



Columbia FDI Perspectives

Perspectives on topical foreign direct investment issues

No. 208 September 11, 2017

Editor-in-Chief: Karl P. Sauvant (Karl.Sauvant@law.columbia.edu)

Managing Editor: Matthew Schroth (mas2443@columbia.edu)

Corporations need to look beyond profits*

by

Lisa Sachs, Jeffrey Sachs and Nathan Lobel**

‘In theory, there is no difference between theory and practice. In practice, there is.’ This adage is useful in assessing Lilac Nachum’s *Columbia FDI Perspective*.¹ She suggests that society is best served when companies focus on maximizing profits rather than on their social and environmental impacts. In this regard, Nachum echoes Milton Friedman’s famous and controversial 1970 position.² This may be good theory, but it is bad practice. The real world is too far from the idealized world of Friedman and Nachum to let companies off the hook.

Nachum argues that, so long as corporations obey the law in good faith, they produce the most social benefit by maximizing profits and bringing goods and services to the market. This argument works under strong theoretical assumptions, mainly that market prices provide accurate signals of social costs and benefits. This is true only when markets are perfectly competitive, negative externalities and information asymmetries are absent and governments are efficiently providing public goods.

In practice, market prices pervasively diverge from true social costs and benefits. Market power is widespread, and firms exercise considerable control over their product prices. Negative externalities are rarely addressed through corrective taxation, regulation or direct negotiation. Governments chronically underprovide public goods. And many enterprises flout the law, knowing that resulting fines will be dwarfed by ill-gotten profits.

To correct inefficiencies, governments must intervene. But many corporations employ their formidable resources to drive legislation and block or roll back responsible regulation. In 2016, special interests spent US\$3.15 billion to employ 11,166 lobbyists in the US.³ This is not the work of a few corporations; it is near-universal practice among large firms trying to influence the law for private benefit. When disasters strike, stories of special interest lobbying and deregulation are rarely far behind.⁴

Even in a world of governments scrupulously correcting market failures, corporate profits could still be mal-distributed because of control failures within the firm itself. Nachum implies that profit-maximization enables corporations to contribute to society through shareholder wealth, taxes, jobs, and innovation. In reality, greater profits often lead to exorbitant executive pay⁵ (at the shareholders' expense)—even for CEOs dismissed for malfeasance⁶— as well as further efforts to avoid and evade taxation.⁷

Given the above, we propose the following standards:

- Companies should not aim to profit from negative externalities. Governments should induce firms to internalize externalities through corrective pricing or regulation, but the absence of government action or international regulation does not absolve firms of the responsibility to avert harms on others.
- Corporate law should ensure that directors' duties reflect a responsibility to minimize harm to the environment and to society, including through observance of workers' rights and environmental, health and human rights standards.
- Firms should refrain from lobbying for the narrow interests of the firm or sector, and legislation should restrict undue corporate influence on public policy. Governments should pursue the public good rather than narrow corporate interests.
- Investors should engage in environment, social and governance (ESG) investing, holding companies to account through shareholder engagement (such as the recent ExxonMobil shareholder resolution⁸) or by divesting from companies that do not pass ESG-filters.

Nachum is right that firms are evaluated based on their contribution to society. So, business leaders should consider why large companies have lost the public's trust. Firms need to stop self-interested lobbying, polluting, cheating, and feathering their own nests, to the detriment of the public and the firms' own shareholders. We need social responsibility throughout society, including in corporate boardrooms and C-suites.

* **The *Columbia FDI Perspectives* are a forum for public debate. The views expressed by the author(s) do not reflect the opinions of CCSI or Columbia University or our partners and supporters. *Columbia FDI Perspectives* (ISSN 2158-3579) is a peer-reviewed series.**

** Lisa Sachs (lisa.sachs@columbia.edu) is Director of the Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment (CCSI); Jeffrey Sachs (sachs@columbia.edu) is the Director of the Center for Sustainable Development at Columbia University; and Nathan Lobel (nathan.lobel@law.columbia.edu) is the Special Assistant to the Director of CCSI. The authors are grateful to Jacob Lipton and Olivia McFadden for their research assistance and to Klaus Leisinger, Peter Muchlinski and Rob van Tulder for their helpful peer reviews.

¹ "How much social responsibility should firms assume and of which kind? Firms, governments and NGOs as alternative providers of social services," *Columbia FDI Perspectives*, No. 207, August 28, 2017.

² Milton Friedman, "The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits," *The New York Times Magazine*, September 13, 1970.

³ "Lobbying database," *The Center for Responsive Politics*, <https://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/index.php>.

⁴ Juliet Eilperin and Scott Higham, "How the minerals management service's partnership with industry led to failure," *Washington Post*, August 24, 2010; Deniz Igan and Prachi Mishra, "Three's company: Wall Street, Capitol Hill, and K Street," *Vox Centre for Economic Policy Research*, August 11, 2011.

⁵ “Executive paywatch,” *AFL-CIO*, <https://aflcio.org/paywatch>. In 2016, CEOs of S&P 500 Index companies made an average of US\$13.1 million—347 times that of the average US rank-and-file worker.

⁶ Fox News paid US\$65 million to executives dismissed following sexual harassment claims; <http://www.newsweek.com/fox-news-payouts-rise-85-million-over-sexual-harassment-claims-587361>.

⁷ Frank Clemente, Hunter Blair and Nick Trokel, “Corporate tax chartbook: how corporations rig the rules to dodge the taxes they owe,” *Americans for Tax Fairness*, September 16, 2016.

⁸ Gary McWilliams, “Exxon shareholders approve climate impact report in win for activists,” *Reuters*, May 31, 2017.

The material in this Perspective may be reprinted if accompanied by the following acknowledgment: “Lisa Sachs, Jeffrey Sachs and Nathan Lobel, ‘Corporations need to look beyond profits,’ Columbia FDI Perspectives, No. 208, September 11, 2017. Reprinted with permission from the Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment (www.ccsi.columbia.edu).” A copy should kindly be sent to the Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment at ccsi@law.columbia.edu.

For further information, including information regarding submission to the *Perspectives*, please contact: Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment, Matthew Schroth, mas2443@columbia.edu.

The Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment (CCSI), a joint center of Columbia Law School and the Earth Institute at Columbia University, is a leading applied research center and forum dedicated to the study, practice and discussion of sustainable international investment. Our mission is to develop and disseminate practical approaches and solutions, as well as to analyze topical policy-oriented issues, in order to maximize the impact of international investment for sustainable development. The Center undertakes its mission through interdisciplinary research, advisory projects, multi-stakeholder dialogue, educational programs, and the development of resources and tools. For more information, visit us at <http://www.ccsi.columbia.edu>.

Most recent Columbia FDI Perspectives

- No. 207, Lilac Nachum, “How much social responsibility should firms assume and of which kind? Firms, Governments and NGOs as Alternative Providers of Social Services,” August 28, 2017.
- No. 206, Victor Steenbergen and Ritwika Sen, “Increasing vertical spillovers from FDI: ideas from Rwanda,” August 14