Is (Successful) Securitization Possible for Climate Change?
İklim Değişikliği İçin (Başarılı) Güvenlikleştirme Mümkün mü?

Osman Nuri BEYHAN* - Mehmet Seyfettin EROL**

Abstract

Especially with the end of the Cold War, the scope of security studies, which has an important place in the field of international relations, has started to "broaden" and "deepen" beyond the conventional boundaries and research areas of classical security theory such as state security, military security, and conflict prevention. In this context, the Copenhagen School is one of the important approaches that offers a different perspective to security studies with its "sectoral security approach", "regional security complex" and "securitization" theories. The Copenhagen School's "securitization" theory has provided an appropriate framework for addressing the issues of "environment" and "climate change", which have been on the agenda of security studies since the last quarter of the 20th century, from a security perspective. However, the negative perspective of the Copenhagen School theorists on the securitization of climate change due to the extraordinary and even military measures that may be taken if the issue of climate change is securitized has been met with caution and criticism by many theorists who have addressed the issue. In light of these criticisms and the developments in the field of climate change in the last quarter century, this study focuses on the question of whether it is possible to approach the securitization of climate change from a different perspective.

Key Words: *Climate change, Copenhagen School, Securitization, Speech-act, De-securitization.*

Öz

Özellikle Soğuk Savaş Döneminin sona ermesiyle birlikte, uluslararası ilişkiler alanında önemli bir yer tutan güvenlik çalışmalarının kapsamı, klasik güvenlik teorisinin devletin güvenliği, askeri güvenlik, çatışmaların önlenmesi gibi alışılagelmiş sınırlarını ve araştırma alanlarını aşarak, çok daha farklı konuları içerisine alacak şekilde "genişlemeye" ve "derinleşmeye" başlamıştır. Bu kapsamda, "sektörel güvenlik yaklaşımı", "bölgesel güvenlik kompleksi" ve "güvenlikleş-tirme" teorileri ile güvenlik çalışmalarına farklı bir bakış açısı sunan önemli yaklaşımlardan birisi de Kopenhag Okulu'dur. Kopenhag Okulu'nun "güvenlikleştirme" teorisi, özellikle 20. Yüzyılın son çeyreğinden itibaren güvenlik çalışmalarının dikkat çeken gündem maddelerin-den birisi olan "çevre" ve "iklim değişikliği" konularının güvenlik açısından ele alınması için uygun bir çerçeve sunmuştur. Bununla birlikte, Kopenhag Okulu teorisyenlerinin, iklim değiş-ikliği konusunun güvenlikleştirilmesi halinde alınması muhtemel olağanüstü ve hatta askeri önlemlere kadar varabilecek tedbirler nedeniyle bu güvenlikleştirilmeye olumsuz yaklaşan bakış açısı, konuyu ele alan birçok teorisyen tarafından da ihtiyatla karşılanmış ve eleştirilere maruz kalmıştır. İşte bu çalışma,

Makale Geliş Tarihi: 21.11.2024. Makale Kabul Tarihi: 11.04.2025.

Araştırma Makalesi / Künye: BEYHAN, Osman Nuri, EROL, Mehmet Seyfettin. "Is (Successful) Securitization Possible for Climate Change?". Gazi Akademik Bakış Dergisi (GABD), 18/36, (Haziran 2025): s. 81-105. DOI:10.19060/gav.1717398

* PhD Student, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Institute of Graduate Studies, E-mail: onuribeyhan@gmail.com ORCID: 0009-0002-8562-9280.

** Prof. Dr., Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Department of International Relations, E-mail: mehmet.erol@hbv.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0001-9175-3742.

söz konusu eleştirilerin ve son çeyrek asırda iklim değişikliği alanında meydana gelen gelişmelerin ışığında, iklim değişikliğinin güvenlikleştirilmesi olgu-suna farklı bir bakış açısıyla yaklaşmanın mümkün olup olamayacağı sorusunun yanıtına odaklanmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *İklim değişikliği, Kopenhag Okulu, Güvenlikleştirme, Söz-e-dim, Güvenlik dışılaştırma.*

Introduction

The entry of environmental problems into the international security agenda coincides with the post-Cold War period. While military threats have relatively decreased compared to the Cold War period, the scope of "security studies", which constitutes an important part of the international relations literature, has undergone major changes by "broadening" and "deepening" to include threats in a wide range of non-military sectors. The intensity and breadth of these changes have reached such a point that some security scholars now characterize them as reflections of a "new security environment" based on new rules, actors and threats.

In the post-Cold War era, one of the main areas of interest in the field of security studies has been environmental security and its subfield of "climate security". Environmental problems, one of the topics at the heart of the debates since the last quarter of the twentieth century, was considered as low politics in the traditional security understanding, but with the changing security understanding, it has managed to become one of the high politics issues.

Climate security deals with the identification of threat areas such as the increase in the number of disasters such as droughts, floods, hurricanes, etc., the decrease in food security, the emergence of water shortages and the increase in competition and tensions related to water, and the flooding of national lands due to sea level rise, which are the consequences of climate change caused by natural or human-made (anthropogenic) causes and the efforts to securitize these areas by producing policies for the specified problem areas. The literature examines climate security in terms of national, human (individual), international and ecological security dimensions.

In this paper, firstly, description of the concept of climate change will be discussed together with its causes and consequences; then, from the perspective of the "Copenhagen School" security approach, which constitutes one of the most influential theoretical perspectives of the new security environment, the issue of "securitization" of the concept of climate change will be discussed and examined in the context of the debates on the subject, especially in international and regional organizations, and the policies and strategies produced by these organizations.

In the last part of the paper, different views and approaches will be discussed regarding the attempts to "securitize climate change" on the basis

of Copenhagen School's perspective. It is important to evaluate the term "securitization" of the climate change based on the Copanhagen School's perspective due to the fact that securitization is one of the three main pillars of the said School's security perspective. Furthermore, securitization of climate change is not considered positively by the theorists of the Copenhagen School due to the fact that "securitization" involves the possibility of urgent and extraordinary decisions and measures that can lead to military interventions in extraordinary and emergency situations by means of procedures that cannot be reconciled with democratic institutions and rules. In that sense, criticisms from both the Copenhagen School itself and the scholars with different perspectives such as the Paris School will be discussed, and in the context of those views, it will be tried to develop a different perspective on how the concepts of "success" and "failure" should be interpreted in the securitization of climate change.

What is Climate Change?

By definition, "climate" is known as the average of weather phenomena such as wind, temperature, air pressure, precipitation and humidity observed in a place for a certain period of time. Climate reflects the average of weather events occurring in a certain part or all of the earth in a certain period of time and may directly or indirectly affect the living conditions of all living things on the earth.[1]

Climate change, which is becoming increasingly important at the international level, is defined by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) [2] as follows: "Changes in climate conditions that can be characterized (e.g., using statistical tests) by changes in climate conditions, averages and/or variables, and that persist over a long period of time (typically decades or longer)."[3]

Climate change can be resulted from natural internal processes or external forcings, or from permanent anthropogenic changes in the composition of the atmosphere or land use.[4] According to this definition, a situation in which statistically climate/weather changes or continuity differ from the

1 Ayten Cesur, "Küresel Isınma ve İklim Değişiklikleri", *MTA Doğal Kaynaklar ve Ekonomi Bülteni*, No: 19, 2015, p.17.

2 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is the United Nations' body for assessing the science related to climate change. IPPCC has been created in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The objective of the IPCC is to provide governments at all levels with scientific information that they can use to develop climate policies. IPCC reports are also a key input into international climate change negotiations. For further information, please visit: https://www.ipcc.ch/about/ .

3 United Nations International Panel for Climate Change (UN-IPCC), *Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report*, Geneva, Switzerland, 2008, p.30.

