

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019



Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

A STUDY ON CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTERS

AUTHORED BY - HARI PRASATH R.

Abstract:

In today's era of rapid industrial growth and global economic integration, corporations possess an extraordinary level of control over environmental resources and ecosystems. Although technological progress and economic expansion have yielded numerous societal advantages, they have also contributed to severe ecological degradation. Catastrophic events such as oil spills, hazardous chemical discharges, large-scale deforestation, and escalating air pollution have left lasting impacts on biodiversity, human health, and climate systems. Following such environmental disasters, corporate responsibility becomes a critical concern. Corporate accountability refers to the systems and processes through which companies are held responsible for their actions particularly those that violate environmental, ethical, or legal norms. In the realm of ecological disasters, accountability includes not only prompt responses, like cleanup operations and victim compensation, but also long-term responsibilities involving risk prevention, operational transparency, and the implementation of sustainable practices. Nevertheless, achieving meaningful accountability is often hindered by several obstacles. Weak regulatory structures, powerful corporate lobbying efforts, inconsistent law enforcement, and cross-border legal complexities frequently allow influential firms to avoid full liability. This matter extends far beyond merely attributing fault, it touches on broader concerns such as environmental equity, the protection of at-risk populations, and the obligation to preserve natural systems for future generations. From the 1989 Exxon Valdez spill to the 2019 Brumadinho dam accident in Brazil, both historical and modern events demonstrate the serious consequences of corporate negligence or operational failure. These events spotlight deeper concerns surrounding corporate ethics, regulatory integrity, and the effectiveness of international legal frameworks in managing environmental responsibility. This paper seeks to delve into the multifaceted nature of corporate accountability in environmental disasters, analyzing its legal, ethical, and societal dimensions. It will also address the persistent gaps in accountability mechanisms and explore potential reforms aimed at strengthening environmental governance and corporate responsibility on a global scale.

Keywords: Corporate accountability, Economic integration, Environmental governance, Operational transparency.

Introduction:

As global industries continue to grow and adopt increasingly sophisticated technologies, their operations also become more demanding in terms of natural resources and energy consumption. This escalation significantly heightens the risk of major environmental accidents. Incidents such as oil spills, chemical discharges, deforestation, and improper hazardous waste disposal are frequently linked to corporate practices, resulting in widespread environmental disruption. These occurrences not only harm fragile ecosystems and threaten diverse species, but also force communities to relocate, compromise public health, and contribute to enduring socio-economic challenges. In this context, corporate accountability involves the systems, values, and actions by which businesses are made answerable for environmental harm linked to their activities. This concept encompasses a wide spectrum legal, ethical, financial, and social, emphasizing that companies, regardless of their sector or size, bear a responsibility to protect the environment and respect the rights of those impacted by their operations. Corporate accountability entails both preventive actions such as integrating sustainability into operations and anticipating risks and responsive measures, including environmental restoration, victim compensation, and adherence to regulatory requirements following environmental incidents. The historical record of industrial development is marked by a series of devastating environmental events that highlight the urgent demand for stronger accountability systems. The 1984 Bhopal gas tragedy in India, caused by Union Carbide, remains one of the most lethal industrial accidents, exposing critical failures in safety management and oversight. In a different instance, the Deepwater Horizon explosion in 2010 caused a huge oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, causing significant financial losses as well as ecological harm. These examples point to recurring issues such as weak environmental regulation, poor corporate governance, cost-cutting at the expense of safety, and insufficient transparency in risk communication. Despite ongoing occurrences of such disasters, the enforcement of corporate accountability remains inconsistent and, in many cases, inadequate. Large multinational corporations often evade full responsibility through legal loopholes, lobbying power, and jurisdictional ambiguity. This challenge is particularly acute in developing nations, where regulatory institutions may lack the capacity or political will to enforce environmental protections effectively. Nevertheless, increased global advocacy, evolving legal standards, and the integration of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics in business practices are gradually

reshaping the accountability landscape. International frameworks, such as the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the growing use of environmental litigation, offer emerging pathways to demand justice and accountability. Through the analysis of key legal instruments, regulatory frameworks, and illustrative case studies, it seeks to understand the effectiveness of current models in both preventing ecological harm and securing redress when disasters occur. Ultimately, the study aims to determine whether corporate accountability can evolve from a reactive legal obligation into a proactive instrument for sustainable and responsible environmental governance in an increasingly interconnected world.

