

The Future of “Ecocide” as the Fifth Crime in International Law in the Context of Environmental Security *

Tuba TAŞLICALI KOÇ¹, Hasret ÇOMAK²



1. Independent Researcher,
ttaslicali@yahoo.com,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6311-9960>

2. Prof. Dr., Istanbul Kent University,
hasret.comak@kent.edu.tr,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5162-5260>

* The study was presented at the International Science Fiction Symposium titled “Inventing the Future,” held from November 4 to 6, 2024, in Moscow, Russian Federation.

<https://doi.org/10.30798/makuiibf.1598657>

Abstract

After the Cold War, the approach to international security in IR shifted, highlighting that harmony in the global system relies on various actors and conditions. In this context, new security perception approaches have emerged and are now analyzed through five sectors instead of a realistic perspective. According to the five-sector analysis approach introduced by the Copenhagen School, security studies now include not only military but also political, economic, environmental, and social elements. While significant strides have been made in enhancing environmental security ongoing environmental challenges and their associated impacts suggest that these initiatives cannot find enough support in the international juridical system. For this reason, the concept of “ecocide” was developed by international actors, which many countries included in their legal systems with a further aim of preventing crimes against the environment by taking its place in international law with the scope of enhancing international security. This study aims to explore the implications of the concept of “ecocide” within the international legal system, particularly in relation to environmental security and emerging security frameworks and its impact on international security. The research utilizes a document analysis method to achieve this goal. Given the importance of the subject matter, this study is poised to make a meaningful contribution to humanity by offering insights into the preventability of environmental pollution, a pressing threat to the environment, and therefore to international security.

Keywords: *Ecocide, Environmental Security, Environmental Immigrants, Copenhagen School, Climate Crisis, Paris Convention, Rome Statute, 5th Crime.*

| Article Type | Application Date | Admission Date |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Research Article | December 9, 2024 | February 11, 2026 |

1. INTRODUCTION

During the Cold War, the world exhibited a bipolar structure; however, it has since evolved into a multipolar world. This transformation has allowed the emergence of regional centers of power that contribute significantly to the dynamics of the international system. However, whether it is a unipolar, multipolar, or a single-state world system, which we can describe as a utopia today, the lands that are dominated or in which there is a conflict of interest do not change in terms of quantity. To put it differently, while the participants within the international system or the system itself may evolve, the fundamental areas where conflicts of interest arise remain consistent across the globe. Nevertheless, although the geographical area does not change in terms of quantity, there is a change in quality due to human-induced effects. The effects of this environmental change, which comes with industrialization and is generally negative, on societies are felt over time and challenges general health conditions (Vergara, 2023, pp. 81-97).

Moreover, the negative impacts resulting from the degradation of environmental structures disrupt the balance between supply and demand in agricultural production while posing a significant risk to public health. All these negativities cause individuals who have to leave their homes due to environmental disasters to become environmental immigrants (Köybaşı, 2022, p. 1048). These forced orientations of environmental immigrants not only cause challenges in the distribution of resources in the migrated regions but also lead to cultural conflicts between new societies in new terrains (Eryılmaz, 2021, p. 125). In addition to this, these conflicts can lead to the breakdown of agreements between countries and the loss of harmony in the international arena (Çınar Yıldırım & Çomak, 2023, pp. 355-367). In other words, if the aggressive actions of a state towards environmental security affect other countries, conflicts between those countries become more likely to escalate to a war.

Therefore, the culmination of these outcomes has led to a significant shift in IR, leading to the acceptance of multifaceted paradigms (Çakır, 2022, p. 262). This shift has enabled other perspectives to flourish (Daban, 2024, p. 118) and overcome the military-oriented security paradigms that were characteristic of the Cold War era, and it has become acknowledged that environmental security, along with other security aspects mentioned by the Copenhagen School, plays a crucial role in ensuring international harmony. This acceptance led to the creation of new norms and the pursuit of new concepts such as ecocide, which can be simply defined as the destruction of the environment.

As researchers undertaking this study, we recognize that the environment we inhabit represents a legacy for future generations. Consequently, this study seeks to explore the aforementioned concept of "ecocide" and its potential contributions to IR. It will be framed within critical security approaches, with a particular emphasis on the Copenhagen School and the emerging field of environmental security. The concept of "ecocide" is scrutinized within modern security frameworks, particularly in the domestic legal systems of jurisdictions that acknowledge this term. Furthermore, the study investigates "ecocide" from an international standpoint, elucidating its ramifications for global legal frameworks.

Utilizing document analysis methodology, a systematic approach frequently employed in qualitative research to scrutinize and interpret information contained in written materials (Sak et al., 2021, p. 227), this research primarily draws from a variety of sources, including international agreements, domestic laws, newspaper reports, documentaries, statements from decision-makers, and declarations from international organizations such as UN, EU and ICC. The main reason for choosing this method is that the document analysis method offers insight into the complex layers of meaning, context and perspective found in textual materials (Bowen, 2009, p. 27). By critically examining these sources to gather insightful data and understand the context, this research aims to analyze the future impacts of the term "ecocide" on IR, while enhancing awareness of the preventable nature of environmental pollution, which represents a significant threat to environmental, and therefore international security.

2. CRITICAL SECURITY APPROACHES, COPENHAGEN SCHOOL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY

Following the conclusion of the Cold War, the international system underwent a significant transformation, prompting a reevaluation of efforts to establish peace and address security concerns from diverse perspectives. This change in perspective has led to increased criticism of the realistic approach that dominates IR. It has also led to the emergence of critical security approaches that have many dimensions.

Critical security approaches have critiqued the realist framework, the prevailing theory during the Cold War, for its inability to address the emerging security needs in the evolving global order. These approaches have introduced a fresh perspective on international security and the methods necessary to meet these new challenges (Öztürk, 2024, p. 52). This set of approaches has manifested itself in different schools such as the Paris School, Aberystwyth School, Copenhagen School, Post-Structuralist Approaches, Post-Colonial Analysis, and Feminist Security Studies. Upon reviewing the arguments presented by these schools of thought, it becomes apparent that each offers a distinct perspective on security. This diversity enhances IR by providing a range of approaches to establishing security.