4 C. B. Field, et al. (Ed.), "Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation-Glossary of Terms-", *A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)*, Cambridge- New York, Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 557.

averages within a certain period of time, is called global climate change. In other words, when we talk about climate change here, we mean a deviation from previously determined climate patterns.

On the other hand, this definition is different from the one used in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), where it is defined as "Climate change that is directly or indirectly attributable to human activities, that changes the composition of the global atmosphere, and that occurs in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods." The UNFCCC therefore distinguishes between climate change attributable to human activities that change the composition of the atmosphere and climate variability attributable to natural causes.

Climate change, which started as a natural process and accelerated with the human factor, is not a uniform situation, but there are various effects of greenhouse gas effect and external forcing. The greenhouse effect is the main driver of climate change as a natural process. It is followed by factors such as the industrial revolution, fossil fuel use, human activities and industrial processes. Intensive use of mechanization and fuel use in industry are other causes of climate change. The increase in greenhouse gases increases the greenhouse effect and global warming occurs. Internal and external causes trigger climate change and climatic feedback. Changes in ocean and air circulation can be given as examples of internal causes.[5]

Causes of Climate Change

The Earth's climate has been changing since its formation 4.5 billion years ago. Until recently, these changes were caused by natural factors. Natural influences on climate include volcanic eruptions, changes in the Earth's orbit and shifts in the Earth's crust (known as plate tectonics). But, since the Industrial Revolution in the 1800s, the global temperature has been rising much faster. For many different reasons, from burning more fossil fuels to changing the way we use the land, human activities have rapidly become the leading cause of changes in our climate.

Today, climate change, which is scientifically proven to be caused by many different factors, is the result of a complex interaction. The IPCC Report cites natural internal procedures, external forcing or permanent changes in atmospheric and/or land use patterns caused by humans as possible causes of global climate change.[6]

There is sufficient scientific evidence that climate change is caused by the transformation of the world energy balance due to various forcing factors (natural and anthropogenic). In the climate science literature, such forcing factors that cause the transformation of the energy balance are classified into

5 Aykut Başoğlu, "Küresel İklim Değişikliğinin Ekonomik Etkileri Üzerine Model Denemesi ve Ekonometrik Bir Analiz", Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Trabzon-2014, p.15, (Unpublished PhD Thesis).

6 C. B. Field vd. (Ed.), *op.cit.* pp. 557-558.

different groups. According to the most common approach, it is scientifically accepted that the main forcing factors in the change of the energy balance are the fluctuations caused by the movement of the earth in its orbit around the sun and the solar cycle. Based on this fact, the most widely used classification in the literature is the one that makes a binary distinction between natural forcing factors (natural causes), which include fluctuations in the global climate system and volcanic activities as the main causes of climate change, and "anthropogenic causes", which include human activities that cause changes in the amount and ratio of greenhouse gases, which are very important for the formation of the earth's atmosphere, and is called "binary classification".[7]

Another classification of the causes of climate change is the classification made by categorizing the factors that cause changes in the climate energy balance as changes in greenhouse gases, changes in the amount of energy reaching the earth, changes in the amount of energy reflected from the atmosphere and the earth.[8]

As a result, the causes of climate change are classified differently as internal and external factors, natural and human-induced (anthropogenic) in terms of their occurrence, and short and long-term in terms of their duration of impact. However, since the classification that divides the causes of climate change into natural causes and human-induced causes is the most widely used classification in the literature, this classification will be preferred in this article.

Natural Causes of Climate Change

The Earth's climate system is influenced by natural factors that affect the amount of solar energy that reaches or leaves the Earth. The main forcing factors that cause climate change are shifts in the orbits of the Earth and the Sun that cause fluctuations in the amount of radiation, changes in the Earth's reflective capacity, changes in the sun and volcanic activity.[9]

The changes in the sun every 11 years and the change in the angle at which the rays reach the earth affect the solar energy intensity to a small extent. Changes in the Earth's tilt and axis similarly cause changes in the amount of solar energy reaching the Earth's surface. Volcanic activity is another forcing factor reported to cause climate change, among others. In particular, significant amounts of sulfur dioxide and CO_2, as well as other volcanic gases, other aerosols and ashes from volcanic activities cause changes in the

7 European Commission; *Climate Action, Causes of Climate Change,* 2015. Web Site: https://climate.ec.europa.eu/climate-change/causes-climate-change_en (Accessed on: 11.10.2024).

8 Korkmaz Yıldırım, *Local Climate Change Governance: The Case of Turkish Metropolitan Municipalities,* Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara, 2017, p. 21, (Unpublished PhD Thesis).

9 U.S. Enviromental Protection Agency-USEPA, *Causes of Climate Change,* 2024, Web Site: https://www.epa.gov/climatechange-science/causes-climate-change (Accessed on: 20. 09. 2024).

chemical structure of the stratosphere. Sulfur dioxide (SO_2) injected into the atmosphere as a result of these natural phenomena can cause significant cooling in global climate change, while volcanic CO_2 gas can have a significant impact on increasing air temperature. Volcanoes have played a prominent role in climate, and volcanic eruptions have released large amounts of carbon dioxide in the distant past. However, volcanic particles from a single eruption do not cause long-term climate change because they remain in the atmosphere for a much shorter period of time compared to greenhouse gases. In addition, human activities emit more than 100 times more carbon dioxide each year than volcanoes. [10]

Anthropogenic Causes of Climate Change

The constancy of heat on the Earth's surface depends on certain physical procedures. In this context, the balance of the sun's rays reaching the Earth and the rays reflected back from the Earth determines the temperature on Earth.[11] Some gases in the Earth's atmosphere trap heat and prevent it from escaping into space. We call these gases 'greenhouse gases'. These gases act as a blanket that warms the Earth, known as the 'greenhouse effect'. Greenhouse gases are both man-made and natural. Gases such as carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide occur naturally in the atmosphere. Others, such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), are produced only by human activity.

The greenhouse effect is actually critical to our survival. In fact, without greenhouse gases, the Earth would be about 30 degrees celcius colder than it is today. So it is safe to say that without greenhouse gases and their heating effect, human survival would not be possible.[12] But since the Industrial Revolution, more and more greenhouse gases have been added to the air, trapping even more heat on the Earth. Instead of keeping the Earth warm and habitable at a constant temperature, the greenhouse effect is warming the planet much faster. This is scientifically called the 'enhanced greenhouse effect' and it is now generally accepted by scientists that this is one of the main causes of climate change.[13] On the other hand, the melting of glaciers reduces the white areas, which are largely covered by snow and ice. Since white areas strongly reflect the sun's rays back into space, they play an important role in keeping the earth's temperature from rising too much. But with the disappearance of the white areas, absorption is taking place, rather

10 D.W. Fahey, *et al.*, "Physical Drivers of Climate Change" In: *Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment,* Volume I [D.J., Wuebbles, *et al.*(eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington D.C., USA, 2017, pp. 74-75.

11 Jayaraman Srinivasan, "Climate Change, Greenhouse Gases and Aerosols", *Resonance,* XIII/12, 2008, pp. 1146-1155.

12 Matthew J. Hoffmann,"Global Climate Change", In: *The Handbook of Global Climate and Environment Policy,* (Ed. R. Falkner), John Wiley & Sons, 2013, p. 4.

13 Veerabhadran Ramanathan - Yan Feng, "Air Pollution, Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change: Global and Regional Perspectives", *Atmospheric Environment*, XLIII/1, January 2009, pp. 38-39.

than reflection, and this means that the world is getting hotter.[14]

Although CO_2 is considered to be one of the main causes of global climate change, the increase in the rate of methane gas (CH_4) in the atmosphere in recent years has also had a major impact on the increase in the temperature of the world. Methane (CH_4) is the second most important greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is the most important greenhouse gas because it has the highest volume, but methane is about 20 times more powerful than the same amount of CO_2.[15] In terms of its impact on climate warming, methane gas is twenty-five times more effective than carbon dioxide gas over a period of one hundred years.[16] On the other hand, fossil fuel use, rice cultivation, biomass burning and cattle farming (bacteria in the digestive tracts of ruminants) are the most methane-generating anthropogenic activities.