Corporate social Responsibility:

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Corporate Accountability are interconnected concepts but differ in focus and scope. CSR involves voluntary initiatives that go beyond legal obligations, where companies engage in ethical practices aimed at benefiting society, the environment, and their stakeholders. These initiatives can include sustainability efforts, community outreach, and responsible labor practices. Corporate Accountability, on the other hand, centers on the company's obligation to answer for its actions, particularly when they negatively affect the environment or society, through both legal and social mechanisms. While CSR is often a proactive approach to prevent harm, corporate accountability ensures companies are held responsible for their actions, especially when they fail to meet CSR goals. CSR can help reduce the need for corporate accountability by addressing issues before they escalate into legal violations, but when failures occur, accountability measures such as penalties, lawsuits, and public backlash are enforced. Essentially, CSR can be viewed as a company's attempt to self-regulate, ensuring that its operations are socially responsible and aligned with public expectations. However, when these efforts fall short, accountability steps in to hold the company answerable, ensuring that businesses not only fulfill their legal obligations but also maintain ethical and socially responsible practices. By integrating both CSR and accountability, companies can foster a positive reputation, mitigate risks, and contribute to sustainable development while avoiding potential harm to their stakeholders and the environment. Companies that embrace corporate responsibility not only fulfill their legal obligations but also foster trust by taking proactive steps to benefit society and the environment, creating long-term value for both stakeholders and the world at large.

Legal and Regulatory Framework:

Corporate accountability in relation to environmental disasters is shaped by both international and domestic legal frameworks. Globally, agreements like the **Paris Agreement** and the **Basel Convention** promote the protection of the environment, encouraging nations to impose regulations on corporate actions, but the enforcement of these frameworks largely depends on national legislation. Agencies like the **World Bank** and **OECD** influence corporate conduct by providing guidelines on sustainability and environmental performance. In India, laws such as the **Environment Protection Act, 1986**, and the **Water and Air Pollution Control Acts** empower regulators to monitor pollution and hold companies accountable for environmental damage, with further oversight provided by the **National Green Tribunal (NGT)**. Other important regulations, like the **Forest Conservation Act, 1980**, and the **Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) provisions under the Companies Act, 2013**, encourage businesses to integrate environmental considerations into their operations. However, challenges persist, including gaps in enforcement, corporate lobbying, and delays in the legal system, which impede the full implementation of these laws. Instruments such as the **Public Liability Insurance Act** and **EIA Notification, 2006** offer compensatory mechanisms in the event of environmental disasters, though these systems face issues like corporate evasion and delayed legal processes. Therefore, while India's legal framework provides a solid foundation, challenges in enforcement and political pressures often limit its effectiveness in holding companies accountable for their environmental impacts. Current legal frameworks aimed at holding corporations accountable for environmental disasters, both in India and globally, face significant limitations that undermine their effectiveness. One major criticism is the lack of strong enforcement mechanisms, with regulatory bodies often under-resourced and incapable of adequately monitoring corporate activities, allowing many companies to circumvent regulations. Overall, these legal and regulatory shortcomings highlight the need for more stringent, comprehensive laws that not only impose heavier penalties but also encourage proactive environmental management and ensure that corporations are truly held accountable for their actions.

Case studies:

1. Union Carbide Bhopal Gas Tragedy (1984) :

Environmental Impact:

- On the night of December 3, 1984, a catastrophic gas leak occurred at a pesticide manufacturing facility operated by Union Carbide in Bhopal, India. Huge amounts of methyl isocyanate (MIC) gas were released into the densely populated surrounding area.
- The immediate aftermath was devastating: within the first few hours, more than 3,000 people lost their lives due to the toxic exposure. Over time, the number of casualties rose, with estimates suggesting that over 15,000 individuals ultimately perished as a result of the disaster. In addition to the loss of life, hundreds of thousands of people sustained severe respiratory issues, blindness, and other chronic health conditions that persisted for years.
- The environment surrounding the plant was severely affected as well. Toxic chemicals seeped into the soil and contaminated local water sources, causing long-term damage to both the ecosystem and the health of the local population. The effects of this environmental degradation are still being felt decades later.

