

REVISITING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BUSINESS AND ENVIRONMENT

Ipsita Roy and Ajit Kumar Behura ♦

Abstract: Economic development coupled with ignorance and careless attitude, have exploited natural resources at alarming rates. Globally, industry is responsible for more than one-third of the primary energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions. Regarding the question whether business has any obligation to help environment, it has been variously answered, sometimes in affirmation and sometimes in absolute negation. Over and above this dichotomy, another dichotomy can arise within the same individual depending on whether a decision is taken as a businessperson or simply as a citizen. The most popular endeavour so far, to dissolve this rivalry, has been what is called 'New Environmentalism,' where the business houses are encouraged to become green for their own profit. This strategy can yield good results but practical application of it comes to a grinding halt when the profitability of the organisation is at stake. Thus the attempt to dissolve the rivalry between business and environment has not been absolutely successful. The problem seems to be one of 'understanding' as well as 'attitude,' as the 'businessperson-self' and 'citizen-self' are distinguished and made rivals. As far as environment is concerned, an attempt has to be made to merge the two selves into one 'pro-environment' self that keeps environment at par with business considerations and not simply as an 'add on'.

Keywords: Business, Businessperson-Self, Citizen-Self, Greenwash, Environment, New Environmentalism, Profit Maximisation, Role Morality

♦**Ipsita Roy** is a PhD Scholar in Philosophy (Environmental Ethics) at ISM, Dhanbad. Roy's areas of research interest include Applied Ethics and Cognitive Psychology. Email ID: ipsitaroy11@rediffmail.com. **Dr Ajit Kumar Behura** is Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, ISM, Dhanbad. His research interests are in Environmental Ethics, Ethics in Scientific and Technological Research, and Engineering Ethics. Email ID: ajitbehura@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

There was a time when murderers chose to poison their victims with arsenic. Who would have thought then that arsenic contaminated water will poison hundreds of thousands without the efforts of any assassin? Human lust for economic development coupled with ignorance and callous attitude have exploited natural resources at disastrous rates. Nature has given broad signals in forms of drying rivers, dying lakes, the spread of deserts, oil polluted oceans, changes in atmospheric conditions, etc. Only recently has there been an active inclination to lend our ears to the wails of ailing nature.

Human activity is greatly responsible for this condition of the environment, including global warming, ozone decline, nuclear radiation, air and water pollution, and industrial toxins. Burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil, gas), deforestation and other land uses (such as growing paddy rice) led to massive carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide emissions. Industry is responsible for more than one-third primary energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions of the globe.¹ This in turn causes anthropogenic climate change and poses serious risks to the planet. Though there is a host of activities that has led to the present environmental crisis, business is seen as a major cause.

2. Business versus Environmental Crisis

What obligation does business have to help with our environmental crisis? Business in general thought that as long as it engages in open and free competition without deception or fraud profit maximisation is its only responsibility.² According to Norman Bowie, "Business does not have an obligation to protect environment over and above what is required by law."³ That is, the responsibility of business, other than profit maximisation, lies only in abiding by the laws and rules imposed by the government and courts. Every other concern including

¹Nirupam Bajpai and Jeffrey D. Sachs, "India's Decade of Development: Looking Back at the last 10 Years and Looking Forward to the Next 20," *CGC | SA Working Paper Series* 2011, <http://globalcenters.columbia.edu/files/cgc/pictures/Indias_Decade_of_Development_II_CGCSA_working_paper_series_July_2011.pdf> accessed 31 Jan. 2013.

²Milton Friedman, "The Social Responsibility of Business," *New York Times Magazine*, 13 Sept 1970, 122-126.