One of the important reasons for the emergence of climate change is the increasing amount of carbon dioxide gas (CO_2) in the atmosphere. There is a certain amount of carbon dioxide in the air under normal conditions, but this rate is gradually increasing as a result of human activities. For example, the fossil fuel used in vehicles and many power plants that produce energy using fossil fuels produce large amounts of carbon dioxide.[17] An important feature of CO_2 is that it stays in the atmosphere for a long time. It is possible for a molecule of carbon dioxide to remain in the atmosphere for a hundred years or even longer. Moreover, 20% of the carbon dioxide produced by human activities remains in the atmosphere for up to a thousand years.[18] If humans are constantly engaged in activities that waste carbon dioxide and this gas remains in the atmosphere for a long time, the whole world will be evenly covered with carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide, which covers the whole earth evenly, inhibits the reflection of long-wave rays into space, and thus the earth's temperature gradually increases as a result of the inability to establish a balance between absorption and reflection of solar radiation entering the atmosphere. Considering the ability of carbon dioxide gas to remain in the atmosphere, even if humans completely give up carbon dioxide waste, the warming of the atmosphere is a process that will continue for centuries. Although significant progress has been made worldwide in the production and use of electric vehicles in recent years, most cars, trucks, ships and airp-

14 Zehra Aşkınsena İlkılıç, *Küresel İklim Değişikliğiyle Mücadeleye İlişkin Uluslararası Belgelerde Güvenlik Kavramının İncelenmesi*, İstanbul University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, 2022, p. 25. (Unpublished PhD Thesis).

15 Oleg A. Anisimov, "Potential Feedback of Thawing Permafrost to the Global Climate System Through Methane Emission", *Environmental Research Letters*, II/4, 2007, 045016, p. 2.

16 Dave S. Reay, *et al.*, "Methane Sources and the Global Methane Budget", *Methane and Climate Change* (Ed. Dave S. Reay, *et al.*) London, Washington, Earthscan, 2010, p. 2.

17 Ragupathy Kannan - Douglas. A. James, "Effects of Climate Change on Global Biodiversity: A Review of Key Literature", *Tropical Ecology*, L/1, 2009, p. 31.

18 Susan Solomon, *et al.*; "Persistence of Climate Changes Due to a Range of Greenhouse Gases", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, CVII/43, 2010, pp. 18354,18356.

lanes still run on fossil fuels. This makes transportation a major contributor to greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide emissions.

Tropical forests are central to maintaining the balance of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. By absorbing carbon dioxide gas and storing it in their branches and roots, tropical forests have the capacity to store twice the amount of CO_2 in the atmosphere, so that about 3 billion tons of the carbon dioxide gas produced by humans in large quantities is absorbed by forests annually. However, due to human activities such as cutting down forests, especially to create farms or pastures or for other industrial purposes, forest fires, as well as the unexpected increase in forest-damaging insects, extreme droughts, and many other reasons that damage forests and reduce forest cover, tropical forests are no longer able to fulfill their former functions, resulting in a disruption of the circulation of carbon dioxide gas in the atmosphere.[19] In such a case, the greenhouse effect in the world would increase even more.

Effects of Climate Change

Climate change has increased the average global temperature and led to more frequent temperature extremes such as heat waves. Between 1901 and 2020, the world's average temperature rose by about 1°C.[20] Higher temperatures can lead to increased mortality, reduced productivity and damage to infrastructure. The most vulnerable members of the population, such as the elderly and infants, stand out as the most severely affected social groups. On the other hand, high temperatures are also expected to cause a shift in the geographical distribution of climate zones. These changes are altering the distribution and abundance of many plant and animal species that are already under pressure from habitat loss and pollution, and even threatening the very existence of some species on Earth.

Temperature increases are also likely to affect phenology, the behavior and life cycles of animal and plant species. This could lead to increased numbers of pests and invasive species and more frequent occurrence of some human diseases. Meanwhile, rising temperatures could reduce the productivity and sustainability of agriculture and livestock, or the capacity of ecosystems to provide important services and goods (such as clean water or cool, clean air).

Drought, as defined as "a natural phenomenon that occurs when precipitation is significantly below normal recorded levels, causing severe hydrological imbalances that adversely affect land resource production systems..." by the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD),[21]

19 Joseph G. Canadell - Michael R. Raupach; "Managing Forests for Climate Change Mitigation", *Science*, CCCXX/5882, 2008, p. 1456.

20 National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration, US Department of Commerce; *Climate Change Impacts,* Web Site: https://www.noaa.gov/education/resource-collections/climate/climate-change-impacts (Accessed on: 14.10.2024).

21 United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Chapter 1, Article 1(c),

refers to an unusual and temporary shortfall in water availability caused by a lack of precipitation and increased evaporation due to high temperatures. From this perspective, climate change is one of the most dominant causes of droughts. Due to a changing climate, many regions of the world are already facing more frequent, severe and prolonged droughts than in previous decades. Droughts have knock-on effects, for example on transportation infrastructure, agriculture, forestry, water and biodiversity. It reduces water levels in rivers and groundwater, stunts the growth of trees and crops, increases pest attacks and fuels forest fires.[22] If the global average temperature increases by 3°C, droughts around the world are projected to become twice as frequent and absolute annual losses from drought in Europe alone, for example, could rise to €40 billion per year, with the most severe impacts in the Mediterranean and Atlantic regions. More frequent and severe droughts will increase the length and severity of the wildfire season, particularly in the Mediterranean region. Climate change is also expanding the areas at risk of wildfires. Areas that are not currently fire-prone may become areas at risk of large-scale and long-lasting fires in the future.

It is now accepted by the scientists that global warming has a direct or indirect effect on many natural phenomena on Earth. For example, with the general increase in air temperatures, winter seasons have shortened and cold days have decreased. Spring starts earlier than in previous periods; similarly, summer months are hotter and longer in duration. Biological systems on Earth are also significantly affected by these changes in the seasons. Scientific research has shown that since the end of the twentieth century, the tropical zone has been gradually expanding northward, in other words, some areas that used to be subtropical now have the characteristics of the tropics. In terms of security, this situation negatively affects many ecosystems, water resources and agricultural activities.[23] In addition, the fact that the expansion of the tropical zone, which was originally projected to be reached by the end of the 21st century, has moved northward much faster than expected so far, is cited by experts as one of the serious problems posed by global climate change.

As a result of anthropogenic, i.e. human-induced, high levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, the seas trap this gas, resulting in acidification of the oceans and seas. For example, compared to the pre-industrialization period, the PH-value in the oceans has decreased by 0.1% since the beginning of the industrial revolution and the acidity of the seas has increased by 26%. This has adversely affected the living conditions of living organisms in the

pp.4. Web Site: https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/2022-02/UNCCD_Convention_ENG_0_0.pdf (Accessed on: 16.10.2024).

22 United Nations International Panel for Climate Change (UN-IPCC), *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report*, IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 2023, p. 46.

