomes essential as the move from ethical issues to the practicalities of legal systems takes effect. Although its main focus is on resource management and maritime boundaries, UNCLOS also establishes the foundation for environmental protection in the Arctic. The responsibility of states to safeguard and maintain the marine environment is emphasised in Article 192. However, the paradigm of planetary justice demands that these duties be interpreted broadly, covering not just the interests of individual states but also the welfare of the planet as a whole.[28] In light of planetary justice, stakeholders might push for a rereading of UNCLOS provisions that emphasise the interdependence of Arctic ecosystems and the effects of environmental degradation in the region on a global scale. Regional accords are essential to Arctic governance in addition to UNCLOS. For example, the Arctic Council encourages collaboration between Arctic states for sustainable development and environmental preservation.

Arctic stakeholders can aid in the creation of legally enforceable agreements that prioritise planetary well-being and handle new concerns. This could entail creating unique environmental protection rules that surpass the current voluntary recommendations. To guarantee that current agreements remain relevant in the face of changing environmental conditions, policymakers should look for regular evaluations and changes in these agreements. This involves thinking about how future legal reforms might take into account indigenous viewpoints, planetary justice concepts, and non-human rights.[21] A regime like that might represent a comprehensive strategy that recognises the interconnectedness of both non-human and human entities in the area. Strong enforcement mechanisms are essential to the efficacy of legal frameworks.

6. RECOGNIZING THE INTRINSIC VALUE OF THE ROLE OF NON-HUMAN NATURE IN ARCTIC OCEAN GOVERNANCE

The legal and moral justifications for recognising non-human nature's influence in Arctic governance are covered in detail in this section. Legal frameworks can change to better safeguard the region's various species, habitats, and biological processes by acknowledging the intrinsic value of Arctic ecosystems.[50] According to the planetary perspective, non-human entities—such as species and ecosystems—have inherent value in addition to being useful to humans. This calls into question the conventional legal theory that says only human actors have legal standing. The idea of giving non-human elements in the Arctic legal personhood or rights must be considered carefully by legal specialists.[2] The concept of legal standing as a form of representation serves as the foundation for one legal defence of this change. Ecosystems and particular species can be granted legal status by the legal system to guarantee their protection and representation, acknowledging their interests in the process of making legal decisions.[17] Legal frameworks frequently highlight how important ecosystems are to providing services that are necessary for human well-being. The planetary approach, however, makes the case for a deeper understanding of the mutual interdependence that exists between human and non-human entities.[17] This entails admitting the close relationship between the health of Arctic ecosystems and the well-being of Arctic communities. Transboundary conservation agreements that put the biological well-being of entire ecosystems ahead of national interests could be one way this shows itself.[14]

The case for acknowledging non-human nature in Arctic administration is strong, but putting such a paradigm shift into practice is fraught with difficulties. Careful thought must go into defining the standards for giving non-human entities legal standing or rights. Policymakers need to deal with issues of accountability, representation, and the real-world effects of expanding the scope of legal recognition beyond human actors. Human interests have historically come first in the legal system; therefore, changing this foundation presents a balance issue. In order to promote awareness and understanding of the moral and legal requirements for such a shift, policymakers must participate in public discourse.[4] Altering legal norms in the Arctic depends on legal arguments that acknowledge the role of non-human nature in governance. A more comprehensive, moral, and long-lasting legal framework for the Arctic is developed by policymakers to tackle the difficulties and complexities of granting legal recognition to non-human entities.

Hence, the incorporation of a planetary approach into the Arctic Ocean Governance System is a crucial measure in guaranteeing the long-term viability of the Arctic marine environment. The suggested changes offer a comprehensive framework for a robust and linked future since they are based on changes in the law, institutions, and society. Accepting these changes and preserving the Arctic as a representation of the health of the world is our shared duty. One indication of a revolutionary change in environmental legislation is the incorporation of a global approach into Arctic governance. This method transcends anthropocentrism and recognises the inherent worth of non-human beings by embracing a holistic view of ecosystems.[35].

