concerning a party's compliance with the Convention. In practice, this is by far the most used and it greatly improves **participation** (Treves 2009).

References

Brown Weiss, Edith and Harold K. Jacobson. 1998. *Engaging Countries: Strengthening Compliance with International Environmental Accords*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Chayes, Abram and Antonia H. Chayes. 1995. *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with Treaties in International Regulatory Regimes*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Hedemann-Robinson, Martin. 2018. *Enforcement of International Environmental Law: Challenges and Responses at the International Level*. London, Routledge.

Maljean-Dubois, Sandrine and Lavanya Rajamani (Eds.). 2011. *Implementation of International Environmental Law*. The Hague, The Hague Academy of International Law, Martinus Nijhoff.

Sand, Peter. 1992. *The Effectiveness of International Environmental Law: A Survey of Existing Legal Instruments*. Cambridge, Grotius Publications.

Treves, Tullio (Ed.). 2009. *Non-Compliance Procedures and Mechanisms and the Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements*. The Hague, Asser Press.

Young, Oran. 1999. *The Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes: Causal Connections and Behavioral Mechanisms*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION

Jean-Frédéric Morin

Université Laval, Canada

Amandine Orsini

Université Saint-Louis – Bruxelles, Belgium

How should the environment be protected? Two opposite stances have addressed this question. Proponents of a conservationist approach argue that humans have to intervene on the environment to actively favor its sustainability. They believe for example that **ecosystem services** and goods provided by forests (timber, recreation, landscapes, etc.) can only be enjoyed by several generations over time if forestry techniques (species selection, logging methods, etc.) are used to ensure that cover and quality of forests remain constant over time. In contrast, advocates

of a preservationist approach consider that humans should shy away as much as possible from nature. They claim that management techniques often have harmful unintended consequences, while natural processes, such as wildfires or species extinction, are necessary regenerative episodes that should be neither favored nor prevented by human intervention (Epstein 2006).

Among the first conservationist advocates were hunters, farmers, and fishermen who, at the end of the nineteenth century, called for international cooperation to ensure the sustainable exploitation of natural resources and secure their activity. As a result of their efforts, several agreements were concluded such as the 1881 International Phylloxera Convention, which aimed at protecting European wineries from American pests, or the 1902 Convention for the Protection of Birds Useful to Agriculture, protecting insectivorous birds. Since the 1980s, several developing countries have endorsed this conservationist approach as a way of protecting their economic interests. For example, they actively support the 1992 **biodiversity regime**, which aims at favoring the conservation of biodiversity, its sustainable use, and the sharing of benefits that arise from this use.

Preservationist arguments have also deeply influenced international environmental politics. **Nongovernmental organizations** such as the Sierra Club and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds have pushed states to create protected areas to preserve wildlife. Several international treaties were concluded to promote the creation of natural parks, including the 1940 Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, the 1971 **Wetlands Convention** and the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage. In some controversial cases, the creation of protected areas on preservationist grounds led to the eviction of **indigenous peoples and local communities** from their traditional land (Adams and Hutton 2007, Ybarra 2018). Other preservationist agreements aim at preserving specific species irrespective of their location, such as the 1973 **CITES** and the 1979 Bonn Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals. These treaties are based on scientific, recreational, esthetic grounds or on **ecocentrism**, not on the desire to conserve natural resources for future exploitation.

In some international **regimes**, conservationist and preservationist views openly clash. It is notoriously the case at the **International Whaling Commission**, where Japan advocates for sustainable hunting practices while the United States and other countries support preservation and are opposed to all whaling activity, even for species that are not endangered. There are also heated debates under the CITES, as some African countries, such as Kenya, favor a strict ban on the trade of ivory while others, including Zimbabwe, argue that an unmanaged elephant population can negatively impact the ecosystem while ivory sales can fund conservation (Stiles 2004).

References

Adams, William and Jon Hutton. 2007. "People, Parks and Poverty: Political Ecology and Biodiversity Conservation." *Conservation and Society* 5(2): 147–183.
Epstein, Charlotte. 2006. "The Making of Global Environmental Norms: Endangered Species Protection." *Global Environmental Politics* 6(2): 32–54.
Stiles, Daniel. 2004. "The Ivory Trade and Elephant Conservation." *Environmental Conservation* 31(4): 309–321.
Ybarra, Megan. 2018. *Green Wars: Colonization and Conservation in the Maya Forest.* Oakland, CA, University of California Press.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Jennifer Clapp and Ian H. Rowlands
University of Waterloo, Canada

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) refers broadly to actions that **business and corporations** voluntarily undertake both to promote social and environmental goals and to minimize any potential social and environmental costs associated with their business activities. The rationale behind CSR is that firms themselves are best placed to ensure **compliance and implementation** and to monitor progress toward their own environmental and social performance targets and will do so because it makes good business sense.

The 1960–70s saw strengthening of environmental regulations in many states, and environmental agencies to uphold those rules were established in most countries by the early 1980s. With the rise of **liberal environmentalism** after the mid-1980s, however, state-driven "command-and-control" type environmental regulations began to lose favor with governments, opening space for more flexible voluntary corporate-driven approaches to governing the environmental impact of business and corporations. Initially there was some concern about whether firms that adopted CSR within their business model would be

able to fulfill their fiduciary duty to shareholders to prioritize financial earnings. This concern followed Milton Friedman's belief that firms' primary responsibility is to generate profits and not take social issues into consideration (Fleming et al. 2013).

By the early 1990s, business leader Stephan Schmidheiny, then head of the Business Council for Sustainable Development, an organization established in 1990 to represent the voice of business leaders at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit (see **Summit diplomacy**), began to champion CSR. He argued that firms must "change course" to put social and environmental issues at the center of their decision-making because he believed it was in the firm's economic interest to do so. He termed this concept "eco-efficiency." The rationale was simple: CSR would help firms to cut costs through efficiency gains from fewer required inputs and reduced waste, while at the same time the green image of firms would help to create new **markets** (Schmidheiny 1992).

Most global business leaders embraced CSR by the early 2000s and it became widely accepted in corporate circles that business knows best how to design and implement environmental measures more efficiently than one-size-fits-all command-and-control regulations. Today, many see CSR as a de facto condition for business success. Most international firms, including a growing number of firms in developing countries, undertake some sort of CSR-type activities, such as **reporting, labeling, and certification**, demonstrating how entrenched CSR has become as a normative frame in global governance (Crane et al. 2019).

Individual CSR reporting by firms is perhaps the most widespread type of CSR activity. Most transnational corporations now produce regular CSR reports. Self-reported CSR activities typically range from broad statements about commitment to "doing right" for the environment to details on specific programs or initiatives. Such reporting might be defensive in the early stages, especially for firms that are in higher-risk industries, or proactive, as is often the case with firms with high public profiles (Shabana et al. 2017). One of the drawbacks of individual CSR reporting is that firms can be selective in what they choose to report, shaping their own environmental image without necessarily meeting any externally set standards. For example, in 2000 the transnational oil firm BP widely trumpeted its green energy activities in a major public relations campaign "Beyond Petroleum," while the vast majority of its investments remained in oil and gas exploration in subsequent years. This type of selective CSR approach led to claims by critics of greenwashing.

The vulnerability of firms to external critique for selective CSR reporting was one of the factors behind the rise of collective approaches