23 Dian J. Seidel et *al.*; "Widening of the Tropical Belt in a Changing Climate", *Nature Geoscience*, I/12008, p. 23.

oceans.[24]

Scientific studies show that glaciers and snow-covered areas in both hemispheres are gradually decreasing as a result of global warming. The proportion of sea ice in the Arctic decreased by 3.5% to 4.1% in each decade between 1970 and 2012.[25]

Ecosystems around the world are being damaged in many ways by global climate change, shaping the habitats and conditions of plants, animals and humans in different directions and dimensions. While humans can adapt to this situation more easily than other beings, some animals and plants, such as some amphibian species, are becoming extinct.[26]

Since the effects of global climate change on human beings depend on geographical, social and economic factors, these effects can be very different in different parts of the world in terms of both depth and breadth. Therefore, it can be said that impacts of the new situation on people varies according to their environment. However, in spite of all the differences observed on a global scale, one of the common effects observed all over the world is that it has been more and more difficult to find sufficient food and nutrition as a result of the negative impact of increasing natural disasters and global climate change on crop productivity in agriculture (especially corn and wheat). [27]

Another important consequence of global climate change is the increase in the water level in the world and the flooding of some regions. The sea water level in the world rose by 0.19 m. between 1901 and 2010. This increase is directly related to the increase in the global temperature. The melting of glaciers in large glacier areas since the 1970s increases the water level.[28] The rise in the water level and the consequent submergence of some parts of coastal states, especially small island-type states, may cause serious territoriality problems.[29]

Securitization Theory and Securitization of Climate Change

The concept of securitization has entered into terminology of international relations for the first time in the mid-1990s after being framed by Waever, one of the theorists of the Copenhagen School. [30] Later theoretical works of the Copenhagen School built on this approach.[31]

24 United Nations International Panel for Climate Change (UN-IPCC), *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report,* IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 2014, pp. 41, 71.
25 United Nations International Panel for Climate Change (UN-IPCC), *Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report,* IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 2007, p. 30.
26 Ragupathy Kannan-Douglas A. James, "Effects of Climate Change on Global Biodiversity: A Review of Key Literature", *Tropical Ecology*, L/1, 2009, p. 34.
27 United Nations International Panel for Climate Change (UN-IPCC), *op cit*., 2014, pp. 49, 51.
28 United Nations International Panel for Climate Change (UN-IPCC), *op cit*., 2007, p.30.
29 Jon Barnett, "Security and Climate Change", *Global Environmental Change*, XIII/1, 2003, p. 9.
30 Ole Waever, "Securitization and Desecuritization", in Ronnie D. Lipschutz (ed.), *On Security*, Chapter 5, New York, Columbia University Press, 1995.
31 Pınar Bilgin, "Güvenlik Çalışmalarında Yeni Açılımlar: Yeni Güvenlik Çalışmaları", *SA-*

In 1995, Waever defined security as speech-act and described the concept of securitization as "the verbal presentation of an issue that already makes it a threat".[32] In the same study, the concept of securitization is explained as follows: "In conclusion, what is security? With the help of language theory, we can consider security as a speech-act. In this usage, security is not something more real, independent of interest. The utterance itself is the action. Something is done with the utterance itself (like making a bet, making a promise, naming a ship). By pronouncing the concept of security, a representative of a state places a certain development in a private sphere and claims the right to use all necessary means to prevent it."

Securitization was defined by the authors of the Copenhagen School in 1998 as taking an issue outside the established rules of politics and framing it as a special political or supra-political situation. Buzan explain securitization with the help of a spectrum. According to his spectrum, each issue can be classified as non-politicized (not of state interest and not requiring public debate and decision-making), politicized (requiring decision-making and resource allocation by the government as part of public policy) and securitized (where the issue is already presented as a threat, requiring urgent measures and justifying extraordinary measures other than normal political measures).

Through the act of securitization, an issue is presented as a threat, thereby giving it absolute priority over other issues. The perception is that if this issue cannot be resolved, no other issue will matter. Thus, the relevant actors gain the legitimacy to solve this issue by using extraordinary means or taking measures. Being aware of this situation, the securitizing actor labels the issues for which it wants to use extraordinary measures as a security problem. By using the term 'security', the securitizing actor indicates that the issue is an emergency and thus demands to use all necessary measures to solve this issue, which it presents as a security threat.[33]

According to Copenhagen School theorists, there are basically three elements in an act of securitization. These are the reference object (that which is already threatened and needs to be rescued from this threat and survive), the securitizing actor (that which declares an issue as a security problem because it threatens the reference object) and the functional actors (those that influence the dynamics of the relevant sector).

The first element is the reference object, which is the object declared to be targeted by the security threat. According to the authors of the Copenhagen School, the object reference is the object that is claimed to have

REM Journal of Strategic Studies, 2010, VIII/14, p. 82.

32 Matt Mcdonald, "Securitization and the Construction of Security", *European Journal of International Relations*, 2008, XIV/4, p. 566.

33 Ciaran O'reilly; "Primetime Patriotism: News Media and the Securitization of Iraq", *Journal of Politics and Law*, 2008, I/3, p. 69.

the right to live and therefore should be protected/saved.[34] The second element of securitization is the securitizing actor. The securitizing actor is the person or group that performs the security speech-act. The usual players in this role are political leaders, bureaucrats, governments, lobby and pressure groups. The securitizing actor is the actor who presents an issue as a threat to an object of reference that deserves to live in order to take extraordinary measures.[35] It is important to note here that in many acts of securitization, the reference object and the securitizer may be the same actor. Or, in other words, there are often cases where the securitizing actor presents itself within the objects of reference. Especially when it comes to the state, state representatives also present the state as an object of reference. In this case, the state becomes both the securitizing actor and the object of reference. Similarly, in many securitizations, the reference object and the audience (the target audience, the audience that needs to be convinced that the issue is a security threat) can be the same group. For example, the citizens of a country can be both the reference object under threat and the target audience to be persuaded by the securitizer.

The last element identified by the Copenhagen School authors in the securitization process is the functional actors. These actors differ according to the sector in which the act of securitization takes place. Buzan define a functional actor as actors who significantly influence decisions in the field of security without being a reference object or a securitizing actor.[36]

Securitization of Climate Change

Environmental awareness and distress posed by environmental degradation increased in the 1960s, especially in the developed Western world.[37] At the international level, states have firstly realized their struggle against global climate change within the framework of conferences and the outcome documents formed in the context of these conferences. Since the first conference centered on the environment (1972 Stockholm Conference), many official conferences on combating global climate change have been held, documents have been prepared and adopted.

Climate change is primarily an environmental issue, however it has far-reaching economic, social and political consequences and it is interconnected with social, cultural, economic dynamics. They do not recognize political borders, so responses require international cooperation.[38] The issue entered the global political arena with the World Conference on the Changing

34 Thierry Balzacq, "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context", *European Journal of International Relations*, 2005, XI/2, p. 178.
35 Barry Buzan *et al*., *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Lynne Riener Publishers, 1998, p. 40.
36 Barry Buzan *et al*., *ibid*, p. 36.
37 Sertif Demir - Adnan Güzel, "Revisiting policy and practices of sustainable development in Turkey", *Environment, Development and Sustainability,* 2024, p.2.
38 Sertif Demir, "The Evolution of Environmentalism in Turkey", *Middle East Policy,* XXIX/4, 2022, p.3.

Atmosphere: The World Conference on the Impacts of Climate Change, held in Toronto, Canada on June 27-30, 1988. In the same year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was adopted in 1992[39]and it was followed by the Kyoto Protocol in 1997[40].

The emergency declarations on climate change made over the last few decades by various actors, some of which are mentioned above, fit into what Buzan and his colleagues have famously described as 'securitization' efforts, which "...are grammatical or speech acts in which vulnerabilities are articulated by a 'securitizing actor' as existential threats to an object of reference, thereby enabling the approval of emergency measures beyond what would otherwise be binding rules".[41]

The Copenhagen School clearly makes a distinction between 'normal politics' - routine interactions among interest groups constrained by the rule of law and routine procedures in liberal democratic states - and 'security' or 'emergency mode' politics where extraordinary measures are legitimized to deal with a threatening situation. From this perspective, politicians, military officials, defense experts and intelligence agencies have the most power to successfully 'provide' or 'talk' security, in the sense that security claims are more likely to resonate with the target audience and convince them of the urgent need for extraordinary measures. However, Buzan notes that this power is not an absolute one and that it is therefore possible for other actors with different social positions to articulate security or emergency claims, too.