Corporate Response and Actions:

- Union Carbide's initial response to the disaster was marked by downplaying the severity of the situation and shifting the blame. The company's executives suggested that the gas leak was the result of sabotage, though this explanation was quickly rejected after investigations, which revealed significant lapses in safety protocols and maintenance.
- In the aftermath, Union Carbide did provide some compensation and financial assistance to the victims, but these efforts were widely seen as insufficient in relation to the scale of the human and environmental damage caused. The company's handling of the crisis was criticized for its lack of transparency and accountability.
- The situation took another turn when Union Carbide was eventually acquired by Dow Chemical.

Legal Consequences and Accountability Measures:

- **Penalties:**

Union Carbide and the Indian government reached a contentious settlement agreement in 1989, when Union Carbide agreed to compensate the gas spill victims with \$470 million. This settlement was widely criticized as inadequate, given the scale of the destruction and the long-term health effects suffered by those affected.

- **Lawsuits:**

Numerous lawsuits were filed by survivors and their families, seeking compensation for both medical costs and emotional damages. However, these legal actions were hindered by complex jurisdictional issues, lengthy delays, and difficulties in navigating the Indian legal system. As a result, many victims saw little or no legal recourse.

- **Ongoing Accountability:**

Although Union Carbide was required to pay a settlement, the legal consequences for the company and its executives were minimal. During 2010, seven of the former employees of the company were convicted of criminal negligence by an Indian court. However, the convictions were widely seen as insufficient in terms of addressing the full extent of corporate responsibility. Many critics argue that the penalties were too lenient, and that the corporation's actions were not adequately held to account, especially given the scale of the environmental and human toll of the disaster.

2. **BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill (2010) :**

Environmental Impact

- During April 2010, an explosion on the Deepwater Horizon oil rig resulted in a catastrophic spill, discharging approximately 4.9 million barrels of oil into the Gulf of Mexico.
- This environmental disaster devastated marine ecosystems, resulting in the loss of aquatic life, pollution of coastal habitats, and long-standing harm to local economies reliant on fishing and tourism. More than 1,300 miles of coastline experienced oil contamination, with ecological residues lingering in the environment for years afterward.

Corporate Response and Actions

- Initially, BP underestimated the magnitude of the spill. However, as the extent of the damage became evident, the company committed over \$20 billion to fund cleanup operations, economic reparations, and environmental restoration.
- To once again rebuild its public image, BP launched a strategic communication campaign and announced a few new safety measures and oversight reforms to prevent similar incidents in the near future.

- The firm also established the Gulf Coast Claims Facility (GCCF) to distribute compensation, though this initiative faced backlash for its slow processing and lack of transparency.

Legal Consequences and Accountability Measures

- BP accepted legal responsibility, pleading guilty to 11 charges of manslaughter as well as obstructing congressional investigations and violating environmental regulations.
- The total financial penalties and related costs amounted to more than \$60 billion marking the largest financial liability ever imposed on a corporation in U.S. history.
- In response, federal authorities imposed stricter regulations on offshore drilling activities, including enhanced safety protocols and oversight requirements for deep-sea oil operations.

3. Chevron-Texaco – Amazon Pollution in Ecuador (1964–1992) :

Environmental Impact

- Between the 1960s and early 1990s, Texaco, which later became part of Chevron, discharged over 16 billion gallons of toxic wastewater into the Ecuadorian Amazon during oil extraction operations.
- This widespread pollution had devastating effects on local indigenous populations and regional biodiversity. Contamination of soil and water sources led to serious public health crises, including increased rates of cancer, birth abnormalities, and other chronic illnesses.
- The surrounding rainforest suffered significant ecological degradation, with long-term impacts still evident today.