7. CONCLUSIONS

The Arctic becomes a focal point for altering legal paradigms globally, serving as a microcosm of planetary health. The complex balancing act between commercial interests and environmental conservation is addressed by the suggested amendments. The livelihoods of individuals who depend on the region's resources and its distinctive biodiversity can be protected by Arctic governance through the recognition of ecosystem interdependence and the promotion of sustainable practices. Navigating various legal and political settings presents hurdles for the implementation of a planetary approach. Obstacles could include opposition to non-human entities having legal status and opposition to international cooperation. In order to overcome these obstacles, diplomatic relations, effective lobbying, and the

development of a sophisticated comprehension of the suggested reforms are all necessary. Critics claim that strict environmental laws could impede the Arctic's economic expansion.

A careful balance can be achieved through incentives for green technologies, sustainable resource management, and ethical tourism to reconcile economic development with long-term ecological sustainability. The paper has emphasised the significance of honouring and upholding ethical obligations towards indigenous communities in light of the ethical aspects of indigenous rights. Not only is it morally and legally acceptable, but incorporating indigenous perspectives into government also complies with larger ethical demands for fairness and equity. In summary, a multifaceted strategy that includes corporate participation, international initiatives, education, lobbying, ethical concerns, monitoring frameworks, interdisciplinary collaboration, and persistent commitment is needed to navigate the future of Arctic governance. A planetary approach's capacity for transformation depends on a thorough and flexible plan that adjusts to the complexity of environmental issues. The need for a planetary strategy that is based on planetary justice, environmental ethics, and the understanding of the role of non-human nature becomes evident as we traverse the challenging terrain of Arctic administration.

The inadequacies of prevailing governance systems, as demonstrated by the examination of UNCLOS, regional accords, and extant frameworks, emphasise the pressing need for reform. Due to the Arctic's susceptibility to abrupt changes in the environment, it is necessary to have legal frameworks that are both flexible and acknowledge the interdependence of Arctic ecosystems with the larger solar system. The necessity to transcend anthropocentrism and acknowledge the inherent value of Arctic ecosystems and their critical role in the well-being of the entire world is highlighted by the ethical issues of planetary justice. A second way to highlight the significance of inclusive decision-making processes that respect past ties to the Arctic environment is through the integration of indigenous knowledge and rights. The legal justifications for adopting a planetary approach to Arctic administration offer a road map for developing standards that respect non-human rights, recognise ecological interconnectivity, and cut across political divides. These arguments, which are based on accepted legal doctrines like the precautionary principle, advocate for taking proactive measures to safeguard the Arctic against harm that cannot be reversed. But putting such a paradigm change into practice has its share of difficulties. Defining legal standards for non-human entities, balancing the interests of humans and non-humans, and promoting a shift in public opinion are difficult undertakings that need cooperation from decision-makers and the larger community.

REFERENCES

[1] Adelman, S. (2021). Planetary boundaries, planetary ethics and climate justice in the Anthropocene. In Edward Elgar Publishing eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789902747.00011>

[2] Alves, F., Costa, P. M., Novelli, L., & Vidal, D. G. (2023). The rights of nature and the human right to nature: an overview of the European legal system and challenges for the ecological transition. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2023.1175143>

[3] Argüello, G. (2022). Opportunities for protecting biological diversity in the Arctic Ocean. *The Yearbook of Polar Law Online*, 13(1), 127–153. https://doi.org/10.1163/22116427_013010007

[4] Baez, S., Patiño-Sáenz, M., Martínez-Cotrina, J., Aponte, D. M., Caicedo, J. C., Santamaría-García, H., Pastor, D., González-Gadea, M. L., Haissiner, M., García, A. M., & Ibáñez, A. (2020). The impact of legal expertise on moral decision-making biases. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-00595-8>

[5] Batory, A., & Svensson, S. (2019). Regulating Collaboration: The legal framework of collaborative governance in ten European countries. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(9), 780–789. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1658771>

[6] Belgrano, A., Cucchiella, F., Jiang, D., & Rotilio, M. (2023). Anthropogenic modifications: impacts and conservation strategies. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-38940-x>

[7] Biermann, F., & Kalfagianni, A. (2020). Planetary justice: A research framework. *Earth System Governance*, 6, 100049. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100049>

[8] Borunda, A. (2020, August 13). Arctic summer sea ice could disappear as early as 2035. *Science*. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/article/arctic-summer-sea-ice-could-be-gone-by-2035>

[9] Brennan A and Lo NYS, Environmental Ethics (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). (2021, December 3). <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-environmental>

[10] Busby, J. (2017, November 12). Planet Politics and international Relations. *The Duck of Minerva*. <https://www.duckofminerva.com/2017/11/planet-politics-and-international-relations.html>.

