

“You cannot escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today.” - Abraham Lincoln

Critically evaluate this statement by considering the notion of responsibility and the relative roles of business, governments and society in general in assuming responsibility for a more sustainable future.

‘You cannot escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today’ is quoted from Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth president of the United States of America. This essay will consider the concept of responsibility and the roles of business, government and society in general for assuming responsibility for a more sustainable future.

Firstly, let us consider what is a ‘sustainable future’. Sustainability has many definitions however for this essay we will define as the same as the Brundtland report in 1987, for clarity, which introduced the concept of sustainable development. It defined sustainability as ‘meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (WCED, 1987).

Steve Denning (2017), senior contributor to Forbes argues ‘what is the purpose of a firm? It’s remarkable that after a century of management theorizing, there is no agreed upon answer’. There are countless examples of when businesses actions have not contributed to a sustainable future or have disregarded the environment in their daily operations. Ecuador’s Amazon degradation, for example where more than four hundred million barrels of toxic waste from oil operations have damaged the Amazon Rainforest over nearly thirty years (Council on Foreign Relations, 2020). Moreover, in June 2020, a state of emergency was ordered by President Putin after 20,000 tonnes of diesel spilled into a river inside the Arctic Circle. This was caused by a collapse of a fuel reservoir at a power plant operated by Nornickel. Nornickel is a Russian nickel and palladium mining and smelting company (The Guardian, 2020). This same business is notorious for aiding the status of Norilsk as ‘Russia’s most polluted city’ (Luhn, 2016b) with events such as the Daldykan river which ran red due to industrial waste from a nickel-producing factory in 2016 (Luhn, 2016a).

Friedman (1970) argued that the only responsibility of business is to make profit. He argued that only people can have responsibilities and the business cannot. He argues instead that executives have direct responsibility to the employers. He argues that they must follow their desires which will generally to be to make as much money as possible. He argues that if the corporate executive has desire to help society, then this would be as a person in their own right. Friedman referred to this as ‘social responsibilities’. He stresses however that these executives would be ‘spending his own money or time or energy, not the money of his employers or the time or energy he has contracted to devote to their purposes’. He believes ‘they are the social responsibilities of the individuals, not of business’. Debeljak and Krkač (2008) highlight that ‘businessmen often say that their morally good deeds are reserved for their private lives, not for their professions’. For example Jack Welch, CEO of General Electric, argued that ‘your main constituencies are your employees, your customers and your products’ (Denning, 2017).

One example of a business that we could argue has adopted Friedman’s perspective is ExxonMobil, an American multinational oil and gas corporation. In 2018 it came to light that in the 1980s oil companies carried out internal assessments of the carbon dioxide released by fossil fuels and forecast the consequences of these emissions. ‘In 1982, for example, Exxon predicted that by about 2060, CO₂ levels would reach around 560 parts per million – double the preindustrial level – and that this would push the planet’s average temperatures up by about 2°C over then-current levels (and even more compared to pre-industrial levels)’ (Franta, 2018). They continued therefore to prioritise profit above their social responsibilities for a more sustainable future.

It is argued that businesses have a legal responsibility to make profit for their shareholders, which is used as an argument against businesses considering the future. Youmans and Eccles (2015) argue however that this is ‘ideology, not the law’. They found that ‘the law in many countries rejects the primacy of shareholder interests’. This is supported by Stout (2012) who argues that courts have allowed businesses large amounts of flexibility in terms of balancing their stakeholders.

Adam Smith (1776) in his 'Wealth of Nations' proposed that human's natural propensity towards 'self-interest' resulted in prosperity. He believed that humans ultimately promote public interest through their everyday economic choices. He believed that free markets were an 'invisible hand' which resulted in the best outcome, with little government intervention. We could note, however that this was authored in the 18th Century, and whilst international trade was occurring with the likes of The East India Company, mass industrialisation and the environmental awareness did not exist like today. Debeljak and Krkač (2008) argue that business people 'do not speak of egoism, and pursuit of self-interest, but rather of utility maximisation'. They describe them as 'enlightened egoists' as they should have 'other regarding interests in a way that he/she should use others as an instrument for their own ends'. Debeljak and Krkač (2008) argue that if it is necessary to be selfish as a businessperson, if it financially sustainable, then it must violate the human rights of others. They argue that this is 'incompatible with the requirement of being environmentally friendly and socially responsible, as is suggested in the Green Paper of the European Commission, 'Promoting a European framework for a corporate social responsibility' (European Commission, 2001).