The Copenhagen School, known for its contributions to critical security theories, offers a distinct perspective on security that contrasts with the traditional views of the Cold War era. The Copenhagen School does not explain security only in terms of the military dimension, but also states that the developing and changing new world order has now diversified the need for security. Therefore, the Copenhagen School indicates that security should now include political, economic, environmental, and social elements, as well as military security. Especially in Buzan's book "People, States, and Fear" written in 1983, it is emphasized that the national security agenda is not only about military security issues, but that security should be considered as a whole of different concerns that may arise in economic, social, and environmental fields. Also, in the same year, Ullman (1983, p. 129) emphasized

in his article "Redefining Security" that reducing national security only to the military dimension is highly inaccurate.

The Copenhagen School's contribution to security studies marks a significant advancement in our understanding of the various factors that could influence the future of humanity. This innovative approach is required for raising awareness about these critical issues. Notably, environmental pollution—identified by the School as one of these vital subjects—has escalated since industrialization. The actions of individuals that disrupt the environment and ecosystem have significantly contributed to this growing challenge (Mehra et al., 2019, p. 2).

Environmental pollution, defined as harming living resources and ecological systems due to human actions (Appannagari, 2017, p. 152), is examined in four different dimensions: air, water, soil, and noise pollution (Nızıgıymana, 2021, pp. 61-70). The main reason for this classification is that the measures to be taken against each type of pollution differ (Taşlıcalı Koç, 2023, p. 345; Taşlıcalı Koç, 2024, p. 210). The environmental pollution elements we examine in these four separate classes create problems such as energy shortage, nutritional problems, decreased living diversity, loss of soil, and health problems. In this respect, environmental security also includes process management to prevent environmental pollution that threatens the continuity of life on Earth.

However, since some actors in the international system have different agendas, they are reluctant to end their actions that cause environmental pollution, which causes difficulties in establishing environmental security. In other words, these behaviors of international actors who prioritize their interests cause the failure to find common ground and prevent achieving targeted outcomes in ensuring environmental security. This behavior disrupts harmony in the international system and leads to disputes between states (Kaypak & Yılmaz, 2019, p. 863), causing a quest for a robust legal framework.

As has been demonstrated, during the Cold War, states' national power and capabilities were primarily assessed in terms of military strength. However, with the emergence of a new world order after the Cold War in the international system, the elements of national power began to be analyzed more holistically, considering a variety of contexts beyond just military might. This new perspective in the international system has led to the emergence of critical approaches to the perception of international security and a new standpoint to IR.

With this newly defined five-sector analysis approach brought to the discipline by the Copenhagen School, security has begun to be defined as a structure that includes not only its military dimension but also political, economic, environmental, and social elements. Furthermore, the heavy pressures on the environment caused by the intense industrial pollution brought about by globalization have proven the importance of environmental pollution in human life. Consequently, climate change and its widespread consequences, along with environmental disasters, have sparked a debate among

international actors about a new concept named "ecocide", which can be briefly defined as the severe destruction of the environment.

Therefore, this study is grounded in the five-sector analysis of the Copenhagen School of Critical Security Studies mentioned above because achieving international security can no longer rely solely on military intervention and there has been a significant shift in security dimensions since the Cold War. The insights provided by critical security studies enriched the field of IR by enabling analysis from diverse perspectives, such as protecting the environment. As a result, various stakeholders have become increasingly aware of the significance of environmental security, pressing for the incorporation of the concept of ecocide into legal frameworks. Additionally, critical security studies have contributed to the international system and the IR discipline by emphasizing the need for monitoring environmental degradation by those accountable for upholding international law.

3. THE TERM ECOCID AND COUNTRIES THAT HAVE ADOPTED THE TERM

3.1. Historical Background of the Term Ecocide

The term ecocide consists of the combination of the words "oikos" and "caedere" (Dursun Özdemir, 2023, p. 75; Rodeiro, 2020, p. 13). While "oikos" means house or home, "caedere" means destroying or killing (Şafak & Tabur, 2023, p. 98). Therefore, etymologically, the word "ecocide" means "home-cide" (Çoban, 2024, p. 241). Erdem and Orhan further expand the concept of ecocide and define it as "the large-scale destruction of ecosystems and the species they support" (Erdem & Orhan, 2021, p. 333). Some scientists explain ecocide as "killing the environment or destroying large areas of the natural environment as a result of human activity" (Metcheva et al., 2022, p. 8). According to The Independent Expert Panel, "ecocide" means unlawful or wanton acts committed with knowledge that there is a substantial likelihood of severe and either widespread or long-term damage to the environment being caused by those acts (Stop Ecocide Foundation [SEF], 2021).

The concept was first used by Arthur Galston in 1970 at the "War and Responsibility" conference in Washington to indicate the damage caused by the USA's use of poisonous orange gas in the Vietnam War. It was determined that between 1962 and 1970, American troops used approximately 20 million gallons of chemical defoliants during the Vietnam War to destroy crops and reveal Vietcong positions and movement routes (Dunlap & Brock, 2022, p. 2; YaleNews, 2008). Additionally, official sources in Vietnam estimate that approximately two million people and three million hectares of land were contaminated with toxins (Jer, 2019, p. 38). While expressing his opinion on the concept of ecocide, Arthur Galston drew attention to these practices of the United States (USA). The term "ecocide" defined the intentional destruction of the environment at that time, and Galston stated that the US's acts caused irreversible damage to plant life in the region.

Professor of Biology Galston, who also served as Director of the Yale Department of Biological Sciences (YaleNews, 2008), argued that the damage in question would have effects on all animals and

humans due to the interdependent relationship of ecological systems (NY Times, 1970, p. 38). Galston emphasized that the destruction of mangrove trees in the estuaries of South Vietnam by the USA would prevent the completion of the life cycle of some shellfish and migratory fish, and this would affect the health and welfare of the South Vietnamese, who obtain their protein sources from the sea.

The main reason behind Galston's reaction to these U.S. practices was that a compound he found in his doctoral thesis in 1943 was later developed and used for military purposes in Indochina. He explained his concerns in his work "Science and Social Responsibility: A Case History," published in 1972, and emphasized that the most important thing for a scientist is to control the use of his work and to follow his work to the end (Galston, 1972, p. 223). Galston fulfilled this follow-up responsibility with his visit to China in 1971 (Morawetz, 1979, p. 879), and in 1973, he published his book "Daily Life in People's China," in which he described his impressions of the environmental destruction he observed during his visit (Galston, 1973).

Following Galston's renowned opposition to the US's acts, a significant milestone in the discussion surrounding the term "ecocide" occurred during the Stockholm Conference in 1972. In his opening speech, Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme characterized the Vietnam War as an ecological warfare (Björk, 1996, p. 20), stating that the immense destruction brought about by indiscriminate bombing with large-scale use of bulldozers and herbicides was an outrage and sometimes described as ecocide, which requires urgent international attention (Palme, 1972, p. 6). This speech was influential in introducing the concept of ecocide to the international legal system and making it a norm. It also inspired Falk to prepare the Draft Ecocide Convention in 1973.