³Norman Bowie, "Morality, Money, and Motor Cars," in *Business, Ethics, and the Environment: The Public Policy Debate*, ed. W. M. Hoffman, R. Frederick and E. S. Petry Jr., New York: Quorum Books, 1990, 89-97.

environmental protection therefore becomes an externality. To do more is according to this view unfair to business, since it affects profits negatively and is often impractical. Such a view today is insufficient, keeping in mind the environmental mess that has already been created. If the condition of the environment had not been so perilous, simple abidance of the law could have been sufficient. Further when environmental consciousness is developing and companies are trying to become green, such a view comes as a discouragement, as if the time and effort that has been invested by business towards a greener world has been a waste and could have better utilised by concentrating on financial aspects. It also seems to be a way of evading responsibility that in fact every human being should share, irrespective of whether he is a business professional or an environmentalist. It generates a false security that the responsibility lies somewhere else and all that is needed is to follow instructions. The inability to reverse environmental conditions so far is evidence enough that simply following laws set by the government is not sufficient.

Traditionally business activities have been overwhelmingly profit driven with little or no other concerns. This juxtaposition between business and environment has developed along the lines of the ‘Separation Thesis’, according to which, “the discourse of business and the discourse of ethics can be separated so that sentences like, ‘x is a business decision’ have no moral content, and ‘x is a moral decision’ have no business content.”⁴ It is such a line of thought that has been responsible for making business and ethics (including environmental concern) rivals and according to Freeman it has been implicit in most of business literature. It may be argued, however, that the separation thesis is a bankrupt discourse since it creates illusions in business practitioners that business can be either successful or good; that is, doing well and doing good are incompatible. The evidence has been forwarded by Collins and Porras that there are companies that are doing well or making profits in spite of changes in managements, developing new products etc. while sticking to their core values.⁵ Further, even if the alleged separation is admitted, ‘what is’ is not necessarily ‘what should be’. To claim so is to commit the Naturalistic

⁴R. Edward Freeman, “The Politics of Stakeholder Theory: Some Future Directions,” *Business Ethics Quarterly* 4, no. 4 (1994), 409-422.

⁵James C. Collins and Jerry I. Porras, *Built to Last*, New York: Harper Business, 1994, <http://www.jtbookyard.com/uploads/6/2/9/3/6293106/success_built_to_last.pdf> accessed 7 February 2013.

Fallacy. Even if the discourse of business and ethics are separate, it does not mean that they should be so. The evidence for this is the emergence of 'business ethics' as a specialised field of applied ethics.

Recently, there has been a change in the 'business or environment' trend with thinkers attaching more and more importance to environmental decline. Deep ecology based social groups like Earth First! and Earth Liberation Front (ELF) claim that corporations must go beyond legal regulations to pro-actively address their ecological footprint⁶. Some philosophers have included an element of environmental impact as a moral responsibility of business. Sagoff, for instance, argues that natural environment has value for its own sake or intrinsic value, and should be preserved.⁷ Freeman, Pierce, and Dodd on the other hand argue in favour of environmental protection because we do not know for certain that continued environmental degradation and over consumption would not leave a barren inhabitable land for our future generations.⁸ In other words, there is rising consciousness that government regulations are not sufficient if we want to make positive environmental changes. However this realization of the social groups and philosophers and their deep ecology based arguments have failed to impress the overall business community, where financial concerns still reign supreme. Thus, on the one hand, we have the Friedmanesque notion that 'the business of business is business,' and on the other hand the environmentalists' notion of giving priority to environment even at the cost of profits. The business based motivation is so strong for a business professional that the ethical stance towards the environment almost seems like a forcefully imposed responsibility and shall remain so unless there is some way to make the two notions compatible.

Irrespective of whether we focused on profit or on environmental issues, what remained common is a built-in dichotomy between profit and sustainability. The illusion remained that we have two options

⁶J. K. Alexander, "Environmental Sustainability Versus Profit Maximisation: Overcoming Systemic Constraints on Implementing Normatively Preferable Alternatives," *Journal of Business Ethics* 76, 2 (2007), 155-162.

⁷Mark Sagoff, "On the Value of Natural Ecosystems: The Catskills Parable," *Politics and the Life Sciences* 21, 1 (2002), 16-21.