After Buzan and his colleagues, some other scholars have also made considerable contributions to the securitization theory in order to make better understanding of climate change and its security implications from the Copenhagen School's perspective. As one of those contributions, Thierry Balzacq's sociological reconsideration of securitization theory, for example, allows us to better understand the Copenhagen School's theory of "securitization". According to Balzacq: "securitization... takes place on a field of struggle, in the context of a configuration of conditions, including the psycho-cultural disposition of the audience and the power that both the speaker and the listener bring to the interaction."[42] This approach facilitates further insights into the shifting contexts, strategies and outcomes of securitization processes, for example by exploring how securitizing actors mobilize "heuristic artifacts (metaphors, policy tools, image repertoires, analogies, stere-

39 United Nations; *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC),* Web Site: https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf (Accessed on: 17.10.2024).

40 United Nations Climate Change, *What is Kyoto Protocol?*, Web Site: https://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol (Accessed on: 17.10.2024).

41 Barry Buzan *et al*., *op cit.*,1998, p. 5.

42 Thierry Balzacq,"A Theory of Securitization: Origins, Core Assumptions, and Variants", in T. Balzacq (Ed.), *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge And Dissolve*, Routledge, 2011, p. 15.

otypes, emotions, etc.)" in order to "encourage a listener to form a coherent network of inferences (emotions, feelings, thoughts and intuitions) about the critical vulnerability of the reference object".

Although the securitization theory has been criticized from various angles and there is no consensus on it, it is highly influential among scholars working on the climate-security nexus. The period between 2003 and 2009 is generally accepted as the time when climate change first began to be perceived as an existential threat, which is believed to be due to the unprecedented climate-related disasters that hit the northern hemisphere during that period, such as the European heat wave in 2003 and Hurricane Katrina in 2005. It can be argued that the increasing certainty about the science of climate change and its projected impacts articulated in the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report in 2007, is a natural consequence of the discursive entrepreneurship practiced by scientists, activists, national security agencies and influential figures such as Al Gore (Environmentalist, businessman and former Vice-President of the USA) to successfully communicate climate change as an urgent crisis to a wider audience.[43]

However, the political momentum for climate change until 2007 was lost when the Bali negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) postponed decision - making to Copenhagen Conference. Between Bali and Copenhagen Conferences, the global financial crisis of 2007-2008, the most severe financial and economic crisis since the great depression, became a major policy priority and the negotiations on climate change never regained the same priority that they had until 2007.

When it comes to the securitization of climate change at international level, this means incorporating climate security into international policymaking discourse and recognizing climate change as a threat to human, national and international security. The first effort to securitize climate change in the international arena can be dated back to 2006, when then British Foreign Secretary Margaret Beckett took a leadership role in promoting the linking of climate change to international security. During the UK Presidency in 2006, G8[44] Member States recognized the fundamental links between energy, security, climate change and sustainable development, and in October 2006, Beckett emphasized the importance of 'climate security' in a speech in Ber-

43 Eric Paglia - Charles F. Parker, "The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: Guardian of Climate Science", in A . Boin, *et al.,* (eds.), *Guardians of Public Value*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cambridge, 2021, p. 312.

44 The Group of Eight (G8) was an intergovernmental political forum between 1997–2014. The forum originated in 1975 with a summit hosted by France that brought together representatives of six governments: France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, thus leading to the name Group of Six or G6. The summit came to be known as the Group of Seven in 1976 with the addition of Canada. Russia was added to the political forum in 1997, which, the following year became known as the G8. In March 2014, Russia was suspended indefinitely following the annexation of Crimea, whereupon the political forum name reverted to G7.

lin. Following significant lobbying, the UK also chaired the first UN Security Council debate on climate change on April 17, 2007. A common theme of the debate was that climate change was a 'threat multiplier'.[45] In the following years, numerous studies and reports by prepared by think tanks, NGOs and governments were to follow.

The EU also has extensively examined the implications of climate change for European security and claims to be taking the lead in shaping the international response to the security implications of climate change. The European Council released a paper on climate change and international security in May 2008. This joint-report entitled "Climate Change and International Security", by the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the European Commission (EC) known to be an initiation of a process of securitisation of climate change in the EU.[46] This report identifies potential security impacts of climate change, including resource conflicts, border disputes, risks to coastal cities and infrastructures, environmentallyinduced migratory movements and tensions over energy supplies. It concludes that climate change is a threat multiplier that compromises international, European and human security.[47]
Following the joint-report, the High Representative presented a follow-up report in December 2008, which contained further recommendations. The document states that "the EU is well suited to taking forward the climate security agenda"[48] and it advocates that climate change should be mainstreamed in EU foreign and security policies and institutions.

Apart from the EU, which has been one of the most important actors in world politics on climate change, there have been some other steps taken by the United Nations (UN) as well. United Nations Security Council (UNSC), for example, held its first-ever meeting on the security implications of climate change in April 2007 based on a call by the United Kingdom. In the full-day debate, the main subject for the discussions was the relationship between energy, security and climate. Although no official statement or resolution was adopted during the meeting, it was a symbolic first-step towards

45 Shirley V. Scott, "The Securitization of Climate Change in World Politics: How Close Have We Come and Would Full Securitization Enhance the Efficacy of Global Climate Change Policy?", *Review of European Community & International Environmental Law (RECIEL),* XXI/3, 2012, p. 221.

46 "Climate Change and International Security", Paper From the EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the European Commission to the European Council on Climate Change and International Security, (S113/08, dated 14 March 2008), Web Page: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/99387.pdf (Accessed on: 03.11.2024).

47 Rafaela Rodrigues De Brito, "The Securitisation of Climate Change in The European Union", in *Global Security Risks and West Africa: Development Challenges,* West African Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, 2012, p. 125.

48 Council of the European Union; 'Climate Change and Security: Recommendations of the High Representative on follow-up to the High Representative and Commission report on Climate Change and International Security', 12 December 2008, 16994/1/08, Brussels, Web Page: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/104895.pdf (Accessed on: 03.11.2024).

the acknowledgement of climate change as a security issue, since the UNSC has primary responsibility, under the UN Charter, for maintaining international peace and security.[49]

Four years later, in July 2011, the UNSC held a second meeting on the impact of climate change with an official statement issued from the meeting entitled "Maintenance of international peace and security", in which the Council expressed its "concern that possible adverse effects of climate change may, in the long run, aggravate certain existing threats to international peace and security".[50]

The link between climate change and security was also acknowledged by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), where a resolution (A/RES/63/281) on the possible security implications of climate change was adopted. In this resolution, the UNGA declares its deep concern that the adverse impacts of climate change could have security implications and invites the relevant UN agencies to intensify their efforts in considering and addressing the security implications of climate change.[51]

Apart from the UN and the EU, several other intergovernmental and/or regional organizations such as OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe), NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organization) and Arctic Council have had the subject of climate change in their agendas and have had decisions on the climate change and its effects on the security agenda for last three or four decades.

In that sense, for OSCE for example, climate-related security risks have gradually become more important in the work and activities that the OSCE carries out to build stability and peace, as climate change is now acknowledged to be a 'potential additional contributor to conflict'. There are indications that there has been a shift in terms of how the OSCE perceives the link between environmental security, conflict prevention and climate change. In the early 2000s, security threats were largely defined in terms of conflict, ethnic tensions and economic crises in the post- Soviet space. But now, the OSCE defines threats more in terms of climate change, unemployment and environmental hazards in a wider context of economic, political and social development in vulnerable societies. The OSCE has gone from using environmental issues to encourage regional stability in general to more specifically focus on building environmental security early warning systems and

49 Rafaela Rodrigues De Brito, "Climate Change as a Security Issue in the European Union", *Portuguese Journal of International Affairs*, No: 3, Spring/Summer 2010, p. 44.

50 United Nations Security Council (UNSC); "Statement by the President of the Security Council", S/PRST/2011/15*, Web Page: https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/707416?ln=en&v=pdf (Accessed on 04.11.2024).