Falk concurred with Galston's observations, stating, "Just as counterinsurgency warfare tends toward genocide with respect to the people, so it tends toward ecocide with respect to the environment.". He also classified the US's acts in Indochina as the first modern example of the last decade in which the environment was chosen as a military target suitable for comprehensive and systematic destruction (Falk, 1973, p. 80). In this perspective, Falk also emphasized in his draft that humanity consciously and unconsciously causes irreparable damage to the environment in times of war and peace (Gauger et al., 2012, p. 2).

3.2. Countries That Have Incorporated the Concept of Ecocide into Their Domestic Legal Frameworks

An examination of the legislation in countries that have integrated the concept of ecocide into their national legal systems reveals a diverse group. This group includes Armenia, Belarus, Belgium, Chile, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Vietnam, and notably, the European Parliament, which has also incorporated the concept of ecocide within its legal framework. Many countries are taking significant steps to develop legal measures to penalize ecocide (Kaminski, 2023).

3.2.1. Armenia

According to the Armenian criminal law system, ecocide is defined as "the intentional mass destruction of flora or fauna, poisoning the environment, the soils or water resources, as well as implementation of other actions causing an ecological catastrophe". If these acts are committed, individuals are sentenced to ten to fifteen years imprisonment (Armenian Criminal Code [ACC], 2003, art. 394). The article on ecocide was accepted in 2003.

3.2.2. Belarus

The concept of ecocide was introduced into the Belarusian criminal law system with an article added in 1999. The article states that "the commission of mass destruction of flora or fauna, poisoning of the atmosphere, soil or water resources and other acts that cause or may cause ecological disaster shall be punishable by ten to fifteen years of imprisonment." (Belarus Criminal Code [BCC], 1997, art. 131).

3.2.3. Belgium

A new criminal code was adopted by the Belgian Parliament on 29 February 2024. This law sets an example for other countries as it includes the recognition of the crime of ecocide at both national and international levels for the first time (Chini, 2024). The significance of this point was also highlighted in the proposal for the legislation, and it was stated that the aim was "to offer Belgium a unique opportunity to present itself as a model and a key player in this global initiative" (Killean, 2024, p. 10). According to the law above, "the punishment for individuals may include up to 20 years in prison, while corporations could face fines of up to 1.6 million euros (Belgium Criminal Code [BCC], 2024). In this respect, Belgium has become the first EU member country to make changes in its domestic legal system to make it compatible with the European Union's revised Environmental Crimes Directive (Savard, 2024).

3.2.4. Chile

On August 17, 2023, the Chilean Congress approved the Economic Crimes Law No. 21.595, which expands criminal liability for economic and environmental crimes (Liedo, 2024). Considering Chile's recent history, it is thought that the underlying reason for preparing the law in question is the perception in some circles that white-collar crimes were not punished sufficiently, especially during military coups (Killean, 2024, p. 14). Ecocide is not explicitly criminalized in the Economic Crimes Law (Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile [BCN], 2024); however, it has received praise because the law includes various elements of the legal definition of ecocide formulated by the Stop Ecocide Foundation and systematizes environmental crimes previously dispersed in different legal bodies (Stop Ecocide, 2023).

Following the new regulation in the Chilean criminal law system, those who violate existing laws in a way that causes serious harm are punished with up to 10 years in prison (Killean, 2024, p. 15).

The profound impact mentioned in this new regulation in Chilean criminal law is attributed to adverse changes in any component of the environment, long-term effects over time, complex or irreversible damage to repair reaching a significant number of species and serious risk to the health of one or more people (BCN, 2024).

3.2.5. Ecuador

Upon examination of the domestic legal system in Ecuador, it becomes evident that this matter is addressed in Article 245 of the Criminal Law (Código Orgánico Integral Penal Ecuador, 2014, p. 98). According to the said article, anyone who occupies areas in the national protected areas system or sensitive ecosystems is punished with a prison sentence of one to three years. If severe damage is caused to biological diversity and natural resources due to the occupation, and the occupation is encouraged, financed, or directed by deceiving the public or exploiting false promises, the heaviest penalty is imposed.

3.2.6. France

With the amendment to the French Criminal Law in 2021, the term "ecocide" has been referenced three times. The first provision on the subject is the statement that if the acts that constitute the crimes stipulated in Article 231-1 of the Criminal Code are committed intentionally, they constitute environmental massacre, and a prison sentence of up to 10 years can be imposed (European Law Institute [ELI], 2023, p. 20). The crimes in the said article have the nature of causing severe and permanent damage to health, vegetation, animals or air, soil or water quality (Brihi & Dufourq, 2022).

One of the significant changes introduced to the French criminal law system is that, within one year of its publication, the law obliges the government to submit a report to the Parliament on its activities towards the recognition of ecocide as a crime that can be tried in international criminal courts (French Criminal Law [FCC], 2021, art. 296).

3.2.7. Georgia

In the legal framework of Georgia, the term "ecocide" is analyzed within the context of two distinct periods: armed conflict and peace. In the Criminal Code of Georgia, ecocide is defined as the pollution of the atmosphere, soil, and water resources, as well as the mass destruction of fauna or flora, or any action that may lead to an ecological disaster. Such criminal actions in peacetime are punishable by imprisonment ranging from twelve to twenty years. During armed conflicts, the penalties increase to fourteen to twenty years or even life imprisonment (Georgian Criminal Code [GCC], 1999, article 409). The article on ecocide was adopted in 1999.

3.2.8. Kazakhstan

In Kazakhstan, similar to the Russian Federation, there is a dedicated section that addresses ecological crimes, providing a comprehensive overview of these issues (Kazakhstan Criminal Code,

1997, section 11). Moreover, Article 161 of the Kazakhstan Criminal Code, known as Ecocide, specifies that acts such as the mass destruction of plants and animals, the pollution of the atmosphere, soil, or water resources, and other actions that result in or could potentially lead to ecological disasters are punishable by imprisonment for a term ranging from ten to fifteen years. The article addressing ecocide was formally accepted in 1997.

