EDICIONES COMPLUTENSE

Observatorio Medioambiental
ISSN: 1139-1987
ISSN-e 1988-3277

CONCEPTO Y MÉTODO

Anomie in its scientific application in the field of the environment and geographical spaces

Ignacio Sotelo Pérez
IUCA (España)

José Antonio Sotelo Navalpotro
IUCA (España)

https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/obmd.10644

Recibido: 5 de febrero del 2025 / Enviado a evaluar: 20 de febrero del 2025 / Aceptado: 5 de diciembre del 2025

ENG **Abstract:** This article examines the phenomenon of legal anomie as it applies to environmental protection and the regulation of geographic spaces. Anomie is understood here not merely as the absence of norms, but as a structural dysfunction marked by normative contradictions, institutional fragmentation, and limited enforceability of environmental rights. These conditions undermine legal certainty and hinder the effective safeguarding of collective ecological goods. The study proposes a systematic reading of the legal framework to overcome internal inconsistencies through integrative interpretation, aligned with constitutional principles and oriented toward sustainability and territorial equity. Drawing on an interdisciplinary approach, the article frames anomie as a complex legal and epistemological challenge that demands coordinated responses across legal, political, and spatial domains.
Keywords: Environment; Unity of law; Geographical space; Legal anomie; Principle of own acts; Legal certainty.

ES La anomia en su aplicación científica en el ámbito del medio ambiente y de los espacios geográficos

Resumen: El presente artículo analiza el fenómeno de la anomia jurídica en relación con el medio ambiente, y, los espacios geográficos, entendida como la ausencia o contradicción de normas que impiden una protección efectiva de estos bienes colectivos. Se examina cómo la falta de coherencia normativa y la fragmentación institucional generan inseguridad jurídica y dificultan la aplicación de principios constitucionales vinculados al entorno natural y al territorio. A través de una lectura sistemática del ordenamiento jurídico, se propone superar estas contradicciones mediante una interpretación integradora, orientada a la sostenibilidad, la equidad territorial y la racionalidad jurídica. El estudio incorpora una perspectiva multidisciplinar, para comprender la anomia como una disfunción estructural que exige respuestas jurídicas, políticas, geográficas, y, epistemológicas coordinadas.
Palabras clave: Medio ambiente; Unidad del derecho; Espacio geográfico; Anomia jurídica; Principio de los actos propios; Seguridad jurídica.

[FR] Anomie in its scientific application in the field of the environment and geographical spaces

Résumé: Cet article analyse le phénomène d'anomie juridique en relation avec l'environnement et les espaces géographiques, entendu comme l'absence ou la contradiction de normes entravant la protection efficace de ces biens collectifs. Il examine comment le manque de cohérence réglementaire et la fragmentation institutionnelle génèrent une incertitude juridique et entravent l'application des principes constitutionnels liés à l'environnement naturel et au territoire. À travers une lecture systématique du système juridique, il propose de surmonter ces contradictions grâce à une interprétation intégrative axée sur la durabilité, l'équité territoriale et la rationalité juridique. L'étude intègre une perspective multidisciplinaire pour appréhender l'anomie comme un dysfonctionnement structurel exigeant des réponses juridiques, politiques, géographiques et épistémologiques coordonnées.
Mots-clés: Environnement; Unité du droit; Espace géographique; Anomie juridique; Principe des actes propres; Sécurité juridique.

Cómo citar: Sotelo Pérez, I. y Sotelo Navalpotro, J.A. (2025). “Anomie in its scientific application in the field of the environment and geographical spaces”. Observatorio Medioambiental, 28(1), 39-64.

1. Introduction

The notion of anomie, in its sociological and legal meaning, refers to the absence, inadequacy, or contradiction of norms that regulate conduct in a given society. In the legal field, anomie is not limited to the absence of norms; it can manifest itself as a dysfunction of the normative system, when existing norms prove inapplicable, contradictory, or devoid of content. This situation generates uncertainty, weakens the authority of the law, and erodes citizens' trust in legal institutions. From a theoretical perspective, anomie has been addressed by authors such as Émile Durkheim and Robert K. Merton in the field of sociology, but its translation into the legal field requires a more structural interpretation. In law, anomie can arise from multiple causes: normative fragmentation, jurisprudential contradictions, lack of systematic interpretation, or even from the deliberate omission of public powers in the application of constitutional norms. Legal anomie should not be confused with a legal lacuna. While a lacuna implies the absence of a rule for a specific case, anomie can exist even in the presence of rules, when these fail to be articulated coherently within the legal system. In this sense, anomie is a pathology of the legal system, a form of normative disorder that compromises the unity of law. The phenomenon of environmental anomie becomes especially serious when it affects fundamental rights, such as the right to the environment. In these cases, environmental anomie not only generates legal uncertainty but also impedes the effective realization of constitutional values, such as human dignity, sustainability, and intergenerational justice. Environmental anomie, therefore, is not only a technical issue but also an ethical and political one.

Anomie can take visible and invisible forms. Visible forms manifest themselves in explicit normative contradictions, such as laws that conflict with each other. Invisible forms, on the other hand, operate more subtly, such as when a constitutional provision is interpreted in a way that renders it meaningless. This latter form of anomie is particularly insidious, as it disguises itself as legality while undermining the principles of the

legal system. In the Spanish context, environmental anomie has been exacerbated by the regulatory dispersion between different administrations, the lack of coordination between territorial powers, and the restrictive interpretation of Article 45 of the Constitution. This situation has generated a fragmented legal framework, where the right to the environment is formally recognized but lacks effective protection mechanisms. Anomie can also arise from contradictions between substantive law and general legal principles. When the legal system permits practices that violate environmental sustainability, a collision occurs between formal legality and substantive legitimacy. This tension reveals the need for systematic interpretation to restore coherence to the legal system.

Overcoming anomie requires a reconstruction of the legal system based on the unity of law. This unity is not merely formal, but functional: it implies that norms must be articulated around common values, such as environmental protection, territorial equity, and ecological justice. Without this unity, law becomes a set of disconnected rules, incapable of responding to contemporary challenges. Legal anomie, in short, is a symptom of a normative crisis; this is why its study should not be limited to legal doctrine, but should incorporate elements of legal philosophy, political theory, and legal geography. Only then can it be understood in all its complexity and addressed with comprehensive solutions.

2. The environment as a constitutional right, and its indeterminacy

Article 45 of the Spanish Constitution recognizes the right of everyone to enjoy an environment suitable for human development and establishes the obligation of public authorities to ensure its protection and restoration. This provision, although located outside the catalog of fundamental rights, has a normative force that makes it a backbone of the environmental legal system. However, the Constitutional Court's jurisprudence has characterized the environment as a "legally indeterminate concept", which has led to an ambiguous and restrictive interpretation of its content. This indeterminacy has allowed the right to the environment to be treated as a programmatic principle rather than an enforceable right, which has contributed to its normative emptiness. The classification of the environment as an indeterminate concept is not in itself problematic. What is worrying is that this indeterminacy is used as an argument to limit its legal protection. Instead of developing its content through systematic interpretation, a minimalist interpretation is adopted that narrows its scope and hinders its practical application.