Debeljak and Krkač (2008) go on to argue that there is a phenomenon where business is not held to the same account as other industries or organisations. They give the example of an architects. Every business is about profits, and 'in a similar way, architecture is about buildings'. However, they argue 'if a bridge falls down due to unprofessional actions by an architect... we would say that it was done unprofessionally...'. In contrast, if a business is profitable and 'at the same time with severe damage or harm to different stakeholders... it would be said that it is just business'.

In contrast it could be argued that a business must consider the future and must accept responsibility for more than profit. Greenwood (2020) argued that 'there is a lot that business can, and must do. I say 'must' because business potentially has the strongest influence in making the necessary change'. Kant believed there are two types of duty or imperatives. Hypothetical and categorical. Hypothetical imperatives, he argued, are when it is necessary to do one thing so we may get something else for example 'the duty to study is dependent on your desire for good grades'. Alternatively, categorical duties are ones that are not considering an end. They are 'universal laws of nature' (Bowie, 2017). Draper (2020) argues that change requires 'a number of players, and one of them is big business'. Draper highlights that businesses can use the Forum for the Future's 'six steps to significant change' to engage practically in a more sustainable future. Kingfisher's B&Q for example, encouraged the creation of the Forest Stewardship Council which is an international non-profit which promotes the responsible management of the world's forests (Forest Stewardship Council, 2021).

Freeman and Elms (2018) disagree with Friedman, they argue that 'the social responsibility of business is to create value for stakeholders.' 'That means its customers, suppliers, employees and communities, as well as its shareholders'. This would suggest that they believe businesses should consider the future, as per Lincon's statement.

Kant argued that 'any business practice that puts money on a part with people is immoral' (Bowie, 2017). Friedman however (1970) would describe these individuals as "Businessmen who talk this way are unwitting puppets of the intellectual forces that have been undermining the basis of a free society these past decades".

Some businesses consider the future. Yvon Chouinard, for example, founder of Chouinard Equipment and Patagonia clothing company made in the decision in the 1970s to stop selling pitons (*metal spikes that are driven into a crack or seam in the climbing surface*) because of the environmental degradation they were causing on the mountains. At this point Chouinard Equipment was the largest supplier of climbing hardware in the United States (Chouinard, 2006). Even today, Patagonia has a clear focus on environmentalism with initiatives such as aiming to be carbon neutral by 2025, selling 'worn wear' which encourages purchasing second-hand Patagonia clothing, and conducting studies on the environmental impact of their products in terms of microfibres (Patagonia, 2020).

Social Enterprises should also be considered in their role towards a more sustainable future. Social Enterprise UK (2020) defines them as businesses that 'aim to make a profit but it's what they do with their

profits that sets them apart – reinvesting or donating them to create positive social change’. One example of a successful social enterprise is Big Issue. Big Issue allows individuals who are having housing difficulties an ‘opportunity to earn a legitimate income through selling a magazine to the public’ (Big Issue, 2020). Some social enterprises do focus on a sustainable future, for example Energise Barnsley, which aim ‘to deliver community owned renewable energy and heating projects’ (Energise Barnsley, 2020). With the existence of these social enterprises, we could argue that perhaps business is a ‘moral community’? Kant suggested that ‘you should act as if you were a member of an ideal kingdom of ends in which you were both subject and sovereign at the same time’ (Bowie, 2007). Kant had an optimistic viewpoint of business in that he argued that because organisations are made up of people, then the organisations must treat people with dignity and respect, and must consider the interests of the affected stakeholders in a decision it makes (Bowie, 2007). Chell, Spence, Perrini and Harris, 2014 highlight that ‘some social entrepreneurs’ work may be imbued by a moral set of values from the outset but that this does not apply to all’. It could be argued however that social enterprises are not inherently ethical (Thompson, 2020) for example some entrepreneurs are ‘likely to accept profit-making as more than a utilitarian necessity’ (Peredo and McLean, 2006). Field (2020) believes however that ‘social should equal ethical’ as if this is not the case it may cause a loss in consumer faith.