⁸R. Edward. Freeman, Jessica Pierce and Richard Dodd, "Shades of Green" in *The Business of Consumption: Environmental Ethics and the Global Economy*, L. Westra and P. H. Werhane, ed., Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998, 339-354.

and must make one choice, either ‘business’ or ‘environment’, presenting itself in form of an ethical dilemma. Although the probability of facing such a dilemma stays, the chances of pursuing both ‘business’ and ‘environment’ has been grossly underrated. Even after business had become more accommodating to environmental issues, the perception still persisted that there is a trade-off to be made between profits and environment. Business leaders and environmentalists still saw themselves at odds, as if environmental considerations were barriers to profitability, and business activities and economic development were barriers to environmental improvement.

Historically business has neither been encouraged nor discouraged to engage in environmental activities. With increasing awareness, the responsibility of business to address the crisis has been more and more realized and it is undeniable that business has compromised, sometimes willingly and sometimes unwillingly. What seems to have remained from the separation thesis is the belief that environment is an externality, at best a moral responsibility and addressing it is a liability or a cost. The cost-benefit mindset of business evaluates every activity related to business as either a benefit or a cost to the organisation, in financial terms. Addressing environmental concerns is a cost in so far as it requires new strategies, superior technologies and consequently greater investments. The separation thesis may have been defeated in theory yet it leaves behind its trail in form of an inability to make environmental ethics one of the primary concerns of business.

3. Businessperson versus Global Citizen

Now, in addition to the society-made dichotomy already discussed, it may be argued that there exists another, more personal dichotomy, which one experiences within oneself. The two dichotomies are so intrinsically related that addressing one without the other would leave the topic incomplete. Even within the same individual there seems to arise a difference depending on whether one thinks of himself as a businessperson or simply as a citizen. The term ‘citizen’ may be broadly interpreted to mean ‘global citizen’. That is, citizen not of a particular country but of the earth. Unlike citizenship, global citizenship has to be realized and does not come simply by virtue of being born. The realization brings about a sense of responsibility for the Earth as a whole, similar to that felt by citizens towards their

country.⁹ An individual simply by virtue of birth, is legally a citizen of a nation but he might not have the realization of the duties of a citizen towards the nation. However, global citizenship does not depend on birth or any legal formalities. It comes only through realization of one's responsibility towards the globe as a whole, beyond all geographical boundaries. It does not matter whether we understand 'citizens' in reference to a particular country or to the earth as a whole; what is important is that we understand it in terms of consciousness of its duties and rights, and not from a legal perspective.

In the garb of a businessperson our main aim becomes profit making, while as citizens we usually take a broader view and do what is best for the community. This is one of the most important reasons for the age old rivalry between businesspersons and environmentalists. It is possible that the same person knows the importance and even supports recycling as a citizen and on the other hand sells products in non-returnable bottles because as a businessperson he intuitively uses financial measures to determine success. The dichotomy actually boils down to a more general dichotomy between preference and value.¹⁰ A preference is a statement about personal choice or desire while a value-judgement is a statement expressing opinion about what is right or good. When a businessperson concentrates on financial success, it is his/her personal preference. When the same individual contemplates environment-friendly measures in his/her business endeavour, irrespective of profits, it is an expression of his/her value. The former is an instance of thinking from the perspective of a business-person only, not as a citizen; while the latter is an instance of thinking from the perspective of a citizen.

It may be objected, that a decision in favour of financial success might not be necessarily a personal preference and might stem from a citizen's concern of national economic development. Similarly, a decision in favour of nature might also be a personal preference without any community based concern. Although it is difficult to point out exactly which kind of decisions stem from which perspective, it does not sufficiently show that the dichotomy does not exist. The dichotomy between the 'business person self' and the 'citizen self' of

⁹Diane Michelfelder, "Global Citizenship and Responsibility," *Macalester Civic Forum* 1, 1 (2007), 19-26.