[11] Cheney, T., Newman, C., Olsson-Francis, K., Steele, S., Pearson, V., & Lee, S. (2020). Planetary Protection in the new space Era: Science and Governance. *Frontiers in Astronomy and Space Sciences*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fspas.2020.589817>

[12] Churchill, R. (2015). The LOSC regime for protection of the marine environment – fit for the twenty-first century? In Edward Elgar Publishing eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781004777.00008>

[13] Clarke, M. (2014). Thinking like a Planet: The Land Ethic and the Earth Ethic by J. Baird Callicott. *Environmental Ethics*, 36(3), 365–368. <https://doi.org/10.5840/enviroethics201436336>

[14] Cooney, R. (2004). The precautionary principle in biodiversity conservation and natural resource management: an issues paper for policy-makers, researchers and practitioners. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA78145093>

[15] Coustenis, A., Hedman, N., Doran, P. T., Shehhi, O. A., Ammannito, E., Fujimoto, M., Grasset, O., Groen, F., Hayes, A., Ilyin, V., K, P. K., Morisset, C., Mustin, C., Olsson-Francis, K., Peng, J., Ballesteros, O. P., Raulin, F., Rettberg, P., Sinibaldi, S., . . . Zaitsev, M. (2023). Planetary protection: Updates and challenges for a sustainable space exploration. *Acta Astronautica*, 210, 446–452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2023.02.035>

[16] Dryzek, J. S., & Pickering, J. (2018). Planetary justice. In Oxford University Press eBooks (pp. 58–81). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198809616.003.0004>

[17] Fischer-Lescano, A. (2020). Nature as a Legal Person: Proxy constellations in law. *Law & Literature*, 32(2), 237–262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1535685x.2020.1763596>

[18] Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). ADAPTIVE GOVERNANCE OF SOCIAL-ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 30(1), 441–473. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511>

[19] Francuz, G. (2020). Nature and intrinsic value. *Principia*, LXVII, 49–85. <https://doi.org/10.4467/20843887pi.20.003.13833>

[20] Gardiner, S. M. (2010). A perfect moral storm: climate change, intergenerational ethics, and the problem of moral corruption. In Oxford University Press eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195399622.003.0012>

[21] Gladun, E., Nysten-Haarala, S., & Tulaeva, S. (2021). Indigenous economies in the Arctic. *Elementa Science of the Anthropocene*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2019.00088>

[22] Grantham, H. S., Duncan, A., Evans, T. D., Jones, K. R., Beyer, H. L., Schuster, R., Walston, J., Ray, J. C., Robinson, J. G., Callow, M., Clements, T., Costa, H. M., DeGemmis, A., Elsen, P. R., Ervin, J., Franco, P., Goldman, E., Goetz, S., Hansen, A., . . . Watson, J. E. M. (2020). Anthropogenic modification of forests means only 40% of remaining forests have high ecosystem integrity. *Nature Communications*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19493-3>

[23] Guarino, M., Sime, L. C., Schröeder, D., Malmierca-Vallet, I., Rosenblum, E., Ringer, M., Ridley, J., Feltham, D., Bitz, C., Steig, E. J., Wolff, E., Stroeve, J., & Sellar, A. (2020). Sea-ice-free Arctic during the Last Interglacial supports fast future loss. *Nature Climate Change*, 10(10), 928–932. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0865-2>

[24] Hartmann, J. (2018). Regulating Shipping in the Arctic Ocean: An analysis of State practice. *Ocean Development & International Law*, 49(3), 276–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00908320.2018.1479352>

[25] Hasan, S. (2021a). Considering the concept of the ecological civilization for conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity under the umbrella of the Biodiversity Beyond National

Jurisdiction instrument. *Environmental Law Review*, 23(3), 248–262.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/14614529211032035>

[26] Hasan, S. (2021b). Appraising the conservation and sustainable use of Arctic marine biodiversity within the legal framework of European Union. In *The contribution of the European Union to the protection of biological resources in marine areas of international interest* (pp. 559–573). Tirant lo Blanch. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=8147446>

[27] Hickey, C., & Robeyns, I. (2020a). Planetary justice: What can we learn from ethics and political philosophy? *Earth System Governance*, 6, 100045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100045>