3.2.9. Kyrgyzstan

In the Kyrgyz Republic, a dedicated section addresses ecological crimes, similar to the framework established in the Russian Federation. This section provides comprehensive details on the various aspects of environmental offenses (Kyrgyzstan Criminal Code, 1997, section 26). Furthermore, Article 374 of the Kyrgyzstan Criminal Code, titled as "ecocide", includes the provision: "In case of mass destruction of the animal or plant world, pollution of the atmosphere or water resources, as well as other actions that may lead to ecological disaster, the person is punished with imprisonment from 12 to 20 years." The article on ecocide was accepted in 1997.

3.2.10. Moldova

In the Moldovan criminal law system, the concept of ecocide is classified among the crimes committed under the Special Section (Moldova Criminal Code [MCC], 2002, art.136). As a matter of fact, in this section, crimes such as ecocide, genocide, inhumane treatment, violation of international humanitarian law, war propaganda, activities of mercenaries, and human cloning are listed (Vîlcu & Ursu, 2009, pp. 59-62). Upon examining the nature of the listed crimes, it becomes evident that the concept of ecocide holds considerable significance within the Moldovan legal system. The article on ecocide was accepted in 2002.

3.2.11. Russian Federation

The Russian criminal law system operates a very descriptive process in crimes against the environment. In fact, the 26th chapter of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation examines Environmental Crimes. Within the chapter, the nature of each crime and the penalties for the crime are detailed (Grechenkova et al., 2015, p. 834).

Furthermore, within the "Crimes against the Peace and Security of Humanity" section, there is an article specifically dedicated to the concept of ecocide. This article, accepted in 1996, defines ecocide as the "massive destruction of the animal or plant kingdoms, contamination of the atmosphere or water resources, and also commission of other actions capable of causing an ecological catastrophe". Individuals who violate the stipulations outlined in this regulation shall face a penalty of imprisonment ranging from 12 to 20 years (Russian Federation Criminal Code [RFCC], 1996, art. 358).

3.2.12. Tajikistan

Article 400 of the Penal Code of Tajikistan addresses ecocide offenses. According to this article, the mass destruction of vegetation and animal species, the pollution of air or water resources, and other actions that may result in ecological disasters are subject to penalties ranging from 15 to 20 years in prison (Tajikistan Criminal Code [TCC], 1998). Ecological security and crimes against the environment are processed in separate sections, and the penalties to be imposed according to the nature of each crime are classified separately (Tajikistan Criminal Code [TCC], 1998, section 24). The article addressing ecocide was formally accepted in 1998.

3.2.13. Ukraine

Article 441 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine, located in the twentieth chapter titled "Crimes against Peace, the Security of Humanity and the International Legal Order" defines ecocide as "mass destruction of flora and fauna, poisoning of air or water resources, and also any other actions that may cause an environmental disaster" and punishment for this crime is imprisonment for a term of eight to fifteen years (Ukraine Criminal Code, 2001, art. 441). In the framework of Ukrainian criminal law, alongside the provisions addressing ecocide, a dedicated section focuses on environmental crimes. These offenses are thoroughly examined to ensure comprehensive protection of the environment (Supreme Council of Ukraine, 2024). The article addressing ecocide was formally accepted in 2001.

3.2.14. Uzbekistan

Although no article is directly titled ecocide in the criminal law system of Uzbekistan, crimes against the environment that overlap with the concept of ecocide are regulated in two separate articles in the Uzbekistan Criminal Code. While Article 196 deals with the pollution or damage of soil, water, or atmospheric air, Article 198 stipulates the damage or destruction of crops, forests, or other plants due to negligence in firefighting. If acted contrary to the provisions of Article 196 of this law and caused mass illness of people, death of animals, birds, or fish, or other serious consequences, the culprit would be sentenced to a fine of one hundred to two hundred minimum monthly wages, to deprivation of certain rights for up to five years, or correctional labor up to three years (Uzbekistan Criminal Code, 1994, p. 61). The same article also indicates that if the same acts result in the death of a person, the culprit shall be punished with arrest from three to six months, or imprisonment up to three years and deprivation of certain rights. Article 198 of the same law states that "damage or destruction of crops, forest, or other plants as the result of negligent dealing with fire, resulted in large damage or other grave consequences shall be punished with fine up to fifty minimum monthly wages, or correctional labor up to one year, or arrest up to three months (Uzbekistan Criminal Code, 1994, p. 62).

According to article 198 paragraph 2 "illegal felling of timber or other plants, resulted in large damage shall be punished with fine from fifty to seventy-five minimum monthly wages, or correctional

labor from one year to two years, or arrest from three to six months, or imprisonment up to three years.", as amended by Law of 29.08.2001.

3.2.15. Vietnam

Vietnam became the first state to include the concept of ecocide in its domestic law by enacting the new criminal code in 1990 (Neto, 2023, p. 3). When the Vietnamese criminal law system is examined, it is observed that the term ecocide is addressed under the headings of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes that undermine peace. Article 342 of the Vietnam Penal Code states: "Those who, in peace time or war time, commit acts of annihilating en-mass population in an area, destroying the source of their livelihood, undermining the cultural and spiritual life of a country, upsetting the foundation of a society with a view to undermining such society, as well as other acts of genocide or acts of ecocide or destroying the natural environment, shall be sentenced to between ten years and twenty years of imprisonment, life imprisonment or capital punishment." (Vietnam Criminal Code, 1999).

The innovative structure of this country, which is the main subject of the ecocide concept, sets an example for other countries (Sarliève, 2020, p. 2). Vietnam's domestic legal regulation is considered to stem from its reaction to the environmental damage it experienced during the Vietnam War (Greene, 2019, p. 19).

3.2.16. European Parliament

In January 2021, the European Parliament called on the EU and its member states to support the recognition of the crime as an international crime (Pereira, 2024, p. 158). The European Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee voted unanimously in favor of condemning "ecocide" under EU law two years later. On March 29, 2023, the European Parliament supported the inclusion of environmental crimes in the revised EU Directive on the protection of the environment through criminal law. The Council of the European Union adopted this directive on the protection of the environment through criminal law one year later; and Germany was the only country to vote against it. The Environmental Crime Directive was published in the Official Journal on April 30, 2024 and entered into force on May 20, 2024 (European Commission, 2024). Member states have until May 21, 2026 to transpose the process into their domestic jurisdictional system. This directive introduces environmental offenses into national criminal law that cause significant damage to nature, comparable to "ecocide".