Corporate Response and Actions

- Texaco undertook a partial remediation effort in the 1990s and declared its environmental obligations met under agreements with the Ecuadorian government.
- After acquiring Texaco in 2001, Chevron consistently denied liability, arguing that PetroEcuador, the government-owned oil company and former partner, was responsible for the remaining damage.
- Chevron also engaged in a strong legal defense, aggressively challenging the plaintiffs and environmental activists involved, both in Ecuador and internationally.

Legal Consequences and Accountability Measures

- In 2011, a court in Ecuador held that Chevron was liable for \$9.5 billion in damages to compensate affected communities and restore the damaged environment.
- Chevron rejected the ruling, alleging corruption and misconduct in the legal proceedings.
- The company initiated international arbitration and launched counter-litigation, including a widely publicized case against American attorney Steven Donziger, who had represented the affected Ecuadorian communities.
- Attempts to enforce the Ecuadorian judgment in other jurisdictions—such as Canada, Brazil, and Argentina have largely failed due to legal barriers and jurisdictional challenges.

Internal Governance and Ethical Responsibility

Corporate accountability is also enforced internally through **governance structures**, such as boards of directors, sustainability committees, and compliance departments. Companies are increasingly adopting **corporate social responsibility (CSR)** frameworks and risk management protocols to identify environmental risks and implement preventative measures. Ethical leadership plays a key role here. When environmental stewardship is embedded into corporate culture and strategic planning—not merely treated as a public relations exercise companies are more likely to avoid harmful practices. However, internal controls can fail when profit motives override ethical considerations, or when whistleblowers are silenced rather than protected. Strengthening corporate governance with clear environmental accountability lines and stakeholder representation (especially from affected communities) is essential. In the context of globalization, many corporations operate across borders, making domestic accountability measures insufficient. International agreements and institutions have stepped in to address this gap. Frameworks such as the **OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises**, the **UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights**, and mechanisms under the **Paris Agreement** promote responsible corporate conduct globally. Though these instruments are largely non-binding, they serve as platforms for international pressure and can trigger national legal actions. Increasingly, countries are exploring laws that hold corporations liable for environmental harms caused abroad—such as the **EU's Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive**.

Media and Public Pressure as Tools of Corporate Environmental Accountability:

In today's interconnected world, traditional media and public discourse, especially amplified by digital platforms serve as powerful catalysts in compelling corporate actors to respond to environmental crises. Unlike formal legal or regulatory mechanisms, public and media-driven accountability is informal, yet often more immediate and emotionally resonant. This mode of accountability operates by shaping perceptions, driving public outrage, influencing consumer choices, and forcing corporate behavior change through reputational risk.

1. The Role of Traditional Media in Environmental Exposure

Conventional news outlets have long played a critical role in uncovering environmental misconduct. Investigative journalism, in particular, has brought global attention to ecological damage caused by large corporations—ranging from toxic chemical leaks to illegal deforestation. For instance, detailed media coverage of oil spills or mining disasters has historically served to inform the public, pressure governments, and even launch international campaigns against corporate wrongdoers. News reporting also provides a form of public record. When media outlets report on environmental negligence, the permanence of those narratives in the public domain can create a lasting reputational stain, forcing corporations to engage in damage control or policy reform. However, access to media coverage is often unequal. Corporations operating in underreported regions or developing countries may escape this layer of scrutiny altogether.

2. The Rise of Social Media and Digital Activism

In recent years, social media has radically altered the landscape of corporate accountability. Unlike traditional media, platforms like Twitter (now X), Facebook, Instagram, and TikTok allow citizens, whistleblowers, and activists to disseminate information instantaneously. This decentralization of communication means that **even small-scale environmental incidents** can gain traction if shared widely enough, often resulting in rapid public backlash. Digital platforms also enable **grassroots mobilization**. Hashtag campaigns, viral videos, and online petitions can gather global attention in hours, placing immense pressure on corporations to respond. Environmental organizations now leverage these tools to mobilize support, frame narratives, and demand

real-time corporate responses. For example, consumer boycotts against brands linked to unsustainable palm oil or plastic pollution often begin with viral social media posts, not formal policy advocacy. Importantly, this form of pressure is not always grounded in verified information, and it may result in reputational damage before a company can respond with facts or clarifications. The **speed of digital discourse**, while a strength, also brings risks of misinformation and superficial engagement.