¹⁰Mark Sagoff, "On the Economic Value of Ecosystem Services," *Environmental Values* 17, 2 (2008), 239-258.

the same individual becomes somewhat blurred since it is not clear, which perspective would lead to decisions in favour of nature and which in favour of financial profit. However, it may be argued that decisions taken from the perspective of individual preference alone might or might not be conducive to community, nation or globe. Following Kant, it may be said that, one would not wish that such a maxim becomes a universal law. From the perspective of a citizen, what is good for the earth might be at odds with one’s own preferences or interests and as such one might not have the motivation to act against one’s own interest (in this case, profits). Thus application would be restricted. What seems to be required is a fusion of the two perspectives, to take decisions not simply as a business person or a citizen but as both. The most popular endeavour so far to dissolve the rivalry between business and environment, through a fusion of the two perspectives, has been what is called ‘New Environmentalism’.

4. New Environmentalism

New Environmentalism refers to the business based motivation to act ethically. Worldwatch Institute published an article named *Doing Well by Doing Good*¹¹ which gave numerous examples of organizations that have flourished because by increasing the environmental contents of their activities they have been able to create competitive advantage that has been positively appreciated by the market. For instance, IBM Corp.¹² saved 4.5 billion kWh of electricity, avoided nearly 3 million metric tons carbon dioxide emissions and as a result also saved more than \$290 million. New Delhi Metro Services catering to 1.8 million people per annum is reaping financial benefits from the UN’s Clean Development Mechanism Scheme, under the Kyoto Protocol. It is the world’s first transport system to receive this incentive for cutting down greenhouse emissions by 630,000 tonnes per year.¹³ This rationale is also being used by environmentalists to encourage pro-environment behaviour of business houses.

¹¹Cynthia Pollock Shea, “Doing Well by Doing Good,” *Worldwatch Magazine* 2, 4 (1989), 30.

¹²“Global Citizenship of Individuals among Organizations across Society,” *IBM Corporate Responsibility Report 2007*, <http://www.ibm.com/ibm/environment/annual/IBM_CorpResp_2006.pdf> accessed 28 June 2013.

¹³“Delhi Metro First Railway to Earn UN Carbon Credits,” *BBC News South Asia* 2011, <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-south-asia-15056512>> accessed 2 November 2014.

Apparently there seems to be nothing wrong with making money while protecting the environment. Moreover, it takes into account both the environmental perspective as the outcome is environmental improvement as well as the business perspective as the motivation is making profits. It tries to please both the 'business person self' and the 'citizen self.' However the stress remains on the 'business person self' because the motivation is a business based one of financial gains. So, the strategy yields results only till there remains the possibility of making profit. The moment the company incurs some short term losses, the strategy would be abandoned, because the motivation is lost. Thus 'making profit' remains the actual aim and 'environment' becomes an 'add on', i.e., a mere supplement to the dominant paradigm of profit maximisation. Further, although environmentalists are sometimes sympathetic towards New Environmentalism, it leads to a violation of the basic principle of environmentalism. The arguments of deep ecology are based on intrinsic value of nature, that nature should be valued for its own sake and not for its instrumental use. Instrumental use of nature can take two forms, either exploiting nature for human purpose or preserving nature for human purpose. New environmentalism is of the latter kind while the traditional view that business has no responsibility towards the environment is of the former kind. However, neither is able to incorporate 'intrinsic value' of nature, without which environmentalism would lose its very essence. Thus the merging of the 'business person self' and the 'citizen self' is not homogeneous, there is undue stress on business motivation. Another important adverse outcome of this is the feeling that what we are doing is sufficient. While Environmental statistics is discouraging, business organisations with a slight incorporation of environmental concern for the sake of profit maximisation feel that they have done their bit. They now invest their time and energy for other concerns, satisfied that environment has been taken care of. This false sense of security acts as a barrier to innovative thinking and creation of innovative ways to address the dilemma. It is, however, important to mention here that these hitches do not suggest that 'New Environmentalism' is useless and should be done away with. It only suggests that it is not sufficient. We cannot give ourselves the pleasure of believing it to be enough to solve all our problems.

