

Enforcing Ecocide – The Challenges of Policing Transnational Environmental Crimes

Orsolya Johanna ZSIGMOND-SZIEBIG¹

Introduction: Ecocide has been gaining legislative momentum, and the European Union is committed to adopting enforceable ecocide legislation, as reflected in the Environmental Crime Directive. This directive explicitly mentions ecocide in its preamble and introduces “qualified offences” comparable to ecocide.

Objectives: This study aims to link the definitions of ecocide and transnational environmental crime, with a particular focus on the challenges of policing such offences.

Methods: This research relies heavily on the last ten years that the author has spent analysing transnational environmental crime and ecocide. The relevant literature was analysed through desk research, including critical viewpoints and the establishment of individual categorisation.

Results: The efforts to recognise ecocide can influence the effectiveness of actions against environmental crimes. The future enforceability of ecocide remains challenging, particularly regarding the implementation of the “qualified offences” category across EU Member States. The implementation of the new Environmental Crime Directive will highly influence the European efforts to combat environmental crimes. Also, it is crucial to strengthen the cooperation between law enforcement agencies. Social and economic changes have continuously influenced the work of law enforcement agencies and policing. Climate change and recent ecological changes are calling for the so-called “green policing”.

Conclusions: It is crucial to step up and combat environmental crimes. Law enforcement agencies must also adapt to new challenges to build climate resilience, and the effective implementation of the new Directive will be essential.

¹ Senior Lecturer, PhD, LLM, University of Szeged Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, Department of International and European Law, e-mail: sziebig.orsolya.johanna@szte.hu

Keywords: ecocide, transnational environmental crime, environmental crime, policing, qualified offences, international crimes, Environmental Crime Directive

Introduction

Climate change, ecological destruction and biodiversity loss became a reality in the 21st century. Although the discussion about environmentalism has already started at the beginning of the 1930s (BEEAMAN 1995: 1–16), so far, only small victories have been achieved. It would be an exaggeration to say that humanity was not able to step up and solve crucial environmental challenges. However, the unprecedented changes in our home, the “Earth”, point out how the international community failed to find effective responses to cut the curve of greenhouse gas emissions and tackle ecological despair. As a result, many believe that those who harm the environment the most have to be seriously punished under ecocide regulation. Environmental crimes are often labelled as “victimless” crimes (SKINNIDER 2013: 1) and considered less serious to society. It was only recently that the climate change and security nexus was intensively researched, highlighting the threat that environmental challenges pose to security. Moreover, the law enforcement agencies face severe challenges due to the rise of environmental crimes and climate change. Eco-policing has begun to emerge in response to the growing demand for a more environmentally conscious and green-minded law enforcement approach. An earlier notion is green criminology, which has emphasised the importance of a multidisciplinary approach to combat environmental crimes, working towards the realisation of human-induced environmental changes (WHITE–HECKENBERG 2014).

In this article, I would like to briefly reflect on the history and legal appearances of ecocide, with a particular emphasis on recent developments, especially at the European Union level. Moreover, the connection between ecocide and transnational environmental crime will be highlighted. Lastly, the need for a “greening” law enforcement will be elaborated in the context of ecocide, detailing the challenges posed by serious environmental crimes. This research highly relies on the last ten years that I have spent analysing transnational environmental crime and ecocide. In this article, I aim to focus on the more practical issues from the perspective of law enforcement, emphasising the importance of agencies responsible for investigating such crimes. As a result, the article relies on desk research, incorporating critical analysis of relevant sources.

Efforts to penalise ecocide and its legal appearance

There is a growing interest in the concept of ecocide; however, the term is surrounded by uncertainty. In the most general sense, ecocide means severe environmental destruction, causing long-term or irreversible harm. The word “ecocide” is a composition of “eco” (oikos, Greek), meaning ecosystem and “cide” (caedere, Latin), which can be translated as destruction. The history of ecocide goes back to the era of the Vietnam War (1954–1975), in which the United States of America had been intensively applying ecologically

destructive war tactics. The latter included the use of herbicides, the infamous “rainbow colour” chemicals, often containing dioxin and other harmful substances. As part of the Vietnam War effort, the USA also destroyed agricultural land and natural habitat sites with bulldozers. The effects of the war are still detectable in Vietnam, as the applied methods caused long-term environmental harm and were also destructive to animal and human health. A global movement has started to stop ecologically harmful tactics and to put an end to irreversible environmental modification as a war method. Although the discussion about ecocide began in the 1970s, an enforceable legal framework is still awaited (ZSIGMOND-SZIEBIG 2025: 67–76).