However sometimes a business’ own perception of its responsibility to a sustainable future seems conflicted. It would be difficult to categorise H&M, the Swedish multinational clothing retailer, for example, into what its position is in regard to its responsibility. In 2019 H&M launched a ‘conscious collection’. H&M used ‘sustainably-sourced materials’ for this collection and advertised that they have ‘continued efforts, commitment...for a sustainable fashion future’ (H&M, 2019). H&M however, has been accused of business practices that would suggest that their executives agree with Friedman, and their only aim is to make a profit. They were accused, for example, in 2017 of burning 12 tonnes of new, unsold clothing per year (Hendriksz, 2017) due to excess stock. Moreover, their conscious collection has been labelled as ‘Green washing’ by anti-fast fashion campaigners, such as Venetia La Manna who argue fashion on this scale can never been sustainable (Petter, 2020).

So instead, is it the government’s responsibility for a more sustainable future? There seems to be a growing rise in environmentally focused political groups across Europe which would suggest that voters believe that the government hold a strong responsibility for a sustainable future. In the 2019 European elections, for example, green parties received a fifth of the votes (Pearse, 2019). It is limited however in central and eastern Europe where ‘green consciousness is spreading but has yet to break through into significant political representation’ (Pearse, 2019). Grant and Tilley (2018) found that Green support is highest among ‘young, university-educated middle-class professionals’ so this mindset does not yet seem to be widely held.

Some governments are considering a sustainable future in principle. 193 countries for example signed up to the UN’s sustainable development goals. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable development by the United Nations has 17 Sustainable Development goals and 169 targets. They aim to ‘build on the Millennium Development Goals and complete what they did not achieve’ (United Nations, 2015). The Sustainable Development goals links to the theory of Utilitarianism, which focuses on collective welfare. This philosophy aims for the betterment of society as a whole. John Stuart Mill, the principal theorist on this ethical theory said that ‘actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness’ (Mill, 1879). In terms of business ethics, it is argued that utilitarianism can be applied as choices that are the greatest good for the greatest number (Shaw, 1999) which could be aiming towards the targets of the Sustainable Development Goals.

The Economist, however, has called these targets ‘sprawling and misconceived’ along with ‘unfeasibly expensive’ (The Economist, 2015). Jason Hickel (2015), an anthropologist economist argues that the SDG programme for development ‘relies precisely on the old model of industrial growth – ever-increasing levels of extraction, production and consumption’. Goal eight, for example is to ‘promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth...’. Hickel (2015) argues that this is the ‘mortal flaw at the heart of the SDGs’. He argues that global production and consumption levels are overshooting our planet’s capacity by about 50% per year. It would seem Michael Green, Economist and Social Progress would support this who argues that a more sustainable future is possible but ‘not with business as usual’ (Green, 2015).

Greenwood (2020) also emphasises government's 'short-termism in policies to secure votes' and 'the ease of which policies are to be undone'. While countries have agreed to various environmental targets, it has not always meant that true responsibility for a sustainable future has been held. The Paris Agreement is a 'legally binding international treaty on climate change' originated by the United Nations on Climate Change. Its goal is to limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius compared to pre-industrial levels (United Nations, 2020). Under the Paris Climate Agreement, the USA had 'pledged by 2025 to cut its greenhouse gas emissions by at least 26 percent of its 2005 levels'. The USA is the second-largest global emitter of greenhouse gases (The Washington Post, 2020). In June 2017 President Trump formally withdrew the USA from the Paris Climate agreement. This was formalised 4th November 2020 (McGrath, 2020). Interestingly, perhaps contradictory to the argument that businesspeople only act in their self-interest, some CEOs such as Elon Musk of Tesla, Robert Iger of Disney, and Travis Kalanick of Uber stood down from Donald Trump's advisory board as a result of this decision.

Furthermore, if we take air pollution in the UK as an example. In 1956 there was the Clean Air Act which came in response to London's great smog in 1952. Since then, we can see government legislation and strategy in documents up to the current day. We can read in a 2003 DEFRA document that 'although the lethal smog in London and other cities caused by coal burning have now gone for good, air pollution remains a problem in the UK' (DEFRA, 2003). Seventeen years have passed with arguably little done by the UK Government. 2020 saw the first ruling of air pollution as a cause of death (Laville, 2020). This could be an example of evading responsibility of tomorrow, where concrete actions by the UK government could prevent some of the 64,000 early deaths in the UK every year due to air pollution (Bawden, 2019).