This situation generates a form of legal anomie: the right exists, but cannot be effectively exercised. Citizens are faced with a constitutionally recognized right, but lacking clear mechanisms for protection. This contradiction between formal recognition and practical ineffectiveness undermines legal certainty and the coherence of legal systems. The lack of definition of the environment also affects territorial planning and the organization of geographic space. Without a clear legal definition, environmental management instruments become fragmented, and powers are dispersed among different administrations. This generates conflicts of authority, regulatory duplication, and gaps in institutional accountability. Constitutional jurisprudence, by failing to develop the substantive content of Article 45, has contributed to a regressive interpretation of environmental law. Instead of strengthening its enforceability, it has allowed it to be subordinated to economic, urban planning, or administrative interests, which compromises its protective function.

This normative regression can be interpreted as a form of institutional contradiction, which violates the principle of proper acts. The State, by recognizing a right in the Constitution, is legally bound to its protection. Acting contrary to this, through interpretations that deactivate it, constitutes a violation of the principle of institutional good faith. The uncertainty surrounding the environment also hinders citizen participation in the defence of this right. Without a clear regulatory framework, social oversight mechanisms, such as public action or administrative complaints, lose effectiveness. This weakens environmental democracy and reduces civil society's ability to influence territorial management. Overcoming this uncertainty requires a systematic interpretation of Article 45, which articulates it with other constitutional precepts, such as the right to health, the protection of natural heritage, and the principle of sustainable development. Only in this way can a coherent regulatory framework be built, capable of guaranteeing the effective protection of the environment. In this context, environmental anomie is not only a legal issue, but also a political, geographical, and even sociological one. It reflects a lack of institutional will to assume the centrality of the environment in the constitutional project. This omission must be denounced as a form of normative incoherence, which demands

a structural response from the legal and public policy perspective.

3. Geographic space as a legal category

Geographic space, traditionally conceived as a physical and descriptive dimension, has acquired normative relevance in recent decades, transforming it into a first-order legal category. This conceptual evolution responds to the growing need to regulate territory not only as a medium for human activities, but also as an object of protection, planning, and justice. In this sense, the law has ceased to consider space as a mere passive setting to become an active instrument for the regulation, control, and guarantee of fundamental rights. The "legalization of space" implies recognizing that each portion of the territory is governed by norms that define its use, ecological value, social function, and ownership regime. This transformation transforms space into a complex legal asset, where public and private interests, environmental demands, citizen rights, and administrative powers converge. Territory, therefore, is not neutral: it is loaded with normative meanings that must be coherently articulated within the legal system. However, this articulation faces serious difficulties. The regulation of space is fragmented across multiple levels of government (state, regional, and local), and across different branches of law (urban planning, environmental law, infrastructure, heritage law, and mobility law). This normative dispersion generates overlaps, contradictions, and gaps that affect the coherence of the territorial legal system. The lack of integration between these norms produces a form of structural anomie, where the law exists but fails to effectively regulate the territory.

Territorial anomie manifests itself in specific situations: declared protected areas that are simultaneously the subject of urban development plans; rural areas subject to extractive pressures without effective environmental regulation; metropolitan areas where mobility, access to housing, and air quality are managed in a disjointed manner. These examples reveal a crisis of normative coherence that compromises the effectiveness of the law and the legitimacy of institutions. This crisis is exacerbated when public authorities act in contradiction with their own normative acts. The principle of proper acts, enshrined in the Brocardo non venire contra factum proprium, establishes that no authority may act contrary to its previous decisions if these have generated a legitimate expectation. At the territorial level, this principle requires institutional coherence: if an administration recognizes the ecological value of an area, it cannot subsequently authorize its destruction without violating legal good faith. The violation of the principle of proper conduct in spatial management generates legal uncertainty, erodes citizen trust, and weakens environmental protection. By allowing these contradictions, the legal system breaks its internal unity and becomes a dysfunctional system. This normative fracture not only affects the effectiveness of the law, but also its legitimacy as an instrument of territorial justice.

The unity of law, requires that all norms be structured around common principles and shared values. In the case of geographic space, this unity must be built on the foundation of sustainability, territorial equity, and environmental protection. Without this axiological basis, the legal system becomes fragmented and loses its ability to guide institutional action. The coherence of the territorial legal system cannot be achieved through the mere accumulation of norms. It requires a systematic interpretation that integrates the various regulations into a common framework, respectful of the normative hierarchy and oriented toward the effective realization of rights. This interpretation must consider space as a collective asset, whose management requires transparency, participation, and institutional accountability. Citizen participation in territorial planning is essential to ensuring spatial justice. The inhabitants of a territory must have a voice in decisions that affect their environment, from land use definition to ecosystem protection. However, regulatory anomie hinders this participation by generating complexity, opacity, and regulatory dispersion. The democratization of space requires regulatory simplification, greater accessibility to legal information, and effective mechanisms for public consultation.

Transparency in territorial management implies that decisions are understandable, justified, and accessible. Regulatory opacity is a form of anomie that impedes citizen oversight and fosters arbitrariness. Accountability, for its part, requires authorities to be accountable for their territorial decisions, assessing their ecological, social, and economic impacts and subjecting them to judicial review when necessary. Territorial sustainability must be the backbone of the spatial legal system. This requires a long-term vision that considers the cumulative effects of decisions on the territory and promotes a balance between development and

conservation. Territorial planning must be strategic, integrated, and oriented toward the common good, articulating urban, environmental, mobility, and infrastructure policies within a coherent framework. Territorial equity requires correcting spatial inequalities, guaranteeing fair access to resources, services, and opportunities. The law must act as an instrument of spatial redistribution, promoting social cohesion and intergenerational justice. Territorial justice, in this sense, implies recognizing the demands of marginalized territories affected by environmental degradation, social exclusion, or a lack of infrastructure.

Environmental protection cannot be separated from spatial regulation. Ecosystems are territorialized, and their preservation requires coherent spatial management. Regulatory fragmentation between environmental and territorial laws impedes effective protection of biodiversity, landscapes, and natural resources. La integración de estas normas es una condición necesaria para la sostenibilidad jurídica del territorio. The systematic interpretation of the territorial legal system must be based on Article 45 of the Spanish Constitution, which recognizes the right to the environment and the obligation of public authorities to safeguard it. This precept must be articulated with other constitutional rights, such as the right to health, housing, participation, and equality, creating a regulatory framework that guides the management of space.

Territorial anomie, in short, is an expression of the crisis of legal rationality in the regulation of space. Overcoming it requires a structural reform of the legal system, based on the unity of law, normative coherence, and respect for general principles. This reform must be interdisciplinary, incorporating knowledge from geography, ecology, sociology, and political philosophy to build a legal framework capable of responding to contemporary challenges. Geographic space as a legal category is not a theoretical abstraction, but a practical requirement. Citizens' daily lives unfold in territories regulated, conditioned, and transformed by law. The quality of this regulation determines quality of life, environmental justice, and social equity. Therefore, law must assume its responsibility in building just, sustainable, and democratic territories.