The problem is not so much with 'New Environmentalism' per se but the attitude with which businesspersons adopt this strategy. Economic goals seem to override all other considerations. This attitude can be exemplified through a number of instances. After the closure of

open cast mines, according to the rules of the Government of India,¹⁴ the entire area should be ecologically restored and made habitable. This is sometimes done in a half-hearted manner that renders the area useless for anything else. Again, least effort is made to incorporate environmental issues in project planning from the beginning. When finally environment is considered, so much of time, effort, and resources have already been invested that only the possibility of a catastrophic outcome is likely to halt a project. For instance, in case of the proposed hydro-electricity project in the Silent valley on Kunthipuzha River (Kerala, India), home to the endangered lion tailed macaque, only the combination of public outrage, full media coverage, international pressure and law was able to stop the development from going ahead.¹⁵ However, it is not always possible to have such a revolt, for every environmental issue. There are also at times attempts to ‘greenwash’ when business programs are cleverly disguised to appear sustainable, without actually working in environmentally acceptable ways. For example, Coca Cola, a world renowned beverage company was recently accused for environmental hypocrisy. It uses about 290 billion litres of water to produce beverages and has partnered with WWF to preserve seven of the world’s major rivers. It has also adopted stylish green cans which highlight company’s water conservation efforts.¹⁶ This shows that inclusion of environment has remained a liability, a cost of doing business. Thus New Environmentalism has tried to dissolve the rivalry between the ‘businessperson self’ and ‘citizen-self’ but with emphasis on business motivation.

5. Business and Environment

¹⁴Government of India (296/7/2000/MRC), “Environmental Aspects of Quarrying of Minor Minerals: Evolving of Model Guidelines,” *Indian Bureau of Mines TMP Division* 2011, <http://ibm.nic.in/Report_minor.pdf> accessed 28 June 2013.

¹⁵Timothy O’Riordan, “On the ‘Greening’ of Major Projects,” *The Geographical Journal* 156, 2 (1990), 141-148.

¹⁶Christopher Zara, “Coca-Cola Company (KO) Busted for ‘Greenwashing’: Plant Bottle Marketing Exaggerated Environmental Benefits, Says Consumer Report,” *International Business Times*, 3 September 2013, <<http://www.ibtimes.com/coca-cola-company-ko-busted-reenwashing-plantbottle-marketing-exaggerated-environmental-benefits>> accessed 2 November 2014.

The 'business person self' and 'citizen self' dichotomy is actually a dichotomy between the role morality of a businessperson and citizen, within the same individual. Role morality refers to moral reasons for acting according to role demands and obligations.¹⁷ For example, a father protects his children, a doctor treats his patients, a hangman hangs criminals, etc. The same individual plays various roles in society and acts in conformity with the duties of the different roles. There is no contradiction in the same person playing more than one role. In fact, it is quite common for an individual to play various roles, say, as a family man, as a professional, as a friend etc. However the problem arises when two roles demand duties that are contradictory to each other, as seems to be the case when the same individual tries to operate as a business person and a citizen at the same time. For instance, when an alleged criminal is being tried before jury, the panel of judges by law cannot have a member who is a relative of the criminal. This is because the duties that conform to his role as a judge would be in conflict with his duties as a relative (e.g., that of a father when his son is being tried before law). If the roles of a businessperson and a citizen are equally antithetical, then the problem arises. But this is often not the case. The roles of a citizen and a businessperson are not by nature antithetical, we make them so by considering one to be pro-environment and the other to be anti-environment. Claiming 'business is anti-environment' is like saying 'politics is a dirty game'. There is nothing inherent in politics that makes it dirty; the role of a politician does not include playing dirty games. Similarly, the role of businessperson might include profit maximisation but it definitely does not include anti-environment activities. The role of citizens, on the other hand, includes pro-environment activities.