In literature, the concept of ecocide has been sporadically discussed, but some articles establishing definitions were already published in the 1970s. Hereby, I would like to emphasise the importance of the article of László Bodnár, who established a still valid definition for ecocide as the following: “The crime of ecocide is committed by a state which intentionally damages or destroys the human environment to such an extent that it may lead to the disruption of the ecological balance outside the territory of its own state” (BODNÁR 1974: 239). Another early appearance of the definition of ecocide was the *Ecocide Convention* by Richard Falk, which remained a proposal published in literature (FALK 1973). For a long time, ecocide has mainly been overlooked by the international community, following the International Law Commission’s removal of ecocide as a distinct crime from the *Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind* (ZSIGMOND-SZIEBIG 2025: 72–74). The rediscovery of ecocide was a result of the work of Polly Higgins, who became the “lawyer of the Earth”² and catalysed a new discussion of environmental crimes. In her book, Higgins elaborated on the definition of ecocide in a lengthy manner and defined the crime as “extensive damage to, destruction of or loss of ecosystem(s) of a given territory, whether by human agency or by other causes, to such an extent that peaceful enjoyment by the inhabitants of that territory has been severely diminished” (HIGGINS 2016: 62–63). In 2021, an independent panel of experts was established with the support of the STOP Ecocide Foundation. The Panel aimed to propose amendments to the Rome Statute.³ In the accepted text, the preambular paragraphs, Article 5 defines the subject-matter jurisdiction of the ICC in relation to the crime of ecocide, and Article 8 incorporates the crime of ecocide (STOP Ecocide Foundation 2021). The legal acceptance of ecocide is rapidly growing, and several countries have introduced ecocide as an individual crime, including France, Belgium, Ecuador, Moldova, Ukraine and Vietnam (Ecocide Law 2025).

The legal embeddedness of ecocide, particularly in the Member States of the European Union (MSs), is strengthened by the implementation of the new Environmental Crime Directive (ECD). The new Directive [Directive (EU) 2024/1203, 2024] replaces the Environmental Crime Directive of 2008. The legal act was adopted in April 2024 and is expected to be implemented by May 2026 in the Member States of the European

² The terminology is used based on the TEDx talk of Polly Higgins (TEDx Exeter 2012).

³ The Rome Statute (1998–2002) is the founding document of the International Criminal Court (in The Hague). Currently, the ICC has jurisdiction over four international crimes: crimes against humanity, war crimes, genocide and aggression. The original aim of Polly Higgins was to amend the Rome Statute with a “fifth crime against peace”, ecocide, which idea gained support in the international community and among international lawyers.

Union. The acceptance of the new ECD was a result of ongoing discussion concerning the protection of the environment through criminal law in the European sphere. The “old” ECD has been intensively criticised for a long time (ZSIGMOND – ZSIGMOND-SZIEBIG 2025). The MSs must include the so-called “qualified criminal offences” that “can encompass conduct comparable to ecocide” as stated in the Preamble paragraph (21) of the ECD. The wording of the ECD Article 3 is similar to the ecocide definition established by the Independent Expert Panel:

“Member States shall ensure that criminal offences relating to conduct listed in paragraph 2 constitute qualified criminal offences if such conduct causes: (a) the destruction of, or widespread and substantial damage which is either irreversible or long-lasting to, an ecosystem of considerable size or environmental value or a habitat within a protected site, or (b) widespread and substantial damage which is either irreversible or long-lasting to the quality of air, soil or water.”

Regardless of the new law, some Member States had already been active in penalising environmental criminal offences due to the adverse effects of climate change and environmental degradation (SZIEBIG 2022). As a result of the implementation process of Directive 2024/1203, it will be interesting to see how the MSs modify or supplement the domestic environmental criminal law in force.

Overall, ecocide gained support from the international community and has started to appear as enforceable law, especially in domestic environmental crime legislation. There are several angles from which ecocide can be interpreted, not just from the perspective of criminal law. As there is a complex and inseparable relationship between human well-being and environmental quality, human rights have long provided an opportunity to advocate against climate change and environmental destruction, linking intergenerational equity, the rights of future generations, and the right to a healthy and liveable environment (SZIEBIG 2024). The “ecocentric turn of international criminal law” would mark a global achievement. However, to support such a notion and make it possible, domestic legislative changes must provide a basis at the local level (CLOSE 2024).