4. Regulatory fragmentation and crisis of coherence

Regulatory fragmentation is one of the most complex and worrying phenomena affecting the contemporary legal system, especially in the areas of the environment and land use planning. This fragmentation is not limited to the proliferation of regulations, but is manifested in the lack of coordination between them, the dispersion of institutional powers, the contradiction of regulatory objectives, and the absence of a systematic logic that allows the different regulatory bodies to be integrated into a coherent framework. The result is a crisis of coherence that compromises the effectiveness of the law, legal certainty and institutional legitimacy.

In the Spanish context, this fragmentation has been intensified by the territorial structure of the State, which distributes powers between the central government, the autonomous communities, and local entities. While this decentralization can be positive in terms of administrative proximity and regulatory adaptation to local realities, it has also generated a multitude of regulations that, in many cases, overlap, contradict, or ignore each other. In the environmental field, this situation is particularly serious, as environmental protection requires coordinated, cross-cutting action based on common principles. Spanish environmental legislation is composed of a mosaic of state, regional, and local laws that regulate aspects such as air quality, waste management, the protection of natural areas, biodiversity, water, noise, soil, and landscape. Each of these areas has its own regulatory framework, its own planning instruments, and its own oversight mechanisms. However, the lack of integration between these regulatory bodies has created a situation of fragmentation that hinders the effective enforcement of environmental law.

This fragmentation translates into multiple practical problems. For example, the same territory may be subject to different environmental, urban planning, and heritage protection regimes, without any coordination between them. This creates legal uncertainty for citizens, businesses, and public administrations, who are unsure which regulations to apply, what procedures to follow, or which authority is competent in each case. The consequence is ineffective land management, insufficient environmental protection, and a loss of confidence in the legal system. The crisis of regulatory coherence is also manifested in the contradiction between the objectives of different public policies. While environmental policy seeks to preserve ecosystems, reduce pollution, and promote sustainability, other policies—such as energy, industrial, or urban planning—may pursue objectives that conflict with environmental principles. This contradiction is not resolved through

a clear normative hierarchy, but rather shifts to the realm of interpretation, where legal practitioners must decide which rule prevails, in what context, and to what extent. The lack of unified interpretative criteria exacerbates normative fragmentation. Courts, administrative bodies, and legal scholars apply rules unevenly, generating contradictory case law, inconsistent administrative decisions, and divergent legal doctrine. This interpretative dispersion contributes to legal anomie, understood as the inability of the normative system to offer clear, predictable, and coherent responses to legal problems. Anomie is not only an absence of norms, but a dysfunction of the legal system that impedes their rational application.

Regulatory fragmentation also has an epistemological dimension. Legal knowledge is affected by the dispersion of sources, the multiplicity of legal systems, and the lack of systematization. Law students, legal professionals, and citizens face increasing difficulties in understanding the scope of legal norms, predicting their effects, and exercising their rights. This normative opacity creates a gap between formal law and practical law, between written norms and their practical application. The result is a loss of meaning for law as an instrument of order, justice, and rationality. The crisis of normative coherence is not an isolated phenomenon, but rather part of a broader transformation of contemporary law. The expansion of rights, the complexity of social problems, legal globalization, and the plurality of regulatory actors have generated an increasingly fragmented, dynamic, and conflictual legal environment. In this context, the unity of law becomes an elusive ideal, but more necessary than ever. Unity does not imply uniformity, but rather articulation: the capacity to integrate diverse norms into a coherent system, oriented toward the realization of constitutional values.

The principle of the unity of law, requires that the legal system function as a rational, hierarchical, and functionally integrated normative system. This principle is not merely formal, but substantive: it implies that norms must be articulated around shared values, such as human dignity, justice, sustainability, and equity. In the environmental and territorial sphere, this principle requires that all norms governing space and the environment be integrated into a common framework, oriented toward the protection of collective goods. Systematic interpretation is the key tool for rebuilding the coherence of the legal system. This interpretation requires reading the rules in relation to the entire system, considering their hierarchy, purpose, and context. Systematic interpretation helps overcome regulatory contradictions, resolve conflicts of jurisdiction, and guarantee the effectiveness of rights. It is, therefore, a form of legal rationality that must be promoted by all system operators: legislators, judges, legal experts, public administrations, and citizens.

The principle of one's own acts also plays a fundamental role in reconstructing normative coherence. This principle, enshrined in the Brocardo non venire contra factum proprium, establishes that no person -natural or legal-, may act in contradiction with their own prior acts if these have generated a legitimate expectation. At the institutional level, this principle requires public administrations to act consistently with their prior decisions, respecting citizens' legitimate trust and avoiding arbitrariness. In the environmental and territorial spheres, the violation of the principle of proper conduct is particularly serious. For example, if an administration declares an area protected, it cannot subsequently authorize activities that degrade it without violating institutional good faith. This contradiction generates legal uncertainty, erodes citizen trust, and weakens environmental protection. By allowing these inconsistencies, the legal system breaks its internal unity and becomes a dysfunctional system. This normative fracture not only affects the effectiveness of the law, but also its legitimacy as an instrument of territorial justice.

The reconstruction of normative coherence requires a structural reform of the legal system. This reform must be based on the recognition of the unity of law as the organizing principle of the system, must promote systematic interpretation as a method of applying norms, and must incorporate the general principles of law as substantive criteria of legitimacy. Equity, justice, sustainability, participation, and transparency must be incorporated as foundations of environmental and territorial legal systems. This reform also requires an institutional transformation. Powers over the environment and territory must be coordinated among the different levels of government through mechanisms of cooperation, joint planning, and integrated assessment. Public administrations must act in a coherent, transparent, and responsible manner, respecting constitutional principles and citizens' rights. Citizen participation must be promoted as an essential element of territorial management, through effective mechanisms for consultation, deliberation, and social oversight. Overcoming regulatory fragmentation and the crisis of coherence is not an easy task, but it is a necessary

condition for building a fair, effective, and legitimate legal system. The law must recover its organizing, guaranteeing, and guiding function to become an effective instrument for protecting common goods and realizing constitutional values. In the areas of the environment and territorial development, this transformation is urgent and necessary.

5. Unity of Law: theoretical and philosophical foundations

The unity of law is one of the most important structural principles of contemporary legal theory. Far from being a merely formal notion, the unity of law constitutes an epistemological, axiological, and functional requirement that allows us to conceive the legal system as a coherent, rational system oriented toward the realization of fundamental values. This section addresses the unity of law from its theoretical and philosophical foundations, its doctrinal development, its application in the Spanish legal system, and its relevance for environmental protection and territorial planning. From a historical perspective, the idea of the unity of law has been present in the great Western legal traditions. In Roman law, the concept of ius commune implied a unitary view of law as a set of norms articulated around general principles. In the scholastic tradition, law was conceived as an expression of natural reason, and therefore as an ordered and coherent system. In modern times, authors such as Montesquieu, Kant, and Hegel developed conceptions of law as a rational normative system, linked to freedom, justice, and the general will.