Unfortunately, often government and business are linked which may hinder government's ability or willingness to encourage business to consider a more sustainable future. At the beginning of this essay, Nor Nickel's environmental damage to areas of Russia was mentioned. Nor Nickel is owned by Vladimir Potanin, the richest man in Russia (Bloomberg, 2020). Potanin has been labelled by the US Government as an oligarch (US Department of the Treasury, 2018), which President Putin, a considered friend of Potanin, describes as 'those who use their proximity to the authorities to receive super profits' (Foy, 2019) but who does claim these no longer exist.

Schweickart (2008) highlights that all economists, regardless of political leaning recognise that 'market transactions can involve externalities...that are not paid for by the transacting parties' and that there is a 'role for governments to play in rectifying these defects'. Hawkin, Lovins and Lovins (1999) argue that government intervention works for example 'cap and trade' schemes. This is when there is a cap on greenhouse emissions and companies trade emission allowances (Environmental Defence Fund, 2020).

In terms of society's responsibility for a more sustainable future, Freeman (2018) argues the following: 'Stakeholders need to respond to these options. Consumers need to purchase responsible products and services. Employees need to choose to work for responsible employers. Suppliers need to provide for responsible buyers. Investors need to finance responsible opportunities. And communities need to welcome responsible entrants and help to sustain responsible incumbents'. Here Freeman (2018) is placing the responsibility on the collective. He argues that 'responsible capitalism depends on responsible behaviour from both business and its stakeholders'.

The philosophical theory of egoism claims that each person has but one ultimate aim: her own welfare in a descriptive sense (statements that claim it is the case). In terms of normative (normative meaning how people ought to act) it is claimed that 'it is necessary and sufficient for an action to be morally right that it maximize one's self-interest' (Debeljak and Krkač, 2008). Aristotle argued that all correct actions lead to the greater wellbeing of the individual human, this ethical theory of Eudaimonism (Aristotle., Thomson and Tredennick, 1999). Perhaps this is incompatible with a sustainable future if all individual's priority is oneself.

However, one could argue that even if individuals have the desire to encourage a more sustainable future it may not be possible. Greenwood (2020) highlights that 'making the right choice isn't actually all that

straightforward' providing examples such as unclear product labelling and high levels of advertising promoting consumption. Swistun (2020) supports this view, highlighting the difficulty for consumers in differentiating between 'actual sustainably sourced products and claimed sustainably sourced products'.

Rather than business, government or society's responsibility, perhaps we could argue that the problem lies with the current economic model of capitalism? Du Pisani (2006) highlights that 'as the Industrial Revolution was unfolding on the world stage from the 18th century... human progress was also linked to economic growth and material advancement'. McConnell, Brue and Flynn (1999) argue that 'the primary driving force of capitalism is self-interest' and that 'each economic unit attempts to do what is best for itself'. Kovel (2007) would suggest that sustainability and capitalism is incompatible. Hawkin, Lovins and Lovins (1999) agree and describe 'capitalism, as practiced, is a financially profitable, non-sustainable aberration in human development'. They introduce the concept of a 'Natural Capitalism' where capitalism is compatible with an economy which is not growing, or one that is growing sustainably, with resources and energy that can be reproduced. Schweickart (2008) however argues that 'a healthy capitalism depends, not simply on ever-increasing consumption but on a steady rate of growth'.

This essay has focused on the Lincoln quote of "You cannot escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today". Lincoln is perhaps most famous for the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, which 'declared "that all persons held as slaves" within the rebellious states "are, and henceforward shall be free"' (National Archives, 2019). At first glance this could be viewed as Lincoln following a Kantian philosophy of categorical duties. It has been argued, however, that Lincoln's motivation may be less of a moral motivation, and more of a political motivation. This instead could be viewed as a hypothetical imperative and therefore in Kant's philosophy have 'no genuinely moral worth'. Historians such as Foner (2012) have argued that it was a political and military tactic. By implementing the proclamation, it economically weakened the South by illegitimizing its main industry, which showed that despite Civil War Conflict, Lincoln and the North still controlled the South. Can we therefore truly use Abraham Lincoln as an example of moral responsibility? Despite questionable morals behind the decision being made, the outcome was overall positive. Perhaps we should focus on the actions being taken, rather than the reasoning behind their notion of responsibility, whether that be business, government or society in general in assuming responsibility for a more sustainable future.