Ecocide definition and environmental crimes

In cases of environmental crimes, there is no universally accepted or internationally defined concept; therefore, domestic criminal law plays a crucial role in addressing these issues. The category of environmental crime is complex and often contradictory. It is frequently used as a collective term for offences impacting biodiversity, wildlife, animals, natural resources, hazardous waste, prohibited substances and environmental quality. Sometimes, specific classifications are employed, such as “brown” (for pollution and air quality), “green” (for wildlife issues and conservation), and “white” (for scientific activities, new technologies and genetically modified organisms) (GIBBS–BORATTO 2017). Organisations active in the environmental field develop their own interpretations of what constitutes environmental crimes. The Interpol’s Environmental Security Unit focuses

on four main areas: fisheries crime, forestry crime, pollution crime and wildlife crime (Interpol 2025). Europol defines environmental crimes as activities that breach environmental regulations and result in significant damage or pose risks to the environment and/or human health. These activities include the destruction, damage, possession, or trade of protected wild animal and plant species, if carried out unlawfully (Europol 2025).

Although the criminal law protection of the environment is not “alien” to international standard-setting, the European Union has devoted special attention to the protection of the environment through criminal law. Environmental crimes have a range of legal consequences that fall within the scope of administrative, civil and criminal law. Crimes against the environment are often committed at the national level within a country’s jurisdiction, but they are typically international in nature and transcend national borders. In recent decades, organised crime groups have recognised the profit potential of activities that harm wildlife, and illegal trade has become a significant source of revenue for these groups. However, the effective enforcement of current international and national regulations would significantly reduce the perpetrators’ opportunities to exploit the weaknesses of implementation and law enforcement. Furthermore, as emphasised in the literature, widespread corruption is another source of the problem, as it facilitates the activities of organised crime groups and increases latency. Corruption can be identified in relation to all environmental crimes. Furthermore, corruption includes a wide range of relevant acts, including bribery, embezzlement, money laundering and other financial crimes (THOMPSON 2023: 143). Organised crime groups generally use the profits they make to fund other illegal activities, like terrorism, human trafficking, arms trafficking and drug trade. Environmental crimes are often associated with developing countries, where limited resources are available to support effective law enforcement and judicial systems. Crimes related to wildlife have adverse social, environmental and economic impacts, reduce government revenues, and hinder sustainable development (UNEP/EA.1/INF/19, 2014).

Among the environmental criminal offences, some are particularly dangerous to society and pose a challenge to detect and prosecute. Transnational environmental crime is difficult to define, as it shares a similar lack of a universally accepted definition with environmental crimes. It is possible to approach the concept from the perspective of international treaties, emphasising the definitions established by the relevant agreements. Transnational environmental crime poses a serious threat, often converging with other serious offences. Moreover, transnational crime groups have diversified into environmental crimes, realising the benefits of such actions (VAN UHM 2024: 188–195). Based on Article 3 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, a crime is transnational in nature if

“(a) it is committed in more than one State; (b) it is committed in one State but a substantial part of its preparation, planning, direction or control takes place in another State; (c) it is committed in one State but involves an organized criminal group that engages in criminal activities in more than one State; or (d) it is committed in one State but has substantial effects in another State”.

Organised crime groups are often involved in various types of environmental crimes, including fisheries crime (illegal, unregulated or unreported fishing), pollution crime (such as illegal dumping of toxic waste), wildlife crime (such as poaching, illegal wildlife trade and wildlife markets) and forestry crimes (ZSIGMOND 2024a). In literature, transnational environmental crime “involves the movement across borders of species, resources, and pollutants in contravention of domestic law or in violation of prohibition or regulation regimes established by multilateral environmental agreements” (ELLIOTT 2012: 88). Environmental crime is becoming a serious concern for the international community, as it generates an astonishing revenue for organised crime groups. Environmental crime is currently ranked as the “fourth-largest criminal enterprise after drug trafficking, counterfeiting, and human trafficking” (MALAKOUTI-HAZRATI 2025: 1). As it was highlighted earlier, these crimes are often linked to other serious offences, including financial crimes (ZSIGMOND 2024b), corruption and harm to justice, equity and the green transition (VAN UHM – NIJMAN 2020). Characteristics of wildlife crime include its international nature, the involvement of organised crime groups, latency, and the exploitation of corruption and weak law enforcement. Corruption and weak implementation greatly hinder the realisation of conservation efforts aimed at ensuring the survival of species. Eliminating or at least curbing wildlife crime can be considered one of the most important challenges of the 21st century. However, the complexity of the issue and the conflicting interests, often at the state level, give the impression that even under the current circumstances, there is no unified approach.