In the last century, legal theory has delved deeper into the notion of legal unity, particularly through the work of Norberto Bobbio. In his General Theory of Law, Bobbio argues that law should be understood as a normative system, characterized by unity, coherence, and completeness. Unity implies that all legal norms are part of a single legal system, governed by a fundamental norm that guarantees their validity. Coherence requires that norms not contradict each other, and that the system be complete enough to respond to all possible legal cases. Bobbio distinguishes between the formal and substantive unity of law. Formal unity refers to the hierarchical structure of the legal system, where norms are organized into levels of validity, from the Constitution to the regulations. Material unity, on the other hand, refers to the articulation of norms around common values, such as justice, equality, freedom, and human dignity. This distinction is fundamental to understanding that the unity of law is not only a matter of normative technique, but also of ethical and political content.

From a philosophical and constitutional perspective, we can maintain that the unity of law is a condition for the possibility of legal democracy. In his works on the theory of the state and the philosophy of law, because the legal system must function as an integrated system, where norms are articulated around constitutional principles and fundamental rights. Regulatory fragmentation, contradictions between norms, and institutional dispersion jeopardize this unity, and thus the legitimacy of the legal system. The unity of law has also been addressed from the perspective of legal systems theory. Some authors analysed law as an autopoietic system, capable of reproducing itself through its own operations. Although, others, like Luhmann emphasizes the functional differentiation of law from other social systems, he recognizes that the internal unity of the legal system is necessary for its operation. Without normative coherence, the system loses its capacity for direction and conflict resolution. In the Spanish legal system, the unity of law is manifested in the hierarchical structure of norms, the primacy of the Constitution, the articulation of the general principles of law, and the requirement of systematic interpretation. Article 9.3 of the Spanish Constitution guarantees legal certainty, liability, and the prohibition of arbitrariness, which implies a requirement for normative coherence. Article 45, which recognizes the right to the environment, must be interpreted in relation to the entire constitutional text, and not as an isolated provision.

The unity of law in Spain is compromised by the regulatory fragmentation resulting from the autonomous state. Although decentralization allows for the adaptation of regulations to territorial realities, it also creates risks of inconsistency, overlap, and contradiction. The jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court has attempted to preserve the unity of the legal system through the doctrine of normative prevalence, conforming interpretation, and the integration of constitutional principles. However, in the environmental and territorial spheres, these tools have been insufficient to guarantee effective unity. Environmental protection requires a unity of law that articulates environmental, urban planning, territorial, and sectoral regulations within a common framework. This unity cannot be merely formal but also substantive: it must be

oriented toward the realization of ecological value, sustainability, and environmental justice. Regulatory dispersion, contradictions between public policies, and a lack of institutional coordination create a crisis of coherence that impedes the effective application of environmental law. Land use planning, as a legal discipline, also requires regulatory unity that allows for the integration of different planning instruments, administrative powers, and citizen rights. The fragmentation of land use planning creates legal uncertainty, hinders citizen participation, and fosters institutional arbitrariness. The unity of territorial law must be built on the basis of spatial equity, sustainability, and democratic participation.

The unity of law also has a hermeneutical dimension. Legal interpretation must aim to preserve the coherence of the system, integrate the norms around constitutional principles, and guarantee the effectiveness of rights. Systematic, teleological, and constitutional interpretation are fundamental tools for reconstructing the unity of law in contexts of normative fragmentation. The principle of proper acts, as an expression of legal good faith, also contributes to the unity of law. This principle prevents individuals—including institutions—from acting in contradiction with their own prior acts, when these have generated a legitimate expectation. In the environmental and territorial spheres, this principle requires institutional coherence, respect for regulatory commitments, and protection of public trust. The violation of the principle of proper acts creates a fracture in the unity of law. When an administration recognizes a right—such as the right to the environment—and then deactivates it through contradictory decisions, the coherence of the legal system is broken. This fracture not only affects the effectiveness of the law, but also its legitimacy as a normative system. The unity of law also implies an articulation between domestic and international law. In the environmental field, international treaties, European directives, and multilateral conventions must be integrated into the national legal system, respecting their hierarchy and content. The fragmentation between domestic and international law generates inconsistencies that affect environmental protection and territorial management.

Legal education must incorporate the notion of the unity of law as a structural principle. Future jurists must understand that law is not a set of isolated norms, but an integrated system oriented toward justice and the protection of the common good. Legal training should promote systematic interpretation, respect for general principles, and normative articulation. The unity of law also has implications for legislative policy. The legislator must avoid producing fragmented, contradictory, or unnecessary regulations. Legislative technique must be oriented toward clarity, coherence, and integration. Normative evaluation, thematic codification, and legislative simplification are tools for preserving the unity of the legal system. Ultimately, the unity of law is a condition for legal justice. Without unity, the law becomes a set of disconnected norms, incapable of guiding institutional action, protecting rights, and guaranteeing legal certainty. In the field of the environment and territorial matters, this unity is especially urgent, given the complexity of the problems, the multiplicity of actors, and the need for integrated responses. Rebuilding the unity of law requires an epistemological, institutional, and normative transformation. It is necessary to rethink law as a system, promote systematic interpretation, coordinate institutional powers, and articulate norms around constitutional values. This task is collective and requires the commitment of all legal, political, and social actors.

6. The principle of one's own actions as a structural limit against institutional anomie in environmental protection and the legal configuration of geographical space

Within the framework of the contemporary legal system, the principle of proper acts stands as an ethical and normative barrier to institutional inconsistency. Its classic formulation -non venire contra factum proprium-, is not a simple rule of conduct, but a structural requirement for consistency in the exercise of legal power. In contexts where the law extends to highly sensitive collective assets -such as the environment and territory-, this principle takes on a systemic dimension: It becomes a criterion of legal rationality that prevents the legal system from fracturing into contradictions that generate anomie, insecurity, and lack of protection. Institutional anomie in environmental and territorial matters manifests itself not only as a lack of norms, but as a more insidious form of contradiction between legal acts, public policies, and normative commitments. This is the case, for example, of administrations that declare special ecological protection zones and, years later, authorize projects that destroy them; or of governments that sign international treaties on climate change while promoting highly polluting infrastructure. These contradictions are not mere administrative

errors: they are symptoms of a legal pathology that erodes the unity of law and the coherence of the legal system. The principle of proper conduct requires public institutions to act in accordance with their prior commitments, especially when these have generated legitimate expectations among citizens or have established legal situations. In the environmental field, this requirement translates into the need to respect protection declarations, ecological management plans, international commitments, and constitutional principles that enshrine the right to a healthy environment. In the context of geographic space, this implies that decisions regarding territorial planning, zoning, land use, and urban planning must be consistent with the ecological and social values that underlie them. Violation of this principle in environmental matters produces devastating effects. Not only are ecosystems destroyed, habitats fragmented, and air and water polluted; citizens' trust in the law as a tool for protection is also shattered. When the legal system allows an area declared a natural park to be subject to massive urbanization, or a protected wetland to be drained to build a highway, it is implicitly stating that legal commitments have no value, that norms can be ignored, and that environmental protection is a fiction. This form of institutional anomie is incompatible with the rule of law.