4. THE FUTURE OF THE TERM ECOCIDE IN INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY

The distinct perspectives and differing needs of various international actors influence each nation's decision-making processes. The different dynamics of each country also affect everyday decisions regarding environmental security. Given the varying dynamics of each nation, decisions concerning environmental security within the international framework may sometimes clash with the

distinct interests of the involved states. Environmental safety issues, while causing a threat to international security, possess complexities that extend beyond both spatial and temporal boundaries (Kaypak & Yılmaz, 2019, p. 862). Consequently, conflicts of interest may be relegated to a secondary status in certain instances. For example a nuclear disaster occurring in any nation has the potential to transcend geographical boundaries and impact other countries via atmospheric transmission. Furthermore, it may extend beyond the present, posing significant threats to future generations and ecosystems.

The aspect of environmental security that transcends spatial and temporal boundaries encourages states to seek collaborative solutions. Therefore, there has been attempts to foster these collaborations in IR. The first attempt in the international legal system to establish environmental security was demonstrated at the United Nations Conference on Human and Environment in 1972. At the conference above, 109 recommendations were made for protecting the environment, which is "not our common heritage but our common debt to future generations", and environmental rights were placed on the main agenda of an international conference for the first time. After the conference, the Stockholm Declaration, which consists of 26 principles, was published, and an attempt was made to instill environmental awareness in countries. The conference also led to the establishment of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). However, there was no reference to the environmental massacre in the official outcome document of the Stockholm Conference (Gauger et al., 2012, p. 4).

Another notable development regarding the efforts to adopt the concept of ecocide to the international legal system was a study prepared by the UN Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities in 1978 (United Nations, 1978, pp. 128-134). In this study, a proposal was made to add the concept of ecocide to the 1948 Genocide Convention (Minkova, 2021, p. 8). While Romania supported the proposal, England opposed it on the grounds that "there is no definition of the crime of ecocide and it does not seem possible for the term to have a precise meaning" (Greene, 2019, p. 13). In 1985, the same committee suggested that the definition of genocide be expanded to include the concept of ecocide (Whitaker, 1985), but other countries argued that ecocide should be considered a crime against humanity rather than an act of genocide (Greene, 2019, p. 14). As a result, the commission was requested to conduct further research on the subject in its 38th session and it was planned to report in its 40th session, which was never held (Higgins et al., 2013, p. 259).

One of the critical progresses regarding environmental security was the Bruntland Report dated 1987, which established the connection between sustainable development and environmental security (Karabıçak & Özdemir, 2015, p. 45). In 1991, it was planned to make a new regulation regarding the damage caused to the environment, and in the "Draft Law on Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Humanity", which consists of 12 crimes prepared by the International Law Commission, Article 26 stated, "An individual who willfully causes or orders the causing of widespread, long-term and severe damage to the natural environment shall, on conviction thereof, be sentenced."

However, in 1996, when the proposed draft was presented for a vote, it was observed that the initial twelve offenses outlined in the draft were reduced to four offenses that remained in accordance with the provisions of the Rome Statute. Furthermore, Article 26 was rescinded (Greene, 2019, p. 16). In fact, during the voting process, it was overlooked that Article 26 had not been presented for a vote. Consequently, it was noted that the vote was erroneously conducted, leading to the unintentional exclusion of the provision in the subsequent session. Greene remarked that two decades of research and study on the ecocide concept were effectively set aside without a formal vote with the quotation: "Article 26 died not with a bang but a whimper." (Greene, 2019, p. 17).

The four crimes listed in the 1998 Rome Statute were aggression, genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes (Köybaşı, 2022, p. 1060). In the Statute, crimes committed against the environment were listed only within the scope of war crimes, together with other crimes in a paragraph (Treaty of Rome, 1998, article 8, (b)(iv)). In this article, jurisdiction over the crime defined as "causing long-term and serious damage to the natural environment" is assigned to the International Criminal Court. It is important to note that this crime pertains solely to wartime actions rather than encompassing both peacetime and wartime, as is often discussed in the context of ecocide. This limited scope has made it challenging to penalize the crime in question within the framework of the provisions of the Statute (Minkova, 2021, p. 7).

Measures to protect the environment continued with initiatives such as the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio in 1992, Agenda 21, the Rio Declaration and Forest Principles, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification. The World Sustainable Development Summit held in Johannesburg in 2002, the Rio+20 Summit in 2012, the Paris Convention and Agenda 2030 in 2015 were also significant international initiatives in building environmental security.

With the development of environmental awareness, in 2016, the Prosecutor's Office of the International Criminal Court stated that it would give priority to the prosecution of crimes that result in environmental destruction, exploitation of natural resources, or illegal land grab (International Criminal Court [ICC], 2016, p. 14). Although this discussion has attracted considerable global attention (Vidal & Bowcott, 2016), a legal evaluation reveals that the Rome Convention governs the ICC Prosecutor's Office. Consequently, the office cannot investigate any actions not specified in the provisions of this convention solely based on a policy document. Indeed, Mistura also states that the primary purpose of the Policy Document is to "provide the rules and principles that guide the exercise of prosecutorial discretion in the selection and prioritization of cases for investigation and prosecution" (Mistura, 2018, p. 215).

The environmental awareness that has emerged as a result of these initiatives to establish environmental security has caused the number of cases filed against environmental crimes to increase

over time (United Nations Environment Programme [UNEP], 2023, p. 12) and the support for the concept of ecocide in the international system to increase (Kusnetz et al., 2021). The new perspective that developed within the framework of this support also found a place in the 2019 initiative (Root, 2024). Vanuatu and the Maldives requested consideration of adding the 'ecocide' to the Rome Statute at the 18th Meeting of the ICC Assembly of States Parties (Ligaiula, 2024), while simultaneously leading to the process of requesting for an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the obligations of states in respect of climate change in the following years (Vanuatu International Court of Justice Initiative (VICJI), 2023).

The reasons underlying the initiative in question are that Vanuatu, which is an island country, has a high probability of its lands being submerged due to climate change (The World Bank Group, 2021, p. 2) and that these countries are listed among the most vulnerable ones against the climate crisis (Mehta, 2021). In addition, the ecological degradation experienced in these countries due to climate change manifests in the bleaching of corals and worsens the ecological economic situation. This initiative, also supported by Belgium, was followed in June 2021 by an independent panel of legal experts, who proposed an amendment to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and requested that the concept of ecocide be included as a separate crime in Article 5 and its definition added to Article 8. (Gonzalez, 2024, p. 480; Konstantara, 2022, p. 180). The Independent Panel of Experts links this initiative to the fact that the current destruction of ecosystems has catastrophic consequences for our shared environment (Stop Ecocide Foundation [SEF], 2021, p. 2).