The global trend can also be observed in the European Union, where syndicates previously involved in traditional forms of organised crime – such as human and arms trafficking and drug trafficking – have recognised the opportunities offered by natural resources. As a result, we are increasingly faced with the illegal trade in wildlife species and natural resources such as timber and minerals. Moreover, the EU is even more vulnerable due to the internal market. Once illegal goods have passed through external border controls, they can move freely between Member States due to the lack of comprehensive border controls. The European Union is not only a destination but also a significant transit point for illicit trade between continents (SZIEBIG 2021). Joint action against environmental crime is therefore necessary, as reinforced by the European Network for Environmental Crime (EnviCrimeNet), recognising that the crimes in question, including ecocide, have a negative impact on human health and biodiversity.

It is an interesting question whether ecocide can be linked to transnational environmental crime, and how the new ecocide legislation will support the fight against the most serious environmental offences. The relationship between ecocide and transnational environmental crime can be approached from several angles. The “rediscovery” of ecocide and its international support are primarily due to the increased attention being paid to global ecological destruction. In this respect, international action against environmental crimes has definitely preceded ecocide. Furthermore, at the level of definitions, there is a correlation between transnational environmental crimes and ecocide, as both can be severe, widespread and cause irreparable harm to the environment. Moreover, ecocide can be the result of transnational environmental crime when these illegal activities cause severe, widespread or lasting damage. The recognition of ecocide marks a “legal and symbolic

revolution”, strengthening ecocentric approaches and highlighting the interdependence of humanity and the environment (ELIA 2025: 12). Within the scope of this article, I would like to focus on the most serious forms of environmental crimes that pose a significant challenge to law enforcement agencies in terms of discovery and subsequent prosecution. Based on the definitional framework established for ecocide, these crimes can be investigated and prosecuted as ecocide. Hopefully, in the upcoming decades, we will see real examples of the ecocide legislation in “action”, as more states are accepting enforceable domestic laws. In the following sections, I will concentrate on the difficulties and challenges that law enforcement agencies face in investigating environmental crimes, particularly those that are transnational in nature, emphasising the importance of eco-policing.

Challenges identified in policing ecocide

The law often trails behind the behaviours and phenomena emerging in society, as law-making tends to follow developments. This pattern is evident in the current context, and it is debatable how much the creation of additional multilateral environmental agreements would resolve existing environmental issues. Increasingly, there is a perspective that further legislation is unnecessary, and instead, the focus should be on effectively implementing and enforcing existing instruments. Typically, international legal instruments contain provisions regarding liability or legal consequences for environmental crimes. However, there are no uniform provisions in this regard, as each state protects its native animal and plant species under its own national regulations. In most cases, international conventions, such as the CITES,⁴ only declare the application of negative legal consequences. However, in cases involving crimes against the environment and wildlife, sanctions vary in different states, from imprisonment to the death penalty,⁵ which may be imposed as a last resort. The range of adverse legal consequences applied by national criminal law is therefore varied, ranging from fines to various forms of imprisonment. However, some states are trying to curb rampant poaching with increasingly severe penalties. In addressing environmental crimes, criminal law, civil law and administrative law all have their place, but none of them is sufficient on its own; therefore, there is a definite need for a “last resort”, namely the tools of criminal law (GÖRGÉNYI 2018: 64–67).

⁴ Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (Washington, D.C. 1973–1975).

⁵ Some countries introduced the most serious sanctions against poachers (Kenya, 2018) or adopted a shoot-to-kill policy against poachers (Botswana, Namibia).

Challenges of investigating environmental crimes and the possible effects of criminalising ecocide

Climate change, ecological despair and crime

The work of law enforcement agencies and the police has been continuously influenced by social, cultural, political, economic, and ecological developments. Nowadays, climate change and environmental degradation are the primary challenges confronting humanity and nations. As the human environment begins to change dynamically, policing actors are increasingly involved in nature, wildlife and environmental conservation efforts. Climate change affects various organisations differently, but it is undeniable that negative environmental impacts will directly and indirectly influence law enforcement agencies, including police work. These impacts include resource scarcity, extreme weather events caused by climate change and global warming, climate refugees, and water shortages. In fact, the exact effects of ecological disasters on law enforcement agencies are not yet fully understood. However, in recent decades, there has been an increasing focus on research into the criminogenic effects of climate change. Climate change is not just a threat multiplier, but also brings new challenges for policing. These challenges will not only appear at the organisational level, but also at the societal and individual levels (MATCZAK-BERGH 2023: 1–6). Climate change generates new social tensions and exacerbates existing conflicts. In this regard, it also influences the nature and pattern of crime. The scarcity of natural resources, the wave of refugees triggered by climate change, and increasing economic instability are contributing to a rise in crime, creating new challenges for crime prevention and the administration of justice (IRK 2025: 351–352). For a long time, criminal law has played only a limited role in addressing climate change. Some authors attribute this to dogmatic problems, as climate change can often be traced back to the behaviour of companies and their combined impact, and some of these actions are socially beneficial and indispensable. At the same time, changing perceptions of the environment, its increased value, and its connection to human rights have enabled the expansion of environmental criminal law (JACSÓ 2025: 365–367).