At the territorial level, institutional contradictions generate a disarticulation of the legal framework. Territory ceases to be an object of rational planning and becomes a field of dispute between conflicting interests. Decisions on land use, the location of infrastructure, the delimitation of vulnerable areas, and the management of natural resources are made without coherence, continuity, and respect for prior commitments. The result is a fragmentation of geographic space that reproduces the fragmentation of the legal system, generating inequality, exclusion, and environmental degradation. The principle of proper conduct, applied in this context, requires a reconstruction of institutional coherence. It is not enough to avoid formal contradictions; it is necessary to ensure that public policies, administrative acts, and judicial decisions are articulated around a common regulatory framework based on environmental protection, territorial equity, and sustainability. This reconstruction entails reviewing planning instruments, strengthening citizen participation mechanisms, ensuring transparency in decision-making, and establishing oversight systems that prevent arbitrariness.

From a constitutional perspective, Article 45 of the Spanish Constitution enshrines the right of everyone to enjoy an adequate environment and the obligation of public authorities to ensure its protection and restoration. This provision cannot be interpreted as a mere programmatic declaration; it must be understood as a binding norm that generates specific legal obligations. The principle of proper acts reinforces this interpretation by requiring that the institutions that have recognized this right act consistently with it, avoiding decisions that void it of content or contradict it in practice. Constitutional jurisprudence has oscillated between recognizing the normative force of Article 45 and classifying it as a legally indeterminate concept. This ambiguity has allowed the right to the environment to be treated as an abstract value, without effective enforceability. The principle of proper acts corrects this trend by requiring that the institutions that have proclaimed environmental law act in accordance with it, respecting their commitments and avoiding contradictions that generate legal anomie. At the international level, the commitments made by States regarding environmental matters -such as the Paris Agreement, the Sustainable Development Goals, or biodiversity conventions-, must be integrated into the domestic legal system and respected in administrative practice. The principle of proper acts prevents States from signing international treaties and then adopting policies that contradict them. This requirement is not only legal but also ethical: it implies that law must be an instrument of coherence between political discourse and institutional action.

Institutional coherence is also essential for spatial justice. Decisions regarding land use must respect the principles of equity, sustainability, and participation. Acting in contradiction with these principles—for example, by promoting urban development in vulnerable areas, authorizing polluting activities in protected areas, or ignoring the demands of local communities—constitutes a form of spatial injustice that the law must prevent. The principle of proper acts requires that institutions act consistently with their territorial commitments, respecting the dignity of the spaces and the people who inhabit them. This is why the principle of proper acts is not an isolated rule, but a profound expression of legal rationality, institutional ethics, and the demand for consistency in the exercise of power. In the field of the environment and territorial planning, this principle acts as a limit to institutional anomie, a guarantee of good faith, and the foundation of democratic legitimacy. Its application requires a transformation of the legal system, a coherent institutional

culture, and a collective commitment to ecological and territorial justice.

7. Systematic interpretation as a tool for normative reconstruction in the face of environmental and territorial anomie

Following the above, it should be noted that systematic interpretation constitutes one of the most powerful and necessary hermeneutic methods for preserving the coherence of the legal system, especially in contexts where normative fragmentation, institutional dispersion, and contradictions between norms generate anomie. In the field of the environment and land use planning, this interpretive technique acquires strategic value: it allows us to reconstruct the meaning of norms, articulate the different bodies of law, and ensure the effective protection of collective legal rights. This section will analyze systematic interpretation as a tool for normative reconstruction in the face of environmental and territorial anomie, directly linking it to the title of the article and the principles developed in the previous sections. Environmental and territorial anomie is not limited to the absence of regulations; it manifests itself as a structural dysfunction of the legal system. This dysfunction can take multiple forms: contradictions between laws of different ranks, overlapping powers between administrations, inconsistency between development plans, and the voiding of constitutional rights, among others. In all these cases, the problem is not the lack of regulation, but the inability of the legal system to offer coherent, predictable, and effective responses. Systematic interpretation is thus presented as a technique of recomposition, capable of restoring the unity of law and articulating normative fragments within a functional framework. From a theoretical perspective, systematic interpretation is based on the idea that legal norms should not be read in isolation, but rather in relation to the entire legal system. This technique requires considering the normative context, the hierarchy of norms, the general principles of law, constitutional values, and the purpose of the regulation. In the environmental field, this implies that a regulation on the protection of natural areas must be interpreted in conjunction with Article 45 of the Constitution, international treaties on biodiversity, regional legislation on land use planning, and the principles of sustainability and precaution. Systematic interpretation is not a neutral technique, but rather a form of legal rationality committed to coherence, justice, and regulatory effectiveness. In contexts of anomie, this technique makes it possible to overcome internal contradictions in legal systems, resolve conflicts between norms, and ensure the effective enforcement of rights. In the environmental field, this means that norms must be interpreted in a way that favors ecological protection, the conservation of natural resources, and the prevention of negative impacts. In the territorial sphere, it implies that decisions on spatial planning must respect the principles of equity, participation, and rationality.

Systematic interpretation also makes it possible to correct deficiencies in legislative technique. In many cases, environmental and territorial regulations are drafted in an ambiguous, incomplete, or contradictory manner. This deficiency generates legal uncertainty and hinders the practical application of the law. Systematic interpretation makes it possible to reconstruct the meaning of these regulations, integrate them into the legal system, and orient them toward the protection of collective goods. This task falls not only to judges, but also to legal practitioners, public administrations, and organized citizens. In the Spanish context, the need for systematic interpretation is especially urgent due to the territorial structure of the State. The distribution of powers between the State, the autonomous communities, and the municipalities has generated a multitude of regulations that, in many cases, overlap, contradict, or ignore each other. In the environmental field, this situation has produced regulatory fragmentation that hinders the effective protection of ecosystems, the rational management of natural resources, and the application of constitutional principles. At the territorial level, this has led to a disarticulation of the legal framework, where decisions on territorial planning are adopted without coordination, continuity, and respect for prior commitments. Systematic interpretation overcomes this fragmentation by articulating the rules around a common framework. This framework must be based on constitutional principles, ecological values, and fundamental rights. In the case of Article 45 of the Spanish Constitution, systematic interpretation requires that this provision be read in conjunction with Article 9.3 (legal certainty), Article 10 (human dignity), Article 103 (administrative effectiveness), and Article 149.1.23 (state powers in environmental matters). This integrated reading allows for the construction of a regulatory matrix that guides institutional action and guarantees effective environmental protection.