As a result, the adventure of the "ecocide" concept, which started in the 1970s, has lasted 50 years and has still not achieved the desired result. In addition, although this concept has been included in the domestic law of the countries mentioned above as a new crime, the ambiguity of the processes to be carried out against this crime in the international system is also evident, since the jurisdiction of the ICC does not yet cover the whole world. Since each country is free to shape its foreign policy by considering its interests, there may be differences regarding memberships in international organizations.

In conclusion, despite extensive efforts over the past five decades to formally define ecocide as the fifth international crime, these endeavors have not yet yielded successful results. Moreover, as current discussions within the realm of international law and IR indicate a lack of a definitive consensus regarding the concept of ecocide, ongoing dialogues aim to establish an explicit agreement on the definition and implications of this term, yet no success has been achieved.

5. CONCLUSION

Each country has different needs, management styles, and perspectives in the global system. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that, regardless of the specific governmental structure or ideological framework in place, humanity—representing the essence of nations—shares a common geographical domain, namely, the world. Within this geographical domain, nations mutually affect one

another, and an action that would deeply harm the ecology within a country's borders could be transboundary and harm other countries. Countries with this awareness have tried to develop an international legal system to prevent the destruction of the environment over time, and the establishment of environmental security has been aimed at various international organizations.

Yet, the Cold War's divisive and polarizing effect and the "conscious indifference" brought about by industrialization have not had a sufficient impact on states' approaches to environmental security. The effects of climate change and the outcome of the Cold War have led to the realization that security must be ensured on many levels, not just in the military dimension. This new approach has significantly influenced the field of IR and has prompted states to reevaluate their perspectives and strategies. In this context, states and other international entities have increasingly recognized the necessity of incorporating environmental security into their discussions and realized that more precautions should be taken for the sake of the global world.

The early steps of this point of view, ecocide, was proposed for incorporation into the international legal system in 1972 by gaining significant prominence in both domestic and international legal frameworks. The inclusion of ecocide as one of the crimes to be adjudicated by the International Criminal Court is currently under discussion. While the deficiency in international law is currently being addressed through case studies at the International Court of Justice, the ongoing classification of ecocide as the fifth crime within the International Criminal Court raises concerns about the likelihood of concluding this process. Moreover, since countries have different perspectives and not every country accepts the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court, a consensus has not yet been reached in the international arena regarding the punishment of ecocide crimes.

Therefore, a significant contribution of the concept of ecocide to IR would be its possibility to facilitate consensus among countries that are otherwise divided by wars and high politics disputes. By framing environmental security as a matter of relatively low politics compared to armed conflict, ecocide may serve as common ground for cooperation. Such collaboration may promote more solid communication and potentially allow peace to transition from low politics to high politics. However, because the International Criminal Court (ICC) lacks universal recognition, designating ecocide as the fifth international crime may not yield effective results. Therefore, rather than incorporating the term into the international legal system, introducing the concept of ecocide into international relations through a newly established organization would encourage adversarial countries to engage in dialogue, and foster cooperation while representing a substantial development for global peace and IR.

In conclusion, the impact of environmental crimes is felt worldwide, and delaying the measures to be taken increases the pressure on the environment -therefore international security- every minute. Moreover, while the UN policies towards the climate change seeks to find a solution as in the Paris Convention, the unwillingness of countries to meet their commitments, along with technical challenges,

hampers effective monitoring of the environmental policies outlined in the accord. In this context, the designation of ecocide as a fifth crime under the Rome Statute would have resulted in heightened scrutiny of environmental crimes by international stakeholders. However, the current situation indicates that, despite the passage of time, the concept of ecocide has not yet been fully embraced or acted upon by the ICC. In this respect, it is considered more effective for the establishment of world peace to organize the processes regarding the concept of ecocide within the framework of a new international organization to be formed by countries that have included it in their domestic legal systems already, rather than being carried out by existing institutions that have not yet reached a consensus due to different perspectives.

Moreover, even if the concept of ecocide is accepted into the international legal system as the fifth crime, the punishability of these crimes becomes questionable due to the fact that some countries do not accept the authorization of the ICC. Therefore, it is more likely to be more effective to establish a new organization that will subject only ecocide crimes against the environment to jurisdiction and to carry out the judicial processes of this new organization rather than waiting for the crimes in question to be brought to justice until each country recognizes the authority of the International Criminal Court.

This study does not require ethics committee approval.

The authors declare that the study was conducted in accordance with research and publication ethics.

The authors states that artificial intelligence tools were employed only for the purpose of language polishing.

The authors declare that there are no financial conflicts of interest involving any institution, organization, or individual associated with this article. Additionally, there are no conflicts of interest among the authors.

The authors declare that they contributed equally to all processes of the research.

REFERENCES

- Armenian Criminal Code. (2003). *Armenian criminal code*, dated April 18, 2003
- Appannagari, R. R. (2017). Environmental pollution causes and consequences: A study, *North Asian International Research Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 3(8), 151-161.
- Belarus criminal code. (1997). *Belarus criminal code*, No. 275-Z, dated July 9, 1997.
- Belgium criminal code. (2024). *Belgium criminal code*, No. 55K3518, dated February 29, 2024.
- Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile. (2024). *LEY 21595*, Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile, <https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=1195119>
- Björk, T. (1996). *The emergence of popular participation in world politics: United Nations conference on human environment 1972*, Department of Political Science, University of Stockholm.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Brihi, S., & Dufourq, P. (2022, June 27). *Environmental criminal law in the French legal framework*, International Bar Association, <https://www.ibanet.org/environmental-criminal-law-in-the-French-legal-framework>