Criminological studies have already highlighted the correlation between climate change and crime. One area of examination was the link between high temperatures and violent crime. There are increased levels of aggression in hot conditions, “with such aggression having a violent, emotional basis associated with hostility towards a target” (WHITE 2017: 245). Heat can also contribute to collective violence, including riots and mob violence. Based on research, higher temperatures increase the tendency toward aggression, and thus, the number of violent crimes is also expected to rise. Furthermore, as a result of ecological changes, citizens are expected to fight over diminishing resources, including water and other basic human necessities. These social tensions could lead to an increase in crime (WHITE 2017: 243–247). *Per definitionem*, ecocide can appear in the form of corporate crime, as one of the main goals in the criminalisation of ecocide is to hold those responsible who violate climate laws and are responsible for pollution. So far, it seems, those who are primarily responsible for causing the adverse ecological changes “are also

those least likely (at least initially) to suffer the consequences of climate change” (WHITE 2017: 249).

Criminalising ecocide would be an important step to draw attention to environmental crimes and to generate institutional responses. Furthermore, criminalising ecocide provides an opportunity to investigate climate and environmental crimes more effectively (GODWIN 2024: 18). Ranking ecocide as the highest of crimes, elevating it to the international crimes, would undoubtedly generate legal follow-up at the state level in the international community. This scenario will only happen if the amendment of the ICC’s Rome Statute is successful and ecocide finds its way into the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. In many cases, the implementation of the MEAs⁶ is weak, demolishing the goals set in the primary sources of interstate environmental cooperation. As a result, a hard law background for ecocide would definitely raise the bar of environmental protection, pressuring the states to implement legislation in force. By introducing a real, enforceable ecocide legislation, such a step might “curtail the impacts of humanitarian crises with environmental origins because then we would have the required diligence or policing, prioritisation of capacity, investigation-led data and judicial enforcement” (CHIN 2021).

Environmental crimes and policing

Detecting environmental crimes presents challenges for law enforcement agencies and police. Based on international trends, these challenges may include, among others: 1. the specialised expertise needed to investigate and detect environmental crimes; 2. difficulties in cooperation between law enforcement agencies in different countries when the case or act is international in scope; 3. forum-shopping; 4. the willingness to investigate. An international response is crucial in addressing environmental crimes. In case of environmental crimes, latency still occurs in many instances. If we examine the number of environmental crimes investigated in a year, we can see a clear disproportion between the actual state of affairs in ecology and the counteraction to such crimes. It is characteristic of environmental criminal law that the defined crimes are general or framework-like, which are filled with content by other legal regulations. Another problematic factor may be the determination of “guilt” relevant to the action committed (IGOREVICH GOLUBEV et al. 2020: 533–535). As a result of the organisation’s work, including that of Interpol, a more effective structure has been developed to support countries in the fields of policing, customs, prosecution and the judiciary. In the case of wildlife crime in particular, buyer and consumer awareness is especially important and complements the work of law enforcement agencies. Reducing demand can be an effective tool in reducing some environmental crimes, including poaching and illegal logging. The international efforts, particularly in relation to the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC), have significantly contributed to combating wildlife and forest crimes, especially in developing source countries (NELLEMANN et al. 2014).

⁶ MEA: Multilateral Environmental Agreements.

Eco-policing and eco-cops

In response to environmental challenges and climate change, and to foster the sustainable development model, a new form of policing has emerged, the so-called “eco-policing”. Green policing and eco-policing are interconnected terms, both referring to the ecological “turn” in law enforcement. While “green policing” concentrates on sustainable internal police activities, “eco-policing” relates to proactive environmental law enforcement. In comparison to traditional policing, eco-policing emphasises the “harmonious development of humans and nature”. The key strategies of eco-policing are prevention, punishment and management. In practice, it highly relies on police coordination, department coordination and public participation. The primary objective of eco-policing is to protect the environment and the economy (XU et al. 2025: 1). In scholarly publications, the term “eco-cop” was first used by Philip Arthur Njuguna Mwanika in relation to environmental policing in Eastern Africa in 2010 (MWANIKA 2010). Based on the definition, eco-cops are “police officers equipped with the knowledge, skills that foster pro-environmental and pro-climate behaviour, and the mindset necessary to address the cascading effects of the triple planetary crisis, among them the climate crisis” (MATCZAK 2025: 93).