With the climate crisis, perhaps the responsibility should be placed on all parties for a more sustainable future? Juniper (2014) argues that 'the Financial and business organisations so focused on their bottom lines must respond to what the science says'. In closing this essay, the following quote from Juniper (2014) could be applied to all parties, not only 'captains of finance and industry'.

'If in pursuit of their individual vested interests the entire system upon which they depend is undermined, then the short-term strategies they've adopted will not just be externalities picked up by society, but will pave a road toward the end of their demise too. If they allow that to happen then the only conclusion to be reached is that the captains of finance and industry have indeed constructed a suicide machine'.

References

- Aristotle., Thomson, J. and Tredennick, H., 1999. *The Ethics Of Aristotle*. Norwalk, Conn.: Easton Press.
- Bawden, T., 2019. *98 People In Every 100,000 People In UK Die From Air Pollution A Year*. [online] inews.co.uk. Available at: <<https://inews.co.uk/news/health/air-pollution-kills-64000-people-in-the-uk-every-year-268508>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].
- Big Issue, 2020. *About Us | The Big Issue*. [online] The Big Issue. Available at: <<https://www.bigissue.com/about/>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].
- Bloomberg, 2020. *# 45 Vladimir Potanin \$29.9B*. [online] Bloomberg.com. Available at: <<https://www.bloomberg.com/billionaires/profiles/vladimir-potinin/>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].
- Bowie, N., 2017. Business Ethics: A Kantian Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(2), pp.593-596.
- Chell, E., Spence, L., Perrini, F. and Harris, J., 2014. Social Entrepreneurship and Business Ethics: Does Social Equal Ethical?. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(4), pp.619-625.
- Chouinard, Y., 2006. *Let My People Go Surfing*. London: Penguin Paperbacks, pp.30-31.
- Coren, M., 2020. *All The Ceos Who Are Staying On Trump'S Elite Advisory Board After The Paris Climate Decision*. [online] Quartz. Available at: <<https://qz.com/997738/all-the-ceos-who-are-staying-on-trumps-elite-advisory-board-after-the-paris-climate-decision/>> [Accessed 2 January 2021].
- Council on Foreign Relations, 2020. *Timeline: Ten Major Ecological Disasters*. [online] Council on Foreign Relations. Available at: <<https://www.cfr.org/timeline/ecological-disasters>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].
- Debeljak, J. and Krkač, K., 2008. "Me, myself & I": practical egoism, selfishness, self-interest and business ethics. *Social Responsibility Journal*, [online] 4(1/2), pp.217-227. Available at: <<https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/docview/1012099756/fulltextPDF/E325B08DB9EE4F46PQ/1?accountid=130472>> [Accessed 19 December 2020].
- DEFRA, 2003. *Air Pollution In The UK: 2003*. London: Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs, p.7.
- Denning, S., 2017. *Making Sense Of Shareholder Value: 'The World's Dumbest Idea'*. [online] Forbes. Available at: <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2017/07/17/making-sense-of-shareholder-value-the-worlds-dumbest-idea/>> [Accessed 17 December 2020].
- Denning, S., 2017. *Making Sense Of Shareholder Value: 'The World's Dumbest Idea'*. [online] Forbes. Available at: <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2017/07/17/making-sense-of-shareholder-value-the-worlds-dumbest-idea/?sh=3952913f2a7e>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].
- Draper, S., 2020. *Creating The Big Shift: System Innovation For Sustainability*. [ebook] Forum for the Future. Available at: <<https://www.forumforthefuture.org/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=5092e413-2f97-43bf-bd7f-9f770d213ce8>> [Accessed 17 December 2020].

Du Pisani, J., 2006. Sustainable development – historical roots of the concept. *Environmental Sciences*, [online] 3(2), pp.83-96. Available at: <https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/185064/mod_resource/content/1/15693430600688831.pdf> [Accessed 21 December 2020].

Energise Barnsley, 2020. *About Us | Energise Barnsley*energise Barnsley. [online] Energisebarnsley.co.uk. Available at: <<http://www.energisebarnsley.co.uk/about/>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].

Environmental Defence Fund, 2020. *How Cap And Trade Works*. [online] Environmental Defense Fund. Available at: <<https://www.edf.org/climate/how-cap-and-trade-works>> [Accessed 11 December 2020].