- Chini, M. (2024, February 23). Belgium becomes first in EU to recognize ecocide as international crime. *The Brussels Times*, <https://www.brusselstimes.com/937229/belgium-becomes-first-in-eu-to-recognise-ecocide-as-international-crime-tbtb>
- Código Orgánico Integral Penal Ecuador. (2014). *Ministerio de Justicia*.
- Çakır, M. (2022). Güvenliğin dönüşümü ve ulusal güvenlik. *Diplomasi ve Strateji Dergisi*, 3(2), 260-278.
- Çinar Yıldırım, H., & Çomak, H. (2023). Afrika'da iklimsel göçler ve sonuçları. In Hasret Çomak, Burak Şakir Şeker, Mehmet Şahin (Ed.), *Afrika jeopolitiği* (pp. 355-367). Nobel Kitabevi
- Çoban, A. (2024). Ekosoykırım: Ekokırımıyla soykırımın içiçe geçmesi. In H. Yurdanur (Ed.), *Sosyo-ekolojik bir toplum için ne yapmalı?* (pp. 239-274). İmge Yayınevi.
- Daban, C. (2024). Uluslararası güvenliği sağlama açısından bir yol haritası: Sambi-Mandara Güvenlik Eylem Planı örneği. *Hitit Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17(1), 114-133. <https://doi.org/10.17218/hititsbd.1434743>
- Dunlap, A., & Brock, A. (2022). Enforcing ecological destruction. In A. Dunlap, A. Brock (Eds.), *Enforcing ecocide* (pp: 1-37). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dursun Özdemir, G. (2023). Ekokırım suçu ve bazı değerlendirmeler. *Terazi Hukuk Dergisi*, 18(203), 74-83.
- European Commission (2024). *Environmental crime directive*. European Commission. https://environment.ec.europa.eu/law-and-governance/environmental-compliance-assurance/environmental-crime-directive_en
- European Law Institute. (2023). *European Law Institute report on ecocide*. European Law Institute.
- Erdem, B., & Orhan, U. (2021). Ecocide. In A. R. Zelle, G. Wilson, R. Adam & H. F. Greene (Eds.), *Emerging ecocentric law: A guide for practitioners* (pp. 333-355). Wolters Kluwer.
- Eryılmaz, Ç. (2021). Yeşil kriminoloji: Çevre suçlarından zarar gören insanların, diğer canlıların ve ekosistemlerin sosyolojisi. *Sosyologica*, (22), 117-131.
- Falk, R. A. (1973). Environmental warfare and ecocide — Facts, appraisal, and proposals. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 4(1), 80-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096701067300400105>
- French criminal code (FCC) (2021). *French criminal code*, dated August 22, 2021 and Law No. 2021-1104.
- Galston, A. W. (1972). Science and social responsibility: A case history. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 196(4), 223-235.
- Galston, A. W., & Savage, J.S. (1973). *Daily life in People's China*. Crowell Publishing.
- Gauger, A., Pouye Rabatel-Fernel, M., Kulbicki, L., Short, D., & Higgins, P. (2012) *Ecocide is the missing 5th crime against peace*. School of Advanced Study, University of London.
- Georgian Criminal Code. (1999). *Georgian criminal code*, No. 2287, dated July 22, 1999.
- Grechenkova, Y., Bondarenko, L. V., & Valuisikov N. V. (2015). Legal analysis of ecocide in the Russian criminal law. *Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia*, 12(1), 831-836.
- Greene, A. (2019). The campaign to make ecocide an international crime: Quixotic quest or moral imperative? *Fordham Environmental Law Review*, 30(3), 1-49.
- Gonzalez, C. (2024). Racial capitalism, climate change, and ecocide. *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, 41(4), 479-519. <https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl/0000-0000-0000-1137>
- Higgins, P., Short, D., & South, N. (2013). Protecting the planet: A proposal for a law of ecocide. *Crime Law Soc Change*, (59), 251-266. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-013-9413-6>
- Jer, S. B. (2019). Ecocide or environmental self-destruction? *Environmental Ethics*, 41, 237-247. <https://doi.org/10.5840/enviroethics201941324>
- Kaminski, İ. (2023, August 26). *Growing number of countries consider making ecocide a crime*. The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/aug/26/growing-number-of-countries-consider-making-ecocide-crime>
- Karabıçak, M., & Özdemir, M. (2015). Sürdürülebilir kalkınmanın kavramsal temelleri. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Vizyoner Dergisi*, (6)13, 44-49.

- Kaypak, Ş., & Yılmaz, V. (2019). Security understanding of a new dimension in the globalization process and environmental effects. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(3), 855-868.
- Kazakhstan Criminal Code. (1997). *Kazakhstan criminal code*, No. 167, dated July 16, 1997.
- Kyrgyzstan Criminal Code. (1997). *Kyrgyzstan criminal code*, No. 68, dated October 1, 1997.
- Konstantara, A. (2022). Conceptualising ecocide as an international crime. *De Jure Journal*, 15(2), 180-186.
- Köybaşı, S. (2022). Ekokırım suçunun tanınması. *Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(210), 1047-1085.
- Kusnetz, N., Surma, K., & Talmazan, Y. (2021, April 7). *As the climate crisis grows, a movement gathers to make ecocide an international crime against the environment*. Inside Climate News, <https://insideclimatenews.org/news/07042021/climate-crisis-ecocide-vanuatu-the-fifth-crime/>
- Liedo, R. (2024, May 21). *Latin America shows why ecocide must be an international crime*. Open Democracy, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/ecocide-must-be-international-crime-latin-america-cop3-escazu-agreement-environmental-rights-defenders/>
- Ligaiula, P. (2024, July 31). Vanuatu pushes ICC to recognize ecocide as international crime. *Pasifika Environews*, <https://pasifika.news/2024/07/vanuatu-pushes-icc-to-recognise-ecocide-as-international-crime/>
- Moldova Criminal Code. (2002). *Moldova criminal code*, No. 985-XV, dated April 18, 2002.
- Mehra N., Gholamreza G., & Babakhani E. (2019). Ecocide: A crime against sustainable development. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, (15), 1-17.
- Mehta, J. (2021). *Ecocide as a fifth crime at the International Criminal Court*. Pathway to the 2022 Declaration, https://pathway2022declaration.org/?post_type=article&p=7807
- Metcheva R., Ostoich P., & Beltcheva M (2022) Ecocide – global consequences (pesticides, radionuclides, petroleum products). In Chankova S, Peneva V, Metcheva R, Beltcheva M, Vassilev K, Radeva G, Danova K (Eds), *Current trends of ecology* (pp. 7-18). BioRisk 17. <https://doi.org/10.3897/biorisk.17.77438>
- Minkova, L. G. (2021). The fifth international crime: Reflections on the definition of “ecocide”. *Journal of Genocide Research*, (August 2021), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2021.1964688>
- Mistura A. (2018). Is there space for environmental crimes under international criminal law? The impact of the office of the prosecutor policy paper on case selection and prioritization on the current legal framework. *Columbia Journal of Environmental Law*, 43(1), 181-226. <https://doi.org/10.7916/cjel.v43i1.3740>
- Morawetz, D. (1979). Walking on two legs? Reflections on a China visit. *World Development*, 7(8), 877-891.
- Neto, D. A. B. (2023). *The search for the codification of ecocide in the internal and external legal systems: Is there a unity of understanding of the crime?* Promise Institute Symposium 2023: 'An International Crime of Ecocide: New Perspectives', <https://ecocidelaw.com/symposium/>
- Nızıgıymana, E. (2021). *Sahra altı Afrika ülkelerinde doğrudan yabancı yatırım, çevre kirliliği ve nüfusun refahı: Yeni bir ekonomik refah modeline gerek var mıdır?* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi.
- NY Times (1970, February 26). And a plea to ban ecocide. *NY Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/1970/02/26/archives/and-a-plea-to-ban-ecocide.html?searchResultPosition=1>
- Öztürk, H. B. (2024). Çevresel güvenliğin ekokırım yorumu üzerinden ormansızlaşma olgusu: Kolombiya’daki silahlı çatışmalar örneği. *Güvenlik Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 26(1), 52-75. <https://doi.org/10.54627/gcd.1444094>
- Palme, O. (1972). *Statement by Prime Minister Olof Palme in the plenary meeting, June 6, 1972*. Swedish delegation to the UN Conference on the human environment. Olof Palme's archive https://olofpalme.arbark.se/wp-content/dokument/720606a_fn_miljo.pdf
- Pereira, R. (2024). A critical evaluation of the new EU environmental crime directive 2024/1203. *EUCRIM*, (2), 158-163. <https://doi.org/10.30709/eucrim-2024-012>
- Russian Federation Criminal Code.(1996). *Russian Federation criminal code*, No. 63-FZ, dated June 13, 1996.