Law enforcement agencies play a vital role in ensuring community safety, fostering climate resilience, and adapting to the effects of climate change. There is only limited literature on the greening attitude within the police organisational system, especially regarding the individual level. The concept of pro-environmental behaviour (PEB) has been intensively researched over the last few decades, primarily in a limited scope, focusing on law enforcement agencies and police forces. Ecological education is crucial for the effective policing of environmental crimes. Green education not only highlights various environmental and climate issues but also enables students to assess and even critique different approaches, making them more aware and sensitive to environmental problems and challenges. In most countries, environmental education remains limited in police academies, resulting in police officers lacking the understanding, skills and experience necessary for effective inspection, investigation and multi-agency collaboration in response to environmental issues. It is essential to recognise that not all police officers need to be experts on ecological issues, but specialisation in environmental law enforcement is necessary. The establishment of dedicated green police units can be a great solution to provide the necessary knowledge, attention and force to investigate such crimes. Another issue that tests law enforcement agencies is the proliferation of environmental and climate legislation. So, even though the police officers hold the required knowledge in theory, it is a challenging task to apply the law in practice. Furthermore, not only is pure environmental knowledge important, but police officers also need to understand the scientific and social implications and challenges (MATCZAK 2025: 96–98).

Closing remarks on the future enforceability of ecocide and eco-policing

Although many realised that without a healthy Earth, humanity will fail, only a few achievements were made towards a sustainable future. The new legal concepts, such as ecocide, aim to provide an enforceable legal basis to punish the biggest polluters and those who harm the environment through committing environmental crimes. Environmental crime, particularly transboundary (international) environmental crime, poses a substantial challenge to law enforcement agencies and police work. In the coming years, new challenges from climate change, such as resource scarcity and climate-induced migration, will exacerbate the existing threats. The new Environmental Crime Directive has definitely “raised the bar” for the MSs of the European Union, and modifying criminal law is necessary to comply with the new regulations. It will be interesting to see how ecocide (in the form of the so-called qualified offences) will appear in the environmental criminal legislation of Member States. Finally, we witness not just the rise of environmental crime, but the rise of efforts to criminalise serious environmental harm and ecological degradation. However, it is essential to recognise that without effective implementation, the law in its pure form is unable to fully mitigate the adverse effects of climate change and biodiversity loss. Law enforcement agencies face crucial challenges in the midst of environmental degradation. Some recommendations that can foster the detection of environmental crime are as follows: support of ecological education at police academies and within law enforcement agencies; the establishment of specialised units within law enforcement agencies; strengthen the power and resources of existing environmental units; intensive cooperation with international organisations and law enforcement agencies from other states; and support for social awareness of ecological issues in general. The following decades might bring the era of eco-policing, but until then, the proper use of current resources is necessary to combat environmental crimes. In conclusion, the future enforceability of ecocide will largely depend on the EU Member States’ commitment to implement the Environmental Crime Directive and develop eco-policing capacities.

References

- BEE MAN, Randal (1995): Friends of the Land and the Rise of Environmentalism, 1940–1954. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 8(1), 1–16. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02286398>
- BODNÁR, László (1974): Az „ekocídium” kérdéséről [On the Issue of Ecocide]. *Jogtudományi Közöny*, 29, 230–239.
- CHIN, Shirleen (2021): Ecocide Law: The Use of Hard Law to Complement Soft Law. *Harvard International Law Journal*, 13 May 2021. Online: <https://journals.law.harvard.edu/ilj/2021/05/ecocide-law-the-use-of-hard-law-to-complement-soft-law/>
- CLOSE, Josepha (2024). Articulating Ecocide and Qualified Environmental Offences under the Environmental Crime Directive (Part 2). *International Law Blog*, 18 November 2024. Online: <https://internationallaw.blog/2024/11/18/articulating-ecocide-and-qualified-environmental-offences-under-the-environmental-crime-directive-part-2/>