European Commission, 2001. *GREEN PAPER: Promoting A European Framework For Corporate Social Responsibility*. Brussels: European Commission.

Field, E. (2020). Activity 3: Does Social Equal Ethical?. Discussion Forum Week 7. Sunday, 22 November 2020, 5:28 PM

Foner, E., 2012. *The Fiery Trial*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Forest Stewardship Council, 2021. *About Us*. [online] Forest Stewardship Council. Available at: <<https://fsc.org/en/about-us>> [Accessed 1 January 2021].

Foy, H., 2019. The Russian oligarchs are gone. Long may they prosper! - Putin gained power by neutering the old cadre. But new names have sprung up to fill their places. *The Financial Times*, [online] Available at: <<https://infoweb-newsbank-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/resources/doc/nb/news/1746FF8DD64A8EE8?p=UKNB>> [Accessed 20 December 2020].

Franta, B., 2018. *Shell And Exxon's Secret 1980S Climate Change Warnings | Benjamin Franta*. [online] The Guardian. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2018/sep/19/shell-and-exxons-secret-1980s-climate-change-warnings>> [Accessed 28 December 2020].

Freeman, E. and Elms, H., 2018. *The Social Responsibility Of Business Is To Create Value For Stakeholders*. [online] MIT Sloan Management Review. Available at: <<https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/the-social-responsibility-of-business-is-to-create-value-for-stakeholders/>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].

Friedman, M., 1970. The Social Responsibility Of Business Is to Increase Its Profits. *The New York Times*, [online] p.17. Available at: <<https://www.nytimes.com/1970/09/13/archives/a-friedman-doctrine-the-social-responsibility-of-business-is-to.html>> [Accessed 18 December 2020].

Grant, Z. and Tilley, J., 2018. Fertile soil: explaining variation in the success of Green parties. *West European Politics*, [online] 42(3), pp.495-516. Available at: <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402382.2018.1521673>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].

Green, M., 2015. *How Can We Make The World A Better Place By 2030*. [video] Available at: <https://www.ted.com/talks/michael_green_how_we_can_make_the_world_a_better_place_by_2030?language=en> [Accessed 20 December 2020].

Greenwood, J. (2020). Activity 3: What can a Business Do?. Discussion Forum Week 3. Tuesday, 20 October 2020, 9:46 PM.

H&M, 2019. *H&M Conscious Collection Launches Worldwide With A Sustainable Future In Mind*. [online] About.hm.com. Available at: <<https://about.hm.com/news/general-news-2019/h-m-s-conscious-collection-launches-worldwide-with-a-sustainable.html>> [Accessed 2 December 2020].

Hawkin, P., Lovins, A. and Lovins, L., 1999. *Natural Capitalism*. Little, Brown and Company.

Hendriksz, V., 2017. *H&M Accused Of Burning 12 Tonnes Of New, Unsold Clothing Per Year*. [online] Fashionunited.uk. Available at: <<https://fashionunited.uk/news/fashion/h-m-accused-of-burning-12-tonnes-of-new-unsold-clothing-per-year/2017101726341>> [Accessed 28 December 2020].

Hickel, J., 2015. *The Problem With Saving The World*. [online] Jacobinmag.com. Available at: <<https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/08/global-poverty-climate-change-sdgs/>> [Accessed 15 December 2020].

Juniper, T., 2014. *Capitalism V Environment: Can Greed Ever Be Green?*. [online] the Guardian. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2014/nov/26/capitalism-environment-green-greed-slow-life-symposium-tony-juniper>> [Accessed 19 December 2020].

Kovel, J., 2007. *The Enemy Of Nature: The End Of Capitalism Or The End Of The World?*. New York: Zed Books.

Laville, S., 2020. *Air Pollution A Cause In Girl's Death, Coroner Rules In Landmark Case*. [online] the Guardian. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/dec/16/girls-death-contributed-to-by-air-pollution-coroner-rules-in-landmark-case>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].

Luhn, A., 2016a. *Investigation Ordered As Russian River Turns Red*. [online] the Guardian. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/sep/07/investigation-ordered-russia-daldykan-river-turns-red-norilsk>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].

Luhn, A., 2016b. *Where The River Runs Red: Can Norilsk, Russia's Most Polluted City, Come Clean?*. [online] the Guardian. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2016/sep/15/norilsk-red-river-russias-most-polluted-city-clean>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].