- Rodeiro, M. (2020). *Environmental transformative justice: Responding to ecocide*. [unpublished doctoral dissertation]. City University of New York.
- Root, R. (2024, October 14). *Climate crisis: Push for ecocide to be added to Rome Statute*. International Bar Association, <https://www.ibanet.org/ecocide-rome-statute>
- Sak, R., Şahin Sak, İ. T., Öneren Şendil, Ç., & Nas, E. (2021). Bir araştırma yöntemi olarak doküman analizi. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Eğitim Dergisi*, 4(1), 227-250. <http://doi.org/10.33400/kuje.843306>
- Sarliève, M. (2020). Ecocide: Past, Present, and Future Challenges. In Leal Filho, W., Azul, A., Brandli, L., Lange Salvia, A. & Wall, T. (Eds.), *Life on land, encyclopedia of the UN sustainable development goals* (pp. 1-11). Springer, Cham.
- Savard, C. (2024, March 5). Belgium recognises the crime of ecocide: A (lukewarm) European first. *Oxford Human Rights Hub*, <https://ohrh.law.ox.ac.uk/belgium-recognises-the-crime-of-ecocide-a-lukewarm-european-first/>
- Supreme Council of Ukraine (2024). *The criminal code of Ukraine*. Supreme Council of Ukraine, <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/en/2341-14#Text>
- Stop Ecocide (2023). Chile: New laws introduce elements of ecocide definition. *Stop Ecocide*, <https://www.stopecocide.earth/breaking-news-2023/chile-new-laws-introduce-elements-of-ecocide-definition>
- Stop Ecocide Foundation. (2023). *Independent Expert Panel for the legal definition of ecocide- commentary and core text*. Stop Ecocide Foundation.
- Şafak, E., & Tabur, Y. (2023). Küresel iklim krizi ile mücadelede uluslararası hukukun rolü ve ekokırım suçu. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(1), 83-114. <https://doi.org/10.54704/akdhfd.1185455>
- Taşlıcalı Koç, T. (2023). Afrika'da çevre güvenliği. In Çomak H., Şeker, B. Ş. & Şahin M. (Eds.), *Afrika Jeopolitiği* (pp. 343-355). Nobel Yayınları.
- Taşlıcalı Koç, T. (2024). Latin Amerika'da çevre güvenliği. In Çomak H., Şeker, B. Ş. & Bozkuş, Ç.A. (Eds.), *Latin Amerika Jeopolitiği* (209-223), Nobel Yayınları.
- Tajikistan Criminal Code.(1998). *Tajikistan criminal code*.
- The World Bank Group (2021). *Climate risk country profile: Vanuatu*.
- Treaty of Rome (1998). Volume 2187, 1-38544. <https://treaties.un.org/doc/treaties/1998/07/19980717%2006-33%20pm/english.pdf>
- Ullman, R. (1983). Redefining security. *International Security*, 8(1), 129-53.
- Ukraine Criminal Code. (2001). *Ukraine criminal code*, No. 2341-III, dated April 5, 2001.
- Uzbekistan Criminal Code. (1994). *Uzbekistan criminal code*, No. 2012-XII, dated September 22, 1994.
- International Criminal Court. (2016). *Policy paper on case selection and prioritization*. https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/itemsDocuments/20160915_OTP-Policy_Case-Selection_Eng.pdf
- United Nations(1978). *U.N. Human Rights Comm., sub-comm. on prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities, study of the question of the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide*, U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/416 (July 4, 1978). <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/663583?ln=en&v=pdf#record-files-collapse-header>
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2023). *Global climate litigation report: 2023 status review*. United Nations Environment Programme. Nairobi.
- Vietnam Criminal Code (VCC) (1999). *Vietnam criminal code*, No. 15/1999/QH10, dated December 21, 1999. https://natlex.ilo.org/dyn/natlex2/r/natlex/fe/details?p3_isn=56207
- Vergara, C. (2023). Democracy to avert ecocide. In Holm, M. and Deese, R. S. (Eds.), *How democracy Survives, Global Challenges in the Anthropocene* (pp. 81-97). Routledge.
- Vanuatu International Court of Justice Initiative (VICJI) (2023). *ICJ Resolution*. Vanuatu International Court of Justice Initiative, <https://www.vanuatuicj.com/resolution>
- Vidal, J., & Bowcott, O. (2016, September 15). ICC widens remit to include environmental destruction cases. *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/global/2016/sep/15/hague-court-widens-remit-to-include->

environmental-destruction-
cases#:~:text=Environmental%20destruction%20and%20landgrabs%20could,decision%20to%20expand
%20its%20remit

Vilcu, N., & Ursu, L. (2009). *The criminal code of the Republic of Moldova*.

YaleNews (2008). *In memoriam: Arthur Galston, plant biologist, fought use of Agent Orange*. Yale News,
<https://news.yale.edu/2008/07/18/memorial-arthur-galston-plant-biologist-fought-use-agent-orange>

Whitaker, B. (1985). *Special Rapporteur on the Economic and Social Council, Revised and Updated Rep. on the
question of the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide*, ECOSOC, 33, U.N. Doc.
E/CN.4/Sub.2/1985/6 (July 2, 1985), <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/108352?v=pdf>