[28] Hickey, C., & Robeyns, I. (2020b). Planetary justice: What can we learn from ethics and political philosophy? *Earth System Governance*, 6, 100045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100045>

[29] Holbech, H., & Pedersen, K. L. (2018). Ballast water and invasive species in the Arctic. In *Springer polar sciences* (pp. 115–137). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67365-3_7

[30] Hossain, K. (2016, May 3). A new legal regime for the protection of Arctic marine biodiversity in the ABNJ? <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ula-201605031120>

[31] IPBES (2019): Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. S. Díaz, J. Settele, E. S. Brondízio E.S., H. T. Ngo, M. Guèze, J. Agard, A. Arneth, P. Balvanera, K. A. Brauman, S. H. M. Butchart, K. M. A. Chan, L. A. Garibaldi, K. Ichii, J. Liu, S. M. Subramanian, G. F. Midgley, P. Miloslavich, Z. Molnár, D. Obura, A. Pfaff, S. Polasky, A. Purvis, J. Razzaque, B. IPBReyers, R. Roy Chowdhury, Y. J. Shin, I. J. Visseren-Hamakers, K. J. Willis, and C. N. Zayas (eds.). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany. 56 pages. https://files.ipbes.net/ipbes-web-prod-public-files/inline/files/ipbes_global_assessment_report_summary_for_policymakers.pdf

[32] Johnson, A., & Sigona, A. (2022). Planetary justice and ‘Healing’ in the Anthropocene. *Earth System Governance*, 11, 100128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2021.100128>

[33] Kapsar, K., Frans, V. F., Brigham, L. W., & Liu, J. (2022). The metacoupled Arctic: Human–nature interactions across local to global scales as drivers of sustainability. *AMBIO*, 51(10), 2061–2078. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-022-01729-9>

[34] Klarsfeld, A., & Cachat-Rosset, G. (2021). Equality of Treatment, Opportunity, and Outcomes: Mapping the Law. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.315>

[35] Kotzé, L. J. (2014). Rethinking global environmental law and governance in the Anthropocene. *Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law*, 32(2), 121–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02646811.2014.11435355>

[36] Lawless, S., Song, A. M., Cohen, P. J., & Morrison, T. H. (2020). Rights, equity and justice: A diagnostic for social meta-norm diffusion in environmental governance. *Earth System Governance*, 6, 100052. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100052>

[37] Okyere-Manu, B., Morgan, S. N., & Nwosimiri, O. (2022). Cultural, ethical, and religious perspectives on environment preservation. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 85, 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2022.09.004>

[38] Pecharroman, L. C. (2018). Rights of nature: rivers that can stand in court. *Resources*, 7(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/resources7010013>

[39] Pereira, J. C., & Saramago, A. (2020). Introduction: Embracing Non-Human Nature in World Politics. In *Frontiers in international relations* (pp. 1–9). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49496-4_1

[40] Prip, C. (2022). Arctic Ocean governance in light of an international legally binding instrument on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction. *Marine Policy*, 142, 103768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103768>

[41] Rose, S. K., Andersen, O. B., Passaro, M., Ludwigsen, C. A., & Schwatke, C. (2019). Arctic Ocean Sea Level Record from the Complete Radar Altimetry Era: 1991–2018. *Remote Sensing*, 11(14), 1672. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11141672>

[42] Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2020) Global Biodiversity Outlook 5—Summary for Policy Makers. Montréal. Available at: <https://www.cbd.int/gbo/gbo5/publication/gbo-5-spm-en.pdf> (last accessed 17 April 2021)

[43] Shin, P. S. (2009). THE SUBSTANTIVE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL TREATMENT. *Legal Theory*, 15(02), 149. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1352325209090090>

[44] Solski, J. J. (2021). The genesis of Article 234 of the UNCLOS. *Ocean Development & International Law*, 52(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00908320.2020.1835026>

[45] Stevis, D., & Felli, R. (2020). Planetary just transition? How inclusive and how just? *Earth System Governance*, 6, 100065. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100065>

[46] Tenberg, M. (2022, March 1). The Arctic in the Anthropocene: An International Relations perspective. Uni of Lapland. <https://www.arcticcentre.org/blogs/The-Arctic-in-the-Anthropocene--An-International-Relations-perspective/me32fvt0/72f56196-1818-4f49-aaaf-e201bbf6e2d6>