51 United Nations General Assembly (UNGA); "Resolution No: 63/281 Adopted by the General Assembly on Climate Change and its Possible Security Implications", A/RES/63/281, New York, 11 June 2009, Web Page: https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n08/487/65/pdf/n0848765.pdf (Accessed on: 04.11.2024).

reducing energy use.[52]

In many ways, the OSCE appears to be using climate security as a mechanism for fostering regional cooperation. The OSCE Madrid Declaration on Environment and Security (2007), Kiev Ministerial Council Decision on Improving the Environmental Footprint of Energy-related Activities in the OSCE Region (2013), Basel Ministerial Council Decision on Enhancing Disaster Risk Reduction (2014) and Ministerial Council Decision on Strengthening Co-operation to Address the Challenges Caused by Climate Change (2021) are some of the decisions taken by the OSCE recently aiming at increasing the level of resilience, adaptation, and mitigation of its member states against climate change.[53]

Similarly, NATO also acknowledges that climate change is part of a changing international security landscape and that its adverse effects will most certainly affect its members and partners. The emphasis that NATO puts on cooperative and collective security makes it hard for the organization to completely discard climate-related security risks as these risks will ultimately effect NATO members and thus call for a collective response.[54] In that sense, most recently, NATO Foreign Ministers endorsed NATO's Climate Change and Security Agenda in March 2021. Furthermore, during the NATO Summit in Brussels, NATO leaders agreed a Climate Change and Security Action Plan in June 2021, with the aim of making NATO the leading international organisation when it comes to understanding and adapting to the impact of climate change on security.

Regarding enhanced awareness among its members, NATO conducts an annual Climate Change and Security Impact Assessment which analyses the impact of climate change on NATO's strategic environment and NATO's assets, installations, missions and operations. Regarding adaptation, NATO incorporates climate change considerations into its work on resilience, civil preparedness, defence planning, capability delivery, assets and installations, standards, innovation, training, exercises and disaster response.

During the NATO Summit in Madrid in 2022, Allies committed to integrating climate change considerations across all of NATO's core tasks and at the 2023 NATO Summit in Vilnius, Allies reaffirmed this commitment, and further agreed to adapt their infrastructure, military capabilities and technologies, ensuring resilience to future operating environments.[55]

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), being one of the most

52 Niklas Bremberg, "European Regional Organizations and Climate-Related Security Risks: EU, OSCE and NATO", *SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security,* No. 2018/1, February 2018, p. 9.

53 For further information about those decisions: https://www.osce.org/oceea/446296 (accsessed on 02.12.2024).

54 Niklas Bremberg, *op.cit.*, 2018, p. 12.

55 For further information on NATO's policies and actions on climate change and environment, visit: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_91048.htm (accessed on 02.12.2024).

important regional organizations in Eurasia region, has already turned its focus on the environmental and climate change-related subjects as crucial elements of regional cooperation, as well. Climate crises and their socio-economic ramifications, member states of the SCO are increasingly recognising the urgent need for collective action to combat global warming and promote sustainable development.In this sense, The 2024 SCO Summit taken place in Islamabad (Pakistan) featured discussions focused on several key strategies for addressing climate change such as strengthening multilateral cooperation, promotion of renewable energy use, disaster risk reduction, water resource management, biodiversity conservation, etc.

Another example of the intergovernmental organizations which exclusively focuses on the sustainable development and environmental protection is The Arctic Council, which is the leading intergovernmental forum promoting cooperation, coordination and interaction among the Arctic States, Arctic Indigenous Peoples and other Arctic inhabitants in he Arctic Region.[56] Some specific working groups were established under the framework of Arctic Council, several decisions and publications have been made, and policies aiming at sustainable development in the arctic region have been pursued under the umbrella of the Arctic Council.

It worths to be underlined that, apart from the efforts given by governments, politicians, internationbal organizations as it was summarized above, a considerable literature has also emerged at about this time through scholarly writings and/or reports of scholars and experts from the universities or nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

Criticisms of the Copenhagen School's Perspective on Securitization of Climate Change

Through the lens of the Copenhagen School, since states have not yet resorted to 'emergency' measures that suspend routine democratic procedures to accelerate decarbonization efforts, these efforts are interpreted as "failed securitization" efforts due to the seemingly distant, abstract, uncertain and contested consequences of climate change. Security itself is clearly not considered by The Copenhagen School as a positive state. Therefore, they see securitization as a process to be avoided as much as possible. Once a problem is defined as a security problem, an authority arises from its nature, and this authority can lead to the implementation of measures such as restricting freedoms and legitimizing violent methods. In this sense, what the Copanhagen School proposes is to remove problems from the security agenda as much as possible (desecuritization) and discuss and find solutions in "normal" political processes instead. The goal should be to minimize security rather than expand it.[57] Thats why their perspective on the securitization of climate chan-

56 For further information about Arctic Council, visit: https://arctic-council.org/about/ (Accessed on: 02.12.2024).

57 Michael C. Williams, "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Poli-

ge is summarized as "Less security, more politics"[58].

However, other scholars argue that a more dynamic understanding of 'securitization' is needed to understand how climate change is reshaping security discourses and practices.

Maria Trombetta, for example, argues that securitizing climate change "is not about applying a fixed meaning of security and associated practices", but rather involves different methods and logics of intervention that are closer to risk management practices, i.e. practices that aim to anticipate and mitigate potential risks as much as possible, rather than eliminating the risks and negative impacts posed by climate change.[59] Furthermore, Trombetta argues that the securitization of the environment must be considered 'successful' in such cases where it "brought about measures and policies that probably would not otherwise have been undertaken" – not only in cases where exceptional measures were enabled.[60] According to Trombetta, the politicization of the environment has in many cases been achieved through its securitization.[61]

Floyd, on the other hand, argues that the securitization of the environment can still trigger some positive environmental outcomes despite all its weaknesses from the perspective of democratic procedures since "desecuritization" may have much more negative consequences in cases where the environmental concerns totally disappear from the policy agenda.[62]

Similarly, Oels, bringing a different approcah to a "securitization" concept, argues that the "failed" securitization of climate change is "better understood as the successful "climatization" of the security domain", in which traditional security practices such as scenario planning and early warning systems are applied to climate change, while the security domain expands to include techniques from climate science such as modelling and risk analysis.[63]

Thus, while all these approaches are somehow critical of the Copenhagen School's assumptions about a universalizing logic and the consequences associated with securitization, they nevertheless share the insight that securitizing an issue by mobilizing the language and effect of urgency 'enables

tics", *International Studies Quarterly,* XLVII/4, December-2003, p. 523.

58 Ole Wæver, "Securitization and Desecuritization", in R. D. Lipschutz (Ed.), *On Security*, Columbia University Press, 1995, p. 53.

59 Maria Julia Trombetta, "Environmental Security and Climate Change: Analysing the Discourse", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, XXI/4, 2008, p. 600.

60 Maria Julia Trombetta, "Rethinking the Securitization of the Environment: Old Beliefs, New Insights", in Thierry Balzacq (Ed.), *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve,* London, Routledge, 2011, p.136.

61 Maria Julia Trombetta, *ibid*, 2011, p.142.

62 Rita Floyd, "Towards a Consequentialist Evaluation of Security: Bringing Together The Copenhagen and The Welsh Schools of Security Studies", *Review of International Studies,* XXXIII/2, 2007, pp. 343, 347.

