EXTENDED SUMMARY

The subject of this study is the normative-theoretical framework of green state power with a political practice that can be characterized as an ecologically responsible state. The importance of this issue has increased since the end of the 20th century and the first quarter of the 21st century, when modern states began to look for a foundation in political ecology for their claims to democratic legitimacy. On the one hand, states are trying to increase their capacity for actions to mitigate the impact of environmental disasters and adapt to environmental changes such as climate change, and on the other hand, global environmental change has exceeded the extent that nation states alone can overcome. Yet a legitimization based on the Westphalian model of classical sovereignty is not considered sufficient in today's societies. Therefore, it is important to show how state power has changed with the approach of political ecology. This study aims to evaluate the state power, in other words, the "greening of Leviathan" under the influence of various concepts derived from green political thought such as green democracy, green citizenship, green constitutionalism, green politics and environmentalism, which modern states use in their legitimacy claims. For this purpose, the term "green state" is preferred. As a matter of fact, it has become meaningful for Public Law to talk not about a liberal democratic state ruled by a green party government with a set of programmatic environmental goals, but about the normative theory of the green state with a political practice that goes beyond this and can be called an ecologically responsible state. In order to achive this aim, the power element of the state is analyzed by taking into account the historical background of both the modern state and political ecology, current political developments and the positioning of the state by political ecology. During this analysis, political ecology's criticisms of existing democracies, its core values and strategy are explained. In the light of its literary-philosophical origins and eco-criticism, it has been determined that ecologism has two main ideological versions as deep ecology and shallow ecology. In line with this determination, it is suggested that the main criticism of ecologism against traditional ideologies is the anthropocentric perspective of traditional ideologies. Today's liberal democracies shaped by traditional ideologies do not have an eco-centric structure that protects nature since both their intellectual foundations and

political life are anthropocentric. In contrast, green state theorists argue that two propositions - that the non-human is morally valuable and that this value derives in part from the non-instrumental value of nature - should transform the current modern perspective. In this context, the value of the non-human is not based on its contribution to human welfare. This paradigm shift, in turn, gives rise to two different views within political ecology that influence each other. These are "green state advocates" and "decentralization advocates". Unlike decentralization, the green statist view positions the nation-state as the main political subject with the authority to both make law binding on its citizens and to participate in negotiations with other nation-states in the international arena. The decentralist view is that there is no need for an institution such as the modern state, which means intervention in the order of nature. On the contrary, just like in nature, political actors can make political decisions on their own without being under the subjection of any center. At this point, ecologists, whether they imagine a society with or without a state, try to align existing political forms with ecological realities. Therefore, according to green political thought, based on the assumption of the "tragedy of the commons" put forward in ecologism to explain the source of political power, the legitimacy of power and its basis can be explained, just like the prisoner's dilemma in Hobbes' Leviathan. Indeed, unlike traditional theories of the state, harms and benefits will be related to the avoidance of harms and securing benefits for the earth's ecosystem, and will not be considered solely in the context of the individual's dilemma of avoiding or causing harm, as in Hobbes. Undoubtedly, taking into account harms and benefits will involve people, but it will not be limited to them. Taking into account harms such as the climate crisis, humans will consent to a state power that will not instrumentalize nature and will systematically and permanently take into account the advancement of common interests and well-being of non-humans. In addition, in a green state, which is based on going beyond being an environmental state and realizing the goals of political ecology, the duties of the state towards non-human beings other than citizens, future generations and actors including nature, such as the common interest of humanity, and the limits of sovereignty are also important topics of this discussion. Political ecology proposes to existing democracies that instead of the community of citizens of the nation, there should be both a sub-national, supra-national and intergenerational community. The extent to which this proposal can be valid and effective is

important. In liberal democracies that are based on the capitalist economy, ecological conclusions that open the door to more repressive governments such as authoritarian population policies, rejection of scientific data and anti-immigrant sentiments, as well as ecological values such as greenwashing can only be seen as a means of legitimization in international public opinion. On the other hand, proposals from the green state theory such as the trusteeship of the earth, the expansion of the concept of citizenship and the sphere of responsibility, and the placing of nature as a whole at the source of power within the framework of ecosophy are currently being discussed in the context of democracy, public sphere, constitutionalism and citizenship. This process shows that today's societies have not yet implemented a comprehensive normative framework for the green state, but have managed to impose a green version of the Leviathan.