[47] The Fletcher School | Law of the Sea; A policy primer. (2017). Trustees of Tufts College. <https://sites.tufts.edu/lawofthesea/#:~:text=The%20law%20of%20the%20sea%2C%20as%20embodied%20in%20the%20Law,international%20framework%20for%20the%20conservation%2C>

[48] Vlasova, T., Petrov, A. N., & Volkov, S. (2020). Rethinking sustainability monitoring in the Arctic by linking resilience and Sustainable Development in Socially-Oriented Observations: A Perspective. *Sustainability*, 13(1), 177. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010177>

[49] Wilson, E. (2019). What is Benefit Sharing? Respecting Indigenous Rights and Addressing Inequities in Arctic Resource Projects. *Resources*, 8(2), 74. <https://doi.org/10.3390/resources8020074>

[50] Yua, E., Raymond-Yakoubian, J., Daniel, R. A., & Behe, C. (2022). A framework for co-production of knowledge in the context of Arctic research. *Ecology and Society*, 27(1). <https://doi.org/10.5751/es-12960-270134>.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Sabrina Hasan – PhD in Law, Postdoctoral Researcher, Faculty of Law, East China University of Political Science and Law (ECUPL), Shanghai, China.
e-mail: 3135@ecupl.edu.cn; sabrinahasan22@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5277-6095>
LinkedIn: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/sabrina-hasan-aa7ba689/>
Google Scholar ID:
<https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=1VvYPK0AAAAJ&hl=en>
Scopus Author ID: [57330803300](https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57330803300)

ABOUT THIS ARTICLE

Conflict of interests: The author declares no conflicting interests

Funding: The research was conducted under the author's role as a postdoctoral researcher with funding support solely from the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation. No other project funding or financial interests are relevant to this work.

Acknowledgments: The findings presented in this paper were discussed at the annual conference titled "Living Environmental Law", hosted by The Law Group of Wageningen University at Wageningen University, Netherlands.

INTEGRACIÓN DEL “ENFOQUE PLANETARIO” Y LA “JUSTICIA PLANETARIA” EN EL SISTEMA DE GOBERNANZA DEL OCÉANO ÁRTICO PARA ACEPTAR EL PAPEL DE LA NATURALEZA NO HUMANA EN LA PROTECCIÓN DEL MEDIO MARINO ÁRTICO

RESUMEN

La región ártica ha atraído la atención mundial debido a su entorno único y su susceptibilidad al cambio climático. La necesidad de un sistema de gobernanza eficaz que trascienda las perspectivas antropocéntricas es más apremiante que nunca ante el aumento de las actividades humanas en la región, desde la explotación de recursos y el transporte marítimo hasta el turismo. En este documento se examina la incorporación de un “enfoque planetario” en el Sistema de Gobernanza del Océano Ártico, lo cual representa un cambio de paradigma crucial para la salvaguardia del medio marino ártico. El documento explora además cómo los conceptos de “enfoque planetario” y “justicia planetaria” pueden integrarse en el sistema de gobernanza del Océano Ártico para asimilar el papel de la naturaleza no humana en la protección del medio marino ártico. Además, el documento analiza cómo el enfoque planetario, con un mandato más amplio, puede implementar las mejores prácticas en la gobernanza del océano Ártico.

Palabras clave: medio ambiente marino ártico, gobernanza del océano ártico, enfoque planetario, justicia planetaria, papel de la naturaleza no humana

将“行星方法”和“行星正义”融入北冰洋治理体系，以充分发挥非人类自然在保护北极海洋环境中的作用

摘要

北极地区因其独特的环境和易受气候变化影响的特性，吸引了世界各地的关注。随着人类在北极地区的活动日益增多，从资源开发、航运到旅游业，建立超越人类中心主义的有效治理体系的需求比以往任何时候都更加迫切。本文探讨了将“行星方法”纳入北冰洋治理体系，这代表着一种范式转变，对保护北极海洋环境至关重要。本文进一步探讨了如何将“行星方法”和“行星正义”的概念融入北冰洋治理体系，以包容非人类自然在保护北极海洋环境中的作用。此外，本文还分析了赋予更广泛授权的“行星方法”如何将最佳实践应用于北冰洋治理。

关键词：北极海洋环境、北冰洋治理、行星方法、行星正义、非人类自然的作用