Systematic interpretation also allows for the incorporation of international commitments into the domestic legal system. Treaties on climate change, biodiversity, sustainable development, and environmental human rights must be integrated into the interpretation of national laws as part of the constitutional framework. This integration strengthens the coherence of the legal system, expands the scope of environmental rights, and ensures compliance with international obligations. The principle of proper acts reinforces this requirement by preventing States from signing international commitments and then adopting policies that contradict them. At the territorial level, systematic interpretation allows planning instruments, protection regimes, and administrative powers to be articulated within a functional framework. This implies that urban development plans must be compatible with territorial planning plans, environmental protection instruments, and sustainable development strategies. Systematic interpretation requires that decisions regarding land use, infrastructure location, and natural resource management respect the principles of spatial equity, technical rationality, and democratic participation. Systematic interpretation also has a pedagogical dimension. It teaches that law is not a set of isolated norms, but an integrated system oriented toward justice and the protection of the common good. It teaches that norms must be read in context, that principles must guide interpretation, and that coherence is a structural requirement of the legal system. This legal pedagogy is essential for training jurists who are conscientious, critical, and committed to sustainability, territorial equity, and environmental democracy. Thus, systematic interpretation is an essential tool for rebuilding the coherence of the legal system in the face of environmental and territorial anomie. It overcomes regulatory contradictions, articulates the various legal bodies, integrates international commitments, and guarantees the effective protection of collective goods. Its implementation requires an epistemological, institutional, and normative transformation based on the unity of law, institutional ethics, and a commitment to ecological and territorial justice.

8. Environmental anomie as a structural phenomenon in the legal configuration of geographic space Interpretation

Regarding environmental anomie, understood as the absence, inadequacy, or contradiction of norms that effectively regulate environmental protection, this is neither an isolated nor accidental phenomenon. It is, in fact, a structural manifestation of a deeper crisis affecting the legal system as a whole, especially with regard to the normative configuration of geographic space. This crisis is expressed in the legal system's inability to coherently articulate the different levels of regulation, constitutional principles, international commitments, and ecological demands that should guide land use planning and natural resource management. Environmental anomie is not limited to the absence of regulations. In many cases, regulations exist, but they are contradictory, ineffective, or unenforceable. This situation creates a legal paradox: the law recognizes the importance of the environment, enshrines it as a constitutional value, and protects it in international treaties, but at the same time empties it of meaning through restrictive interpretations, legislative omissions, or administrative decisions that subordinate it to economic, urban planning, or political interests. This internal contradiction in the legal system is a form of anomie that compromises legal certainty, institutional legitimacy, and regulatory effectiveness. In the Spanish context, this anomie is exacerbated by the territorial structure of the State and the regulatory fragmentation that characterizes environmental regulation. Environmental powers are divided between the State, the autonomous communities, and the municipalities, which has generated a multitude of regulations that, in many cases, overlap, contradict, or ignore each other. This regulatory dispersion impedes the construction of a coherent legal framework, hampers institutional coordination, and generates legal uncertainty for citizens, businesses, and the administrations themselves.

Environmental anomie is also manifested in the lack of integration between public policies. Land use, urban planning, infrastructure, energy, agriculture, and tourism policies are developed autonomously, without a common vision or compatibility criteria. This disconnect between policies generates negative impacts on the environment, fragments geographic space, and reproduces territorial inequalities. The absence of integrated and sustainable planning is a form of structural anomie that impedes rational land management and the effective protection of ecosystems. Another key aspect of environmental anomie is the weakness of legal enforcement mechanisms. Although Article 45 of the Spanish Constitution recognizes the right of everyone to enjoy an adequate environment, this right has not been developed as a fundamental

right fully enforceable before the courts. The Constitutional Court's jurisprudence has characterized the environment as a legally indeterminate concept, which has allowed for ambiguous and restrictive interpretations that limit its effectiveness. This lack of enforceability turns environmental law into an unfulfilled promise, a symbolic norm that generates no real legal effects.

Anomie is also expressed in the lack of citizen participation in environmental and territorial management. Although mechanisms for consultation and public action exist, these are often merely formal, lacking any real capacity to influence institutional decisions. Regulatory opacity, administrative complexity, and a lack of transparency hinder access to information, understanding of regulations, and effective citizen participation. This democratic exclusion is a form of anomie that weakens the legitimacy of the legal system and impedes the construction of a participatory environmental culture. The legal configuration of geographic space is directly affected by this anomie. The territory, instead of being managed as a collective good, as a space for life and relationships, is treated as an economic resource, an object of exploitation and commodification. Decisions regarding land use, the location of infrastructure, the delimitation of protected areas, and the management of natural resources are made without ecological criteria, without citizen participation, and without respect for prior regulatory commitments. This fragmented and arbitrary territorial management reproduces environmental anomie and generates negative impacts on biodiversity, quality of life, and spatial equity.

Environmental anomie also has an epistemological dimension. Legal knowledge about the environment and territory is fragmented, dispersed, and disjointed. Legal disciplines develop in isolation—administrative law, urban planning law, environmental law, international law—without conceptual integration that allows for a systemic approach to ecological and territorial problems. This fragmentation of legal knowledge reproduces normative fragmentation and hinders the construction of a coherent and effective legal system. Overcoming environmental anomie requires a profound transformation of the legal system. This transformation must begin with the recognition of the environment as a fundamental legal asset, as an enforceable right, and as a constitutional value that should guide all public policies. It must entail the normative integration of the various environmental and territorial regulations, institutional coordination between the different levels of government, effective citizen participation in territorial management, and the incorporation of international commitments into domestic law. This transformation also demands a new legal epistemology, capable of addressing ecological and territorial complexity from an interdisciplinary perspective. Law must engage with ecology, geography, sociology, economics, and political philosophy to build a normative framework capable of responding to contemporary challenges. This new legal rationality must be based on the unity of law, normative coherence, institutional ethics, and a commitment to ecological and territorial justice. Therefore, environmental anomie is not a technical problem, but a structural expression of a crisis of law as a system for protecting common goods. Overcoming it requires a normative, institutional, and epistemological reconstruction that allows for a coherent articulation of environmental protection and the legal configuration of geographic space. Law must recover its organizing, guaranteeing, and guiding function to become an effective instrument for defending life, promoting equity, and fulfilling constitutional values.

9. Proposals for territorial regulatory articulation to overcome environmental anomie and restore the legal coherence of the geographic space

Overcoming environmental and territorial anomie requires much more than a one-off reform of the legal system. It requires a profound and sustained structural transformation that allows for a coherent articulation of the norms, principles, powers, and instruments that legally define the environment and geographic space. This section focuses on the formulation of specific proposals for territorial regulatory articulation, aimed at restoring coherence to the legal system, ensuring the effective protection of ecological assets, and promoting rational, equitable, and sustainable territorial planning. From this perspective, several proposals can be formulated, namely:

The first proposal is to recognize the environment as a cross-cutting issue in the legal system. This implies that all laws, regardless of their material scope—urban planning, infrastructure, energy, agriculture, tourism, transportation—must be interpreted and applied in accordance with the principle of environmental

sustainability. This principle must acquire operational constitutional status, and not be limited to a programmatic declaration. Environmental transversality demands that the environment cease to be an isolated legal sector and become a structuring criterion for all public policies. The second proposal concerns environmental and territorial codification. Regulatory dispersion is one of the main causes of anomie. In Spain, there are dozens of laws, regulations, decrees, and plans that regulate partial aspects of the environment and territorial law, without any systematic coordination. This fragmentation generates legal uncertainty, hinders the practical application of the law, and fosters institutional arbitrariness. Thematic codification would allow environmental and territorial regulations to be compiled, organized, and systematized into coherent, accessible, and functional regulatory bodies. This task should be undertaken by state and regional legislators, in coordination with local authorities and with citizen participation.