The two roles can be made compatible when business professionals or business organizations consider as their duty profit maximisation as well as pro-environment activities; and most importantly when the latter is given equal importance as the former and not simply treated as an 'add on'. This is not as difficult as it sounds. It is important to understand that human beings are responsible for making them rivals; their relationship depends entirely on whether they are treated as rivals or as allies. Further, when the crunch comes, i.e., profit maximisation and environment protection become incompatible; the solution lies not in choosing one over the other, but in finding a way or

¹⁷Judith Andre, "Role Morality as a Complex Instance of Ordinary Morality," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 28 (1991), 73-80.

an innovation that would enhance both.¹⁸ This means encouraging pragmatism and experimentation in business that can continuously come up with newer ways to accommodate both profits and environmental concerns. It is human psychology to fear and resist change. Fine pointed out that resistance to change is inevitable and the management must be prepared to deal with it.¹⁹ So as long as the company is making profits, efforts are not made to move out of the comfort zone and address the pressing environmental issues. It has to be realised, as stated by Seth Godin, an American author and entrepreneur, that change is not a threat, it's an opportunity. Jan Van Dokkum, then president of UTC Power, a company of United Technologies Corp., lamented in a Thought Leader Commentary, “The biggest hurdle is simply reluctance to entertain new ideas. Leaders get comfortable with a specific business model and don't want to change.”²⁰ If present attitude persists then business people would intuitively give financial matters greater importance, but when understanding prevails that environmental matters are as much a part of commerce as accounting, finance, marketing and management; a change in attitude is bound to result.

The understanding may be made clearer with the help of an analogy. Take for instance, the dichotomy between the role of a mother and that of a manager. A manager has responsibilities towards the organization and employees while a mother has responsibilities towards her children. The role of a mother and that of a manager are not by nature incompatible, in the sense that it is possible to fulfil both responsibilities by the same individual. One role does not necessarily require doing injustice to the other role. But suppose a situation arises where she is not being able to balance both, and professional pressure is leading to neglect of her children. Now, she has the option of choosing one that is more significant to her and giving up the other. But if both are important to her, she also has the option of trying to

¹⁸R. Edward Freeman, Jeffrey G. York and Lisa Stewart, “Environment, Ethics, and Business,” *Business Round Table Institute for Corporate Ethics* 2008, <http://www.corporate-ethics.org/pdf/environment_ethics.pdf> accessed 15 May 2013.

¹⁹Sara F. Fine, “Technological Innovation, Diffusion and Resistance: A Historical Perspective,” *Journal of Library Administration* 7, 1 (1986), 83-108.

²⁰Freeman, York and Stewart, “Environment, Ethics, and Business,” <http://www.corporate-ethics.org/pdf/environment_ethics.pdf> accessed 3 May 2014.

find a solution that would not neglect any of her responsibilities. So instead of giving up one for the sake of other, she might decide to do extra work during office hours so that she does not have to take work back home and is able to spend some quality time with her children. The role of businesspeople and citizens may be treated in a similar manner, where it is not necessary to do injustice to any of the roles; in fact it is necessary not to do injustice to any of the roles. If and when the crunch comes the fall back may be an innovative solution that would not undermine any of the responsibilities.

A distinction is made in sustainable economics between 'growth' and 'development.' "To grow means "to increase naturally in size by the addition of materials through assimilation or accretion;" and to develop means "to expand or realize the potentialities of; to bring gradually to a fuller, greater, or better state."²¹ Growth in Gross Domestic Product (GDP)²² might reflect a country's development but it is definitely not all that there is to the concept of development. GDP is a gauge of economic performance of a country and an increase in GDP reflects only a progressive economy.²³ In general, development of a country is measured with reference to its economic development and human development. While economic development is calculated with the help of GDP, GNP, demographics, etc., human development index incorporates life expectancy, access to health care, sanitation, education, technology, risk of diseases, etc.²⁴ Thus overall development equally includes economic, environmental, technological and many other aspects. Similarly, it would be useful to make a distinction between profitability and overall success of a business. Understanding the distinction would bring the concept of business a little closer to ethics and a little away from hard-core finance, at least theoretically. Profit maximisation is undoubtedly an important part but not the entirety of a successful business. Success of a project is often determined through the triple constraint of time, cost and

²¹Herman Daly, "Sustainable Growth: An Impossibility Theorem," in *Valuing the Earth: Economics, Ecology, and Ethics*, H. Daly and K. Townsend, ed., Boston: MIT Press, 1993, 267-273.