63 Angela Oels, "From 'Securitization' of Climate Change to 'Climatization' of the Security Field: Comparing Three Theoretical Perspectives", In J. Scheffran *et al*.,(Eds.), *Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict,* Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, Vol: 8, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012, p. 185.

measures to be taken that would not otherwise be taken'.[64] However, as it was argued by the Paris School[65]scholars, it should be underlined that the specific policy measures that result from such securitizations are still subject to contextual discussions and political struggles. Because, Paris School emphasizes the political and social construction of (in)security but offers a different explanation of how the process works. The main claim in this regard is that 'speech acts' are effective in the process of securitization, but they are not decisive alone. According to the Paris School, 'speech acts' are the result of the struggle between actors with their own definitions of security and different sources of authority and legitimacy. Therefore, the process of (de)securitization (the construction of a threat and the response to this threat with extraordinary measures) can be defined as the result of the strategic interaction between the speech acts of different dominant actors and the practices of security agencies. In such a case, "who is doing the (de)securitization? Under what conditions, towards whom and with what consequences?"[66]

From the perspective of the Paris School's (in)securitization approach, the securitization of climate change may have adverse effects. Insecuritization approach focuses on how the securitization of certain issues results in insecuritization of individual human beings or groups. According to the school, security of one referrent object is always provided by sacrifice of the security of other individual human beings or groups. From this perspective, securitization of climate change, and the security practices as a result of this securitization – while providing security for some individuals or groups – will, on the other side, result in insecurities for other people such as the migrants who have to move or people who loose their jobs because of the measures taken against climate change.[67]

The literature on the securitization of climate change has so far addressed climate securitization policies in different national and/or institutional contexts, their policy implications and lessons for securitization theory broadly, and much progress has been made in that sense. However, Albert argues that there are two fundamental gaps in the securitization of climate change.[68] First, according to Albert, scholars working on climate securiti-

64 Maria Julia Trombetta, "Securitization of Climate Change in China: Implications For Global Climate Governance", *China Quarterly of International Strategic Studies*, V/1, 2019, p. 102.

65 Paris School, is a school of security studies that tries to integrate other disciplines in the study of security and conflict, with Didier Bigo as its most prominent representative. The Paris School aims to analyse security issues by using conceptual and operational tools from the realms of international relations, sociology, and criminology. Recognizing the work of Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver from Copenhagen School, the Paris School's main contribution is by adding to the analysis of securitization processes based on speech acts and on the significance of security practices, while building on the sociological approaches of Bourdieu and Foucault.

66 Didier Bigo, "International Political Sociology", in Paul D. Williams (ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, Routledge, 2008, p.126.

67 Başar Baysal - Uluç Karakaş, "Climate Change and Security: Different Perceptions, Different Approaches", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, XIV/54, 2017, p. 35.

68 Michael Albert, "Climate Emergency and Securitization Politics: Towards a Climate Poli-

zation have yet to systematically investigate grassroots activist movements as actors with the capacity to 'speak for security' (e.g. by declaring climate emergencies) and in doing so reshape global climate policies. While their effectiveness has, time to time, been acknowledged; questions about their capacity to influence climate policy outcomes and the conditions under which they might be more successful in driving more radical climate emergency mobilizations have not received much attention. Second, and relatedly, these scholars largely focus on past and present patterns of climate securitization, rather than considering how these might change in the future (both as a result of worsening socio-climate shocks and intensifying climate activism).

Conclusions

Together with the sectoral security approach and the regional security complex theory, securitization theory constitutes one of the three main pillars of the Copenhagen School security approach. Although it is not possible to say that securitization theory is a fully agreed upon and generally accepted theory, it would not be wrong to say that it offers a perspective that has made a great contribution to security studies in the last quarter century and has made its name frequently mentioned. When it comes to climate change, which has become one of the main areas of security studies in the last quarter century, securitization theory again offers one of the most fundamental and interesting methods of analysis.

When we look at the problematic of climate change from the perspective of securitization theory, the nature and scope of the measures taken and policies pursued against the direct or indirect consequences of climate change on the natural life and the existence of humanity is a determining factor for the success of the securitization of climate change. This is because, despite the strong discourse on climate security that has emerged at every level in the world public opinion, especially in the last quarter century, the effectiveness of global policies against climate change continues to lag far behind the seriousness of the problem that the world faces, as claimed by scientists, politicians, security experts, academics and even by the Secretaries General of the United Nations (UN), one of the main actors in ensuring global security. From this perspective, the "securitization of climate change" has been described as a "failure" by securitization theorists.

Although the term "failure" here may seem to evoke a negative impression at first glance, when this result is approached from the perspective of "securitization" theory, this "failure" actually opens the door for policies to be carried out against climate change based on democratic, pluralistic decision-making mechanisms and more respectful attitudes towards fundamental human rights, rather than extraordinary measures that can be taken to prevent emergencies that threaten global security and can lead to the use of military force.

tics of the Extraordinary", *Globalizations*, XX/4, 2023,p. 536.

Since environmental challenges are transboundary and their solutions require global cooperation, a global effort is essential to cope with problems of climate change.[69] In fact, the current international decision-making mechanisms, due to their "multilateral" nature, make it very difficult to take a joint decision on any problem in the short and medium term and to implement the decisions taken smoothly and completely. Especially in a topic such as "climate change", where there are so many different perspectives and disagreements on the source of the problem, its perpetrators and methods of combating it; where countries always approach the issue from the perspective of their own national security and needs; and where the differences in perspectives between developed countries and developing or underdeveloped countries are extremely deep, it seems extremely difficult to reach a consensus that will satisfy all the parties involved in.

Moreover, the fact that the UN, which is entrusted with the duty and authority to protect and promote international peace and security, and its most important decision-making body in the field of protecting and promoting security, the UN Security Council, are far from taking concrete decisions and producing solutions in the face of regional and global security problems and humanitarian crises, the most recent and most prominent example of which we see in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, justifies the existence of extremely serious and justified doubts about whether the steps to address this problem can be taken even if the issue of climate change is fully "securitized".

International organizations such as the European Union and the UN, which have been sensitive to the issue of climate change from the very beginning and have assumed leading roles in this regard, have characterized the phenomenon of "climate change" in their official documents as a "threat multiplier" that could exacerbate existing vulnerabilities and tensions.

This approach implies that climate change alone is unlikely to trigger violent conflicts, but in combination with other factors it may increase the likelihood of conflict. From this perspective, it is clear that a holistic approach that evaluates the concept of "climate change" solely on the basis of the armed conflict/peace dichotomy and whether the measures taken are extraordinary or not, that excludes the issue of climate change from the classical security domain, does not provide us with the most accurate perspective. Instead, there is a need for a perspective that can ensure the implementation of necessary and mandatory measures at the national, regional and international levels with the widest possible consensus, through policy instruments such as sustainable development, adaptation policies and disaster management, against the negative effects of climate change, which are becoming more concrete and growing each and every day.

69 Sertif Demir, "Revisiting the Environmental Security in terms of Evolution Process", *Uluslararası Kriz ve Siyaset Araştırmaları Dergisi*, VI/1, 2022, p. 130.

References

ALBERT Michael, "Climate Emergency and Securitization Politics: Towards a Climate Politics of the Extraordinary", *Globalizations*, XX/4, 2023, pp. 533-547.

ANISIMOV Oleg A.,"Potential Feedback of Thawing Permafrost to the Global Climate System Through Methane Emission", *Environmental Research Letters*, II/4, 2007, 045016, pp. 1-7.

BALZACQ Thierry, "A Theory of Securitization: Origins, Core Assumptions, and Variants", in T. Balzacq (Ed.), *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge And Dissolve*, Routledge, 2011, pp. 1–30.

BALZACQ Thierry, "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context", European Journal of International Relations, XI/2, 2005, pp. 171-201.

BARNETT Jon, "Security and Climate Change", *Global Environmental Change*, XIII/1, 2003, pp. 7-17.

BAŞOĞLU Aykut, "Küresel İklim Değişikliğinin Ekonomik Etkileri Üzerine Model Denemesi ve Ekonometrik Bir Analiz", Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Trabzon, 2014, (Unpublished PhD Thesis).

BAYSAL Başar - Uluç Karakaş, "Climate Change and Security: Different Perceptions, Different Approaches", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, XIV/54, 2017, pp. 21-44.