- Directive (EU) 2024/1203 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law and Replacing Directives 2008/99/EC and 2009/123/EC (11 April 2024) OJ L, 2024/1203 30.4.2024.
- Ecocide Law (2025): *Ecocide / Serious Environmental Crimes in National Jurisdictions*. Online: <https://ecocidelaw.com/existing-ecocide-laws/>
- ELIA, Vincenzo (2025): Ecocide to Effectively Stimulate the Integration of International Environmental and Criminal Laws. *Asian Journal of International Law*, (First View), 1–12. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2044251325100702>
- ELLIOTT, Lorraine (2012): Fighting Transnational Environmental Crime. *Journal of International Affairs*, 66(1), 87–104.
- Europol (2025): *Environmental Crime*. Online: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/crime-areas/environmental-crime>
- FALK, Richard (1973): Environmental Warfare and Ecocide – Facts, Appraisal, and Proposals. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 4(1), 80–96. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1177/096701067300400105>
- GIBBS, Carole – BORATTO, Rachel (2017): Environmental Crime. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.013.269>
- GODWIN, Eleanor L. (2024): *Towards an Effective Law of Ecocide: Identifying and Assessing Domestic and International Contradictions in Environmental Law and Regulation*. PhD Thesis. University of Liverpool. Online: https://livrepository.liverpool.ac.uk/3189605/1/201231742_July2024.pdf
- GÖRGÉNYI, Ilona (2018): Környezetvédelmi büntetőjog az európai elvárásokra figyelemmel [Environmental Criminal Law with Regard to European Requirements]. *Agrár- és Környezetjog*, (25), 46–80. Online: <https://doi.org/10.21029/JAEL.2018.25.46>
- HIGGINS, Polly (2016): *Eradicating Ecocide. Laws and Governance to Stop the Destruction of the Planet*. London: Shephard-Walwyn.
- IGOREVICH GOLUBEV, Stanislav – VIKTOROVNA GRACHEVA, Julia – VLADIMIROVICH MALIKOV, Sergey – IVANOVICH CHUCHAEV, Alexander (2020): Environmental Crimes: Law Enforcement Issues. *Caspian Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 18(5), 533–540. Online: <https://doi.org/10.22124/cjes.2020.4483>
- Interpol (2025): *Our Response to Environmental Crime*. Online: <https://www.interpol.int/Crimes/Environmental-crime/Our-response-to-environmental-crime>
- IRK, Ferenc (2025): Éghajlati bűnözés mint tömegjelenség: Tények és következmények [Climate Crime as a Mass Phenomenon: Facts and Consequences]. In BARABÁS, Tünde A. – PALLAGI, Anikó (eds.): *Tudomány és praxis. Ünnepi tanulmányok a 70 éves Polt Péter tiszteletére* [Science and Praxis. Festive Studies in Honour of the 70th Birthday of Péter Polt]. Budapest: Ludovika Egyetemi Kiadó, 347–362. Online: https://doi.org/10.36250/01279_27
- JACSÓ, Judit (2025): Klímabüntetőjog mint új kihívás [Climate Criminal Law as a New Challenge]. In BARABÁS, Tünde A. – PALLAGI, Anikó (eds.): *Tudomány és Praxis. Ünnepi tanulmányok a 70 éves Polt Péter tiszteletére* [Science and Praxis. Festive Studies in Honour of the 70th Birthday of Péter Polt]. Budapest: Ludovika Egyetemi Kiadó, 363–374. Online: https://doi.org/10.36250/01279_28
- MALAKOUTI, Zeynab – HAZRATI, Mohammad (2025): Interconnected Challenges: Examining the Nexus of Environmental Crime and Money Laundering in the Context of Energy Transition. *Journal of Economic Criminology*, 8(1), 1–10. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconc.2025.100151>