²²GDP of a country is calculated as a sum of consumption, investment, government purchases and net exports.

²³N. Gregory Mankiw, *Macroeconomics*, New York: Worth Publishers, 2009, 18-25.

²⁴"Contrasts in Development," BBC 2014, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebiteize/geography/development/contrasts_development_rev4.shtml> accessed 2 May 2014.

quality. There is growing consensus about the inadequacy of this calculation.²⁵ There are other equally important aspects like pro environmental and ethical activities, consumer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, preservation of core value, professionalism, etc., all of which together should determine whether a business is successful or not. Thus be it at the level of a country, a business organization, or an individual, what is to be aimed at is overall development and not the growth of any one aspect.

Further, it has been shown that longest surviving and most profitable business organizations are the ones that do not have profit maximisation as their primary aim. They have a bunch of objectives, of which money is just one. They are equally guided by core values and ideologies and a sense of purpose. Most importantly they reject the necessity of abiding by the ‘either ... or’ imperative, and are most determined to embrace the “Genius of the AND,”²⁶ They have shown the way for the possibility of ‘business and environment’ instead of ‘business or environment.’ Their difference from New Environmentalism motivated business is that in case of the former the motive is not monetary profit which is the outcome; while in case of the latter the motive itself is financial benefits and as such falls prey to the shortcomings already mentioned.

6. Conclusion

It is true that, regardless of the reason when management gives importance to environmental activities, negative externalities decrease and society as a whole benefits. New Environmentalism has made very important positive changes in the society and is far better than the traditional outlook in this respect. Hence far from opposing, the former should be encouraged over the latter. But we cannot stop here and be complacent with whatever is being done. It is only the first step where change of attitude is motivated by the expectation of the outcome. This should be followed by the same change in attitude, but brought about by proper understanding and realization. The result would be a more natural and a more lasting change. Another problem arises in addressing the question about how the understanding can be

²⁵Jack S. Duggal, “Next Level Up: How Do You Measure Project Success? Rethinking the Triple Constraint,” *Project Management Institute* 2014, <<http://www.pmi.org/Learning/Next-Level-Up-How-Do-You-Measure-Project-Success.aspx>> accessed 2 May 2014.

²⁶Collins and Porras, *Built to Last*, accessed 7 February 2013.

brought about, from which attitude change is expected to follow. Initially the results have to be achieved by conflict rather than enlightenment. For instance, in the 'Chipko Movement' or 'Embrace-the-tree Movement' in India, people literally hugged the trees to protect them from felling. Conflict marks the beginning of a change. The next step, however, depends on the spread of change. The spreading of the change would not be possible unless the ones who are already convinced of the new way are ready to articulate their view. Childhood learning is the best way to bring about an environmental culture in the world, irrespective of whether the child grows up to choose business profession or not. Here comes government's role in making environmental education as well as ethical education mandatory in schools, so that the next generation evolves as environmentally conscious individuals. Business ethics that teaches all the components of a successful business, without undue stress on any one factor, should be one of the primary subjects of business education. When the aim is an overall successful business and environmental activities are given equal importance as profit maximisation, the conflicts between environmentalists and business persons would cease to exist, because environmental concern is no longer forced upon or dependent on some external condition (like increase in profits) but stems from inside through a change in understanding.

Thus, there are two dichotomies, one between business and environment and the other between role morality of business professionals and citizens. Addressing the former without any reference to the latter would be forcefully making the two compatible and they would remain compatible as long as the force exists. But if we try to make the latter compatible then the compatibility of the former would naturally follow. The latter can be made compatible through a change in understanding as has already been described. Government and media have a huge role to play in bringing about this realization and popularising 'attitude change'. However, nothing will yield results unless individuals consciously adopt this path. As Mahatma Gandhi stated, you must be the change you wish to see in the world.