The third proposal aims to create an integrated territorial planning framework. Currently, territorial planning instruments, urban development plans, rural development programs, and infrastructure plans are developed independently, without compatibility criteria or coordination mechanisms. This disconnection reproduces territorial anomie and generates negative impacts on the environment, social cohesion, and spatial equity. Integrated planning requires the development of strategic territorial plans that articulate the various sectoral instruments around common objectives, such as sustainability, ecological resilience, and spatial justice.

The fourth proposal concerns the reform of the system of powers. The distribution of powers between the State, the autonomous communities, and the municipalities has generated institutional fragmentation that hampers environmental and territorial management. This fragmentation results in overlaps, gaps, contradictions, and conflicts of authority. Competence reform should focus on clarifying functions, creating mechanisms for inter-administrative cooperation, and promoting multi-level governance structures. Environmental and territorial management requires coordinated action based on subsidiarity, co-responsibility, and institutional efficiency.

The fifth proposal consists of strengthening citizen participation mechanisms. Environmental and territorial anomie is not only legal but also democratic. The exclusion of citizens from decision-making regarding space and the environment generates mistrust, weakens institutional legitimacy, and favors the capture of the state by special interests. Participation must be active, informed, binding, and ongoing. This entails reforming administrative procedures, guaranteeing access to information, promoting public deliberation, and recognizing the right to collective action in defense of territory and the environment.

The sixth proposal aims to effectively incorporate international commitments into the domestic legal system. Spain has signed numerous treaties, conventions, and agreements on environmental and territorial matters, which establish clear legal obligations. However, these commitments do not always translate into domestic regulations or coherent public policies. Normative articulation requires that international treaties be part of the constitutional framework, that they be integrated into the interpretation of national norms, and that they become binding criteria for institutional action. This would strengthen the coherence of the legal system and ensure compliance with global commitments.

The seventh proposal concerns the creation of legal indicators of regulatory coherence. The evaluation of the legal system cannot be limited to formal or technical criteria; it must incorporate indicators that measure its coherence, effectiveness, and protective capacity. These indicators may include compatibility between regulations, the integration of constitutional principles, coordination between planning instruments, effective citizen participation, the enforceability of environmental rights, and institutional transparency. The creation of these indicators would make it possible to diagnose legal anomie and strategically guide regulatory reforms.

The eighth proposal consists of developing a coherent legal culture. The training of lawyers, public officials, legal practitioners, and citizens must incorporate the notion of coherence as a structural value of law. This entails teaching systematic interpretation, promoting respect for general principles, fostering institutional ethics, and recognizing the importance of the environment and territory as fundamental legal assets. A coherent legal culture is a necessary condition for overcoming anomie and for building a fair, effective, and legitimate legal system.

The ninth proposal aims at the creation of regulatory coherence oversight bodies. These bodies could be inter-administrative commissions, legal observatories, environmental ombudsmen, or specialized courts, charged with overseeing the coherence of the legal system, resolving regulatory conflicts, and ensuring the effective application of constitutional principles. These bodies must have independence, technical capacity, democratic legitimacy, and binding powers. Their function would be to prevent anomie, correct institutional contradictions, and promote the regulatory coordination of the environment and the territory.

The tenth proposal concerns the integration of the spatial dimension into legal analysis. Law can no longer ignore space as a normative category. Territory is not merely a physical medium, but a legal object that must be regulated in a coherent, equitable, and sustainable manner. Normative articulation requires that legal analysis incorporate geography, ecology, sociology, and economics to understand the complexity of space and to design norms that respond to its dynamics. This integration would overcome normative fragmentation, promote spatial justice, and ensure effective environmental protection.

Ultimately, together, these proposals constitute a program of structural reform of the legal system, aimed at overcoming environmental and territorial anomie, restoring regulatory coherence, and ensuring the protection of collective goods. This reform cannot be undertaken by a single actor; it requires the participation of all levels of government, public authorities, civil society, academia, and the public. It is a collective, ethical, and political task that demands commitment, creativity, and a willingness to transform. The articulation of territorial regulations is not a legal utopia, but a structural necessity. In a context of ecological crisis, territorial inequality, and institutional fragmentation, the law must recover its capacity to organize, protect, and guide. Regulatory coherence, the unity of law, systematic interpretation, and respect for constitutional principles are essential tools for building a legal system capable of responding to contemporary challenges. The environment and geographical space cannot continue to be victims of anomie; they must become structuring axes of a new legal rationality, committed to life, justice, and the future.

10. Epistemological implications and legal conclusions on environmental anomie and the normative configuration of geographical space

Environmental and territorial anomie, as developed throughout this research, cannot be understood solely as a normative dysfunction or an institutional pathology. Its scope goes beyond the legal and penetrates the epistemological realm, that is, the way in which legal knowledge about the environment and geographic space is constructed, interpreted, and legitimized. This section aims to explore the epistemological implications of anomie, as well as to draw legal conclusions that can guide the reconstruction of the legal system from a coherent, ecologically, and territorially just perspective. From an epistemological perspective, anomie reveals a crisis in the foundations of legal knowledge. Law, historically conceived as a rational, orderly, and hierarchical system, faces complex phenomena that go beyond its traditional categories. The environment, due to its systemic, dynamic, and interdependent nature, challenges the compartmentalized logic of positive law. Geographic space, due to its physical, social, and symbolic dimensions, demands regulation that articulates multiple scales, actors, and values. Anomie arises when law fails to integrate this complexity, when it clings to normative frameworks that fragment, simplify, or ignore ecological and territorial reality. This epistemological crisis is manifested in the difficulty of legally defining the environment. Constitutional jurisprudence has characterized the environment as a legally indeterminate concept, which has allowed for ambiguous and restrictive interpretations. This indeterminacy is not only semantic but also structural: it reveals the law's inability to construct a normative category that captures ecological complexity, articulates the different levels of regulation, and guarantees the effective protection of ecosystems. Anomie, in this sense, is an expression of an insufficient legal epistemology, which requires revision and expansion.

The legal configuration of geographic space faces a similar problem. Territory has traditionally been regulated from sectoral perspectives—urban planning, land use planning, infrastructure, heritage—without an integrated vision that recognizes its multidimensional nature. This normative fragmentation reproduces an epistemological fragmentation, where each legal discipline approaches space from its own logic, without dialogue or articulation. Territorial anomie is, therefore, the result of a legal epistemology that has failed to construct a theory of space as a complex legal object, as a place of life, relationships, and justice. Overcoming this epistemological crisis requires a transformation of the legal paradigm. Law must cease to be conceived

as a closed, self-referential, and hierarchical system and become an open, relational system oriented toward the protection of common goods. This transformation entails incorporating ecology, geography, sociology, economics, and political philosophy into the construction of legal knowledge. It implies recognizing that the environment and territory are not passive objects of regulation, but rather active subjects that shape social life, structure power relations, and determine the conditions of existence.