BIGO Didier, "International Political Sociology", in Williams, Paul D. (ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction,* Routledge, 2008, pp. 116-129.

BİLGİN Pınar, "Güvenlik Çalışmalarında Yeni Açılımlar: Yeni Güvenlik Çalışmaları", *SAREM Journal of Strategic Studies*, VIII/14, 2010, pp. 69-96.

BREMBERG Niklas, "European Regional Organizations and Climate-Related Security Risks: EU, OSCE and NATO", *SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security,* No. 2018/1, February 2018, pp. 1-16.

BRITO Rafaela Rodrigues De, "Climate change as a security issue in the European Union", *Portuguese Journal of International Affairs*, No: 3, Spring/Summer 2010, pp. 41-50.

BRITO Rafaela Rodrigues De, "The Securitisation of Climate Change in The European Union", in *Global Security Risks and West Africa: Development Challenges,* West African Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, 2012, pp. 120-134.

BUZAN Barry *et al.*, "Security: A New Framework for Analysis", Lynne Riener Publishers, 1998.

CANADELL J.G. - M.R. Raupach, "Managing Forests for Climate Change Mitigation", *Science*, CCCXX/5882, 2008, pp. 1456-1457.

CESUR Ayten, "Küresel Isınma ve İklim Değişiklikleri", *MTA Doğal Kaynaklar ve Ekonomi Bülteni,* No: 19, 2015, pp.17-21.

COUNCIL OF THE EU, "Climate Change and Security: Recommendations of the High Representative on follow-up to the High Representative and Commission report on Climate Change and International Security", 12 December 2008, 16994/1/08, Brussels, Web Page: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/104895.pdf

COUNCIL OF THE EU, "Climate Change and International Security", Paper from the EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the European Commission to the European Council on Climate Change and International Security, (S113/08, dated 14 March 2008), Web Page: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/reports/99387.pdf.

DEMİR Sertif, "Revisiting the Environmental Security in terms of Evolution Process", *Uluslara-*

rası Kriz ve Siyaset Araştırmaları Dergisi, VI/1, 2022, pp. 115 -135.

DEMİR Sertif, "The Evolution of Environmentalism in Turkey", *Middle East Policy,* 2022, pp. 1-13.

DEMİR Sertif - Adnan Güzel, "Revisiting policy and practices of sustainable development in Turkey", *Environment, Development and Sustainability,* 2024.

EU COMMISSION, "Climate Action, Causes of Climate Change", 2015. Web Site: https://climate.ec.europa.eu/climate-change/causes-climate-change_en.

FAHEY, D.W. *et al.,* "Physical Drivers of Climate Change" In: Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I [Wuebbles, D.J. *et al.* (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington D.C., USA, 2017, pp. 73-113.

FIELD, C. B. et al. (Ed.), "Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation-Glossary of Terms-", *A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),* Cambridge- New York, Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 555-564.

FLOYD Rita, "Towards a Consequentialist Evaluation of Security: Bringing Together The Copenhagen and The Welsh Schools of Security Studies", *Review of International Studies*, XXXIII/2, 2007, pp. 327-350.

HOFFMANN Matthew J., "Global Climate Change", in *The Handbook of Global Climate and Environment Policy*, (Ed. R. Falkner), John Wiley & Sons, 2013, pp. 3-18.

İLKILIÇ, Zehra Aşkınsena; "Küresel İklim Değişikliğiyle Mücadeleye İlişkin Uluslararası Belgelerde Güvenlik Kavramının İncelenmesi", İstanbul University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, 2022, (Unpublished PhD Thesis).

KANNAN Ragupathy - Douglas A. James, "Effects of Climate Change on Global Biodiversity: A Review of Key Literature", *Tropical Ecology*, L/1, 2009, pp. 31-39.

MCDONALD Matt, "Securitization and the Construction of Security", *European Journal of International Relations,* XIV/4, 2008, pp. 563-587.

National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration, US Department of Commerce; Climate Change Impacts, Web Page: https://www.noaa.gov/education/resource-collections/climate/climate-change-impacts.

O'REILLY Ciaran, "Primetime Patriotism: News Media and the Securitization of Iraq", *Journal of Politics and Law*, I/3, 2008, pp. 66-72.

OELS Angela, "From 'Securitization' of Climate Change to 'Climatization' of the Security Field: Comparing Three Theoretical Perspectives", in SCHEFFRAN, J. *Et al.*,(Eds.), *Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict,* Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, Vol: 8, Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2012, pp.185- 205.

PAGLIA Eric - Charles Parker, "The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: Guardian of Climate Science", in BOIN Arjen *et al.*(eds.), *Guardians of Public Value*, Palgrave Macmillan, Chambridge, 2021, pp. 295- 321.

RAMANATHAN Veerabhadran - Yan Feng, "Air Pollution, Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change: Global and Regional Perspectives", *Atmospheric Environment*, XLIII/1, January 2009, pp. 37-50.

REAY Dave S. *et al.,* "Methane Sources and the Global Methane Budget", in *Methane and Climate Change* (Ed.) Dave S. Reay *et al.,* London, Washington, Earthscan, 2010, pp. 1-14.

SCOTT, Shirley V., "The Securitization of Climate Change in World Politics: How Close Have We Come and Would Full Securitization Enhance the Efficacy of Global Climate Change Policy?",

Review of European Community & International Environmental Law (RECIEL), XXI/3, 2012, pp. 220 – 230.

SEIDEL Dijan J. *et al.,*"Widening of the Tropical Belt in a Changing Climate", *Nature Geoscience,* I/1, 2008, pp. 21-24.

SOLOMON Susan *et al.,* "Persistence of Climate Changes Due to a Range of Greenhouse Gases", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, CVII/43, 2010, pp. 18354–18359.

SRINIVASAN Jayaraman, "Climate Change, Greenhouse Gases and Aerosols", *Resonance,* XIII/12, 2008, pp. 1146-1155.

TROMBETTA Maria Julia, "Environmental Security and Climate Change: Analysing the Discourse", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, XXI/4, 2008, pp. 585-602.

TROMBETTA Maria Julia, "Rethinking the Securitization of the Environment: Old Beliefs, New Insights", in BALZACQ, Thierry (Ed.), *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve,* London, Routledge, 2011, pp.135-149.

TROMBETTA Maria Julia, Securitization of Climate Change in China: Implications For Global Climate Governance, China Quarterly of International Strategic Studies, V/1, 2019, pp. 97-116.

UNCC- United Nations Climate Change, What is Kyoto Protocol?, Web Site: https://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol.

UNCCD-United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, Web Page: https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/2022-02/UNCCD_Convention_ENG_0_0.pdf.

UNFCC-United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Web Site: https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf .

UNGA-United Nations General Assembly, "Resolution No: 63/281 Adopted by the General Assembly on Climate Change and its Possible Security Implications", A/RES/63/281, New York, 11 June 2009, Web Page: https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n08/487/65/pdf/n0848765.pdf .

UNIPCC- United Nations International Panel for Climate Change, Climate Change 2007, 2014 and 2023: Synthesis Reports, Geneva, Switzerland, 2007, 2014, 2023.

UNSC- United Nations Security Council, "Statement by the President of the Security Council", S/PRST/2011/15*, Web Page: https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/707416?ln=en&v=pdf .

USEPA-U.S. Enviromental Protection Agency, Causes of Climate Change, 2024, Web Site: https://www.epa.gov/climatechange-science/causes-climate-change.

WÆVER Ole; "Securitization and Desecuritization", in LIPSCHUTZ Ronnie D. (Ed.), *On Security*, Columbia University Press, 1995, pp. 46-87.

WILLIAMS Michael C., "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics", *International Studies Quarterly*, XLVII/4, December-2003, pp. 511-531.

YILDIRIM Korkmaz, "Local Climate Change Governance: The Case of Turkish Metropolitan Municipalities", Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Institute of Social Sciences, , Ankara, 2017, (Unpublished PhD Thesis).