McConnell, C., Brue, S. and Flynn, S., 1999. *Economics: Principles, Problems, And Policies*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin, p.63.

McGrath, M., 2020. *Climate Change: US Formally Withdraws From Paris Agreement*. [online] BBC News. Available at: <<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-54797743>> [Accessed 25 December 2020].

Mill, J., 1879. *Utilitarianism*. 7th ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

National Archives, 2019. *The Emancipation Proclamation*. [online] National Archives. Available at: <<https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/featured-documents/emancipation-proclamation>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].

Patagonia, 2020. *Environmental & Social Footprint - Patagonia*. [online] Patagonia.com. Available at: <<https://www.patagonia.com/our-footprint/>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].

Pearse, N., 2019. *The Irresistible Rise Of Europe'S Greens*. [online] Financial Times. Available at: <<https://www.ft.com/content/a535ed94-aa30-11e9-90e9-fc4b9d9528b4>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].

Peredo, A. and McLean, M., 2006. Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of World Business*, [online] 41(1), pp.56-65. Available at: <https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/203219/mod_resource/content/1/Social%20Entrepreneurship.pdf> [Accessed 16 December 2020].

Petter, O., 2020. *H&M Accused Of 'Greenwashing' Over Plans To Make Clothes From Sustainable Fabric*. [online] The Independent. Available at: <<https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/fashion/hm-greenwashing-sustainable-circulose-venetia-falconer-manna-a9312566.html>> [Accessed 28 December 2020].

Schweickart, D., 2010. Is Sustainable Capitalism Possible?. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, [online] 2(5), pp.6739-6752. Available at: <<https://pdf.sciencedirectassets.com/277811/1-s2.0-S1877042810X000R>> [Accessed 27 December 2020].

Shaw, W., 1999. *Contemporary Ethics*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Smith, A., 1776. *The Wealth Of Nations*. Edinburgh: Capstone Pub.

Social Enterprise UK, 2020. *What Is It All About?*. [online] Social Enterprise UK. Available at: <<https://www.socialenterprise.org.uk/what-is-it-all-about/>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].

Stout, L., 2012. *The Shareholder Value Myth*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Swistun, A. (2020) Activity 3: What Can Business Do?. Discussion Forum Week 3. Friday, 23 October 2020, 11:47 AM

The Economist, 2015. *The 169 Commandments*. [online] The Economist. Available at: <<https://www.economist.com/leaders/2015/03/26/the-169-commandments>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].

The Guardian, 2020. *Putin Orders State Of Emergency After Huge Fuel Spill Inside Arctic Circle*. [online] the Guardian. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/jun/03/vladimir-putin-orders-state-of-emergency-huge-fuel-spill-siberia-power-plant-kerch>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].

The Washington Post, 2020. *Rejoin The Paris Climate Agreement*. [online] The Washington Post. Available at: <<https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/policy-2020/climate-change/rejoining-paris-climate-agreement/>> [Accessed 28 December 2020].

Thompson, W. (2020). Activity 3: Does Social Equal Ethical?. Discussion Forum Week 7. Saturday, 21 November 2020, 1:54 PM

United Nations, 2015. *THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development*. [online] Sdgs.un.org. Available at: <<https://sdgs.un.org/goals>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].

United Nations, 2020. *The Paris Agreement*. [online] Unfccc.int. Available at: <<https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>> [Accessed 28 December 2020].

US Department of the Treasury, 2018. *Treasury Designates Russian Oligarchs, Officials, And Entities In Response To Worldwide Malign Activity* | U.S. Department Of The Treasury. [online] Home.treasury.gov. Available at: <<https://home.treasury.gov/news/press-releases/sm0338>> [Accessed 31 December 2020].

WCED, 1987. *The Common Future, The Brundtland Report*. [ebook] United Nations. Available at: <https://www.are.admin.ch/are/en/home/sustainable-development/international-cooperation/2030agenda/un_-milestones-in-sustainable-development/1987--brundtland-report.html> [Accessed 2 December 2020].

Youmans, T. and Eccles, R., 2015. *Why Boards Must Look Beyond Shareholders*. [online] MIT Sloan Management Review. Available at: <<https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/why-boards-must-look-beyond-shareholders/>> [Accessed 29 December 2020].