From this new legal epistemology, the environment must be recognized as a fundamental right, as a collective good, and as a constitutional value that guides all public policies. Geographic space must be regulated as a complex legal object, requiring integrated planning, democratic participation, and spatial justice. Anomie must be understood as a warning sign, a symptom of a legal rationality that has lost its capacity to order, protect, and guide. Overcoming it requires a normative, institutional, and epistemological reconstruction that allows for a coherent articulation of environmental protection and the legal configuration of the territory.

11. Conclusions

The research developed throughout this essay allows us to identify, analyse, and, problematize the phenomenon of **legal anomie** as it applies to the **environment** and **the normative configuration of geographic space** from an interdisciplinary, critical, and systematic perspective. The conclusions drawn from this study not only confirm the existence of a structural normative crisis but also reveal the urgent need for an epistemological, institutional, and legal reconstruction that will restore the coherence of legal systems and guarantee the effective protection of common goods.

Firstly, it can be concluded that environmental anomie is not simply a lack of norms, but a complex form of legal dysfunction manifested in contradictions between norms, institutional fragmentation, interpretive inconsistency, and the lack of enforceability of recognized rights. This anomie compromises the effectiveness of the law, erodes legal certainty, and weakens the legitimacy of the institutions responsible for managing the environment and the territory. **Geographic space**, far from being a mere physical medium, constitutes a legal category that requires coherent regulation, integrated planning, and effective protection. The normative disarticulation of the territory -expressed in the dispersion of powers, the lack of coordination between planning instruments, and the subordination of ecological values to economic interests-, reproduces legal anomie and generates negative impacts on biodiversity, spatial equity, and the quality of life of communities.

Secondly, it is concluded that the **principle of proper acts**, as an expression of institutional good faith, must be applied as a structural limit against normative and administrative contradiction. Public institutions, when making decisions regarding the environment and territorial matters, are legally bound to them and cannot act in contradiction without violating the coherence of the legal system. This principle must be recognized as a guarantee of legal rationality, as a tool to control arbitrariness, and as an expression of institutional ethics. From this perspective, **systematic interpretation** has been defended as a fundamental hermeneutic method for overcoming anomie. This technique makes it possible to articulate norms around constitutional principles, integrate international commitments into domestic law, resolve normative conflicts, and guarantee the effective application of environmental and territorial rights. Systematic interpretation is not a methodological option, but a structural requirement of law as a rational system.

Thirdly, a set of **proposals for territorial regulatory articulation** has been formulated, aimed at restoring coherence to the legal system and ensuring the protection of ecological assets. These proposals include thematic codification, integrated planning, jurisdictional reform, strengthening citizen participation, creating legal indicators, developing oversight bodies, and promoting a coherent legal culture. These measures must be adopted as part of a collective commitment to ecological and territorial justice, raising the need for an **epistemological transformation** of law that allows ecological and territorial complexity to be addressed from an interdisciplinary perspective. Law must engage with ecology, geography, sociology, and political philosophy to build a normative framework capable of responding to contemporary challenges. This new legal rationality must be based on the unity of law, normative coherence, and a commitment to life, equity, and the future.

Fourthly, it is concluded **that Article 45 of the Spanish Constitution**, which recognizes the right to the environment, must be interpreted as a binding, enforceable, and structuring rule of the legal system. Its emptying of content through restrictive interpretations constitutes a form of anomie that must be corrected through the application of constitutional principles, international commitments, and systematic interpretation

techniques. It is therefore understood that **environmental and territorial anomie** is not only a legal problem but also a political, ethical, cultural, and territorial one. Overcoming it requires a profound transformation of institutions, administrative practices, legal culture, and civic awareness. The law must recover its organizing, guaranteeing, and guiding function to become an effective instrument for defending the common good and realizing constitutional values.

Fifth and finally, it is concluded that **the unity of law** is a condition for the possibility of legal justice. Without unity, the legal system fragments, contradicts itself, and loses its capacity to guide institutional action. Unity does not imply uniformity, but rather articulation: the capacity to integrate diverse norms into a coherent system, oriented toward environmental protection, territorial equity, and intergenerational sustainability. **Anomie, in its scientific application to the environment and geographic spaces**, constitutes one of the most urgent and complex challenges of contemporary law. Addressing it requires a critical perspective, a transformative will, and an ethical commitment to life, to justice, and to a future in which law must be reconstructed as a system for the protection of common goods, as a tool for territorial planning, and as an expression of a legal rationality committed to sustainability and equity in the environmental sphere.

12. Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio (2005). Estado de excepción. Editorial Pre-Textos, Valencia.

Bobbio, Norberto (1993). Teoría General del Derecho. Editorial Temis, Bogotá.

Delgado Piqueras, Juan (2007). Ordenación del Territorio y Urbanismo. Editorial Civitas, Madrid.

García de Enterría, Eduardo & Fernández, Tomás Ramón (2002). Curso de Derecho Administrativo I. Civitas, Madrid.

Cazorla Prieto, María del Carmen (2019). La Participación Ciudadana en la Gestión Ambiental. Editorial Tirant lo Blanch, Valencia.

Crutzen, P. J (2006). The "Anthropocene", en E.Ehlers y T.Krafft (eds.), Earth System Science in tehe Anthropocene, Berlín,Springer, págs. 13 a la 18.

Díez-Picazo, Luis (2005). Sistema de Derecho Civil. Vol. I. Editorial Tecnos, Madrid.

Fernández, Santiago (2010). Derecho Ambiental: Fundamentos y Régimen Jurídico. Editorial Thomson Reuters Aranzadi, Navarra. ↪ Obra especializada en el marco normativo ambiental español y su articulación con el derecho internacional.

García-Pelayo, M. (2009). Las Transformaciones del Estado Contemporáneo. Editorial, Alianza Universidad.

López Ramón, Fernando (2011). Derecho Urbanístico. Editorial Civitas, Madrid.

Luhmann, Niklas (1995). Sistema Jurídico y Dogmática Jurídica. Editorial Universidad Externado de Colombia, Bogotá.

Moruno Rodríguez, María del Mar (2015). El Derecho al Medio Ambiente en la Constitución Española. Editorial Dyckinson, Madrid.

Pérez Luño, Antonio Enrique (2006). Derechos Humanos y Estado de Derecho. Editorial Tecnos, Madrid

Rodríguez-Arana Muñoz, Jaime (2008). Principios de Derecho Público. Editorial Marcial Pons, Madrid.

Rebollo Puig, Manuel (2013). El Principio de Buena Fe en el Derecho Administrativo. Editorial Comares, Granada.

Sotelo Pérez, I. (2020). El Recurso Agua en España: fuente jurídica de conflictos hídricos sin resolver. Revista Barataria.

Sotelo Navalpotro, J.A; Sotelo Pérez, I. (2018). Agua y medio ambiente: encuadre jurídico constitucional de la materia hídrica en España, en la actualidad. Anales de la Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales de la Universidad Nacional de La Plata.