- MATCZAK, Anna (2025): Eco-cops. In MATCZAK, Anna (ed.): *Adapting to Climate Change in Modern Policing. The Rise of the “Eco-Cop”*. Cham: Springer, 93–106. Online: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-97510-3_9
- MATCZAK, Anna – BERGH, Sylvia I. (2023): A Review of the (Potential) Implications of Climate Change for Policing Practice Worldwide. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 17, 1–8. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paad062>
- MWANIKA, Philip A. (2010): Eco-cop. Environmental Policing in Eastern Africa. *Institute for Security Studies, ISS Paper*, 215, 1–16. Online: <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/136679/PAPER215.pdf>
- NELLEMANN, Christian – HENRIKSEN, Rune – RAXTER, Patricia – ASH, Neville – MREMA, Elizabeth eds. (2014): *The Environmental Crime Crisis. Threats to Sustainable Development from Illegal Exploitation and Trade in Wildlife and Forest Resources*. A UNEP Rapid Response Assessment. United Nations Environment Programme – Interpol – GRID-Arendal. Online: <https://www.cbd.int/financial/monterreytradetech/unep-illegaltrade.pdf>
- SKINNIDER, Eileen (2013): *Effect, Issues and Challenges for Victims of Crimes that Have a Significant Impact on the Environment*. United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Online: https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CCPCJ/CCPCJ_Sessions/CCPCJ_22/PNI_Workshop/Paper_ICCLR_CJP_PNI-Workshop.pdf
- STOP Ecocide Foundation (2021): *Independent Expert Panel for the Legal Definition of Ecocide. Commentary and Core Text*. Online: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ca2608ab914493c64ef1f6d/t/67f539d588e9544792700921/1744124385734/SE%2BFoundation%2BCommentary%2Band%2Bcore%2Btext%2B2025.pdf>
- SZIEBIG, Orsolya J. (2021): *Vadvilág végeszélyben. A vadvilággal kapcsolatos büntetendő cselekmények nemzetközi és uniós jogi vonatkozásai* [Wildlife in Dire Danger. The International and EU Legal Aspects of Wildlife Crime]. Szeged: Iurisperitus Kft.
- SZIEBIG, Orsolya J. (2022): Ökocídium az uniós jogban – eddigi történések és lehetséges scenáriók [Ecocide in EU Law – Developments to Date and Possible Scenarios]. In GOMBOS, Katalin (ed.): *Az európai jog 21. századi kihívásai* [The Challenges Facing European Law in the 21st Century]. Budapest: Ludovika Egyetemi Kiadó, 117–134. Online: <https://doi.org/10.55413/561.A2200301.EUO>
- SZIEBIG, Orsolya J. (2024): The Crime of Ecocide through Human Rights Approach: The “Universal” Right to a Healthy Environment as a Driving Force Calling for Ecocide Legislation. *Acta Humana*, 12(2), 75–89. Online: <https://doi.org/10.32566/ah.2024.2.5>
- TEDx Exeter (2012): Ecocide, the 5th Crime against Peace: Polly Higgins at TEDxExeter. *YouTube*, 2 May 2012. Online: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8EuxYzQ65H4>
- THOMPSON, Sara T. (2023): The Convergence of Environmental Crime and Corruption: An Operational Typology. *International Criminology*, 3(2), 133–148. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43576-023-00093-2>
- United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime (15 November 2000).
- United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme (21 May 2014). *Illegal trade in wildlife: the environmental, social and economic consequences for sustainable development*.
- VAN UHM, Daan (2024): Transnational Environmental Crime. In SMITH, Susan L. – SAHRAMÄKI, Iina (eds.): *Research Handbook on Environmental Crimes and Criminal Enforcement*. Cheltenham–Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, 188–201. Online: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035309511.00019>

- VAN UHM, Daan – NIJMAN, Rick C. (2020): The Convergence of Environmental Crime with Other Serious Crimes: Subtypes within the Environmental Crime Continuum. *European Journal of Criminology*, 19(4), 542–561. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370820904585>
- WHITE, Rob (2017): Criminological Perspectives on Climate Change, Violence and Ecocide. *Current Climate Change Reports*, 3(3), 243–251. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-017-0075-9>
- WHITE, Rob D. – HECKENBERG, Diane (2014): *Green Criminology. An Introduction to the Study of Environmental Harm*. London: Routledge. Online: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203096109>
- XU, Ganbin – CHEN, Haonan – ZHOU, Lei (2025): Eco-policing and Environmental Sustainability: Do Smart Technologies Matter? Evidence Based on the City of Huzhou’s “Eco-policing” Strategy. *Sustainable Future*, 10, 1–10. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.101014>
- ZSIGMOND, Csaba (2024a): Illegal Wildlife Trade and Money Laundering. In POČUČA, Milan (ed.): *21st International Scientific Conference “Legal Days – Prof. Slavko Carić, PhD”, The Responses of Legal Sciences to the Challenges of Modern Society*. Novi Sad: The University of Business Academy in Novi Sad, Faculty of Law for Commerce and Judiciary, 317–328. Online: <https://doi.org/10.5937/PDSC24317Z>
- ZSIGMOND, Csaba (2024b): Organised Crime in International Environmental Crime. In KOVÁCS, Gábor – MÉSZÁROS, Bence – CZENCZER, Orsolya (eds.): *2nd Ludovika International Law Enforcement Research Symposium Conference Proceedings*. Budapest: Magyar Rendészettudományi Társaság, 338–345. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12944/24899>
- ZSIGMOND, Csaba – ZSIGMOND-SZIEBIG, Orsolya J. (2025): The Possible Effects of the New ECD on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law in the Member States of the European Union. In POČUČA, Milan (ed.): *22nd International Scientific Conference “Legal Days – Prof. Slavko Carić, PhD”, “Law and Justice” 2025, International Law and the Challenges of Contemporary Society*. Novi Sad: The University of Business Academy in Novi Sad, Faculty of Law for Commerce and Judiciary, 258–268. Online: <https://doi.org/10.5937/PDSC25258Z>
- ZSIGMOND-SZIEBIG, Orsolya J. (2025): *Ecocide – An Evolving Legislative Concept in the Light of Care for Creation*. Budapest: L’Harmattan – Pázmány Péter Catholic University. Online: <https://doi.org/10.56037/978-963-646-394-6>