3. Reputation Management and the Business Case for Environmental Responsiveness

Public and media pressure translate into tangible business consequences when they affect a company's **brand image, consumer trust, and investor confidence**. In an age where sustainability is a key consumer value, companies risk losing market share if they are perceived as polluters or environmental exploiters. Public outcry—whether in response to oil spills, illegal waste dumping, or emissions scandals—can lead to reduced sales, divestment by shareholders, and long-term damage to customer loyalty. To pre-empt or recover from reputational harm, many corporations now invest heavily in **crisis communication strategies and sustainability branding**. Environmental social governance (ESG) reports, green initiatives, and partnerships with NGOs are often motivated, at least in part, by public relations concerns. However, these measures are sometimes criticized as **greenwashing** superficial sustainability efforts meant to appease public sentiment without meaningful change.

4. Public Pressure on Governments and Regulatory Action

In many cases, media coverage and citizen mobilization can influence not only corporate behavior but also public policy. Widespread media attention to environmental disasters often leads to **parliamentary inquiries, regulatory reforms, or judicial intervention**. The court of public opinion, when loud enough, can compel governments to enforce environmental laws more rigorously or to impose penalties that were previously overlooked. Moreover, media-driven campaigns often build public awareness about gaps in environmental protection, such as the lack of clean-up obligations or corporate immunity in cross-border operations. In this way, public discourse becomes a driver of systemic change, even if indirectly.

5. Limitations and Ethical Considerations

Despite its effectiveness, media and public pressure are inherently uneven. Corporations

with strong media relations or PR capabilities may deflect criticism more successfully than smaller actors. Furthermore, media attention tends to focus on dramatic, visible disasters—such as oil spills or forest fires—while long-term, slow-onset harms like groundwater contamination or biodiversity loss may receive little coverage. There is also a concern about **performative outrage**. Public pressure can be short-lived, driven by news cycles and social media trends. Once attention shifts elsewhere, corporations may revert to previous practices unless formal accountability mechanisms follow. Finally, the power to shape narratives rests disproportionately with those who control media infrastructure or wield influence on social platforms. Marginalized communities affected by environmental harm often struggle to have their voices heard, especially if they lack digital access or visibility in mainstream media.

Conclusion:

The occurrence of environmental disasters linked to corporate activity represents a significant challenge that spans legal, ethical, and ecological dimensions. Throughout this study, it has become evident that corporate accountability in such situations is not dependent on a singular process, but instead involves an interconnected framework of legal instruments, regulatory institutions, economic incentives, media influence, public engagement, and internal governance practices. These components, while diverse, share the common goal of ensuring that corporations are answerable for the environmental consequences of their operations and take measures to avoid such outcomes in the future. This research highlights that **legal and regulatory approaches**, while essential, often prove to be inconsistent or slow to respond—particularly in international contexts or regions with weak enforcement capacities. Although **civil lawsuits** have brought about significant judgments in notable cases, they are frequently inaccessible to communities with limited financial or legal resources. Similarly, **ESG frameworks and investor influence** have emerged as critical tools in driving corporate behavior; yet, their potential is undermined by unclear benchmarks, selective transparency, and the misuse of sustainability narratives to mask harmful practices. In parallel, **media scrutiny and public engagement** have proven to be some of the most immediate forms of informal accountability. The rapid dissemination of information through digital platforms enables civil society and activists to apply pressure, challenge narratives, and mobilize collective action. However, the same tools can lead to inconsistent outcomes, short attention spans, and the risk of performative responses from corporations. Internally, many companies have introduced sustainability teams, ethical policies, and oversight mechanisms to address environmental risks.

While these initiatives may reflect a growing awareness, in many instances they remain surface-level efforts designed to maintain brand image rather than fundamentally shift corporate conduct or strategy.

References:

1. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387253605> **Corporate accountability in environmental degradation An international legal perspective on global sustainable practices**
2. <https://academic.oup.com/book/32022/chapter/267799075>
3. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1045235415000167>
4. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/21582440241266115>
5. <https://www.ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT2412364.pdf>
6. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8035611/>
7. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43621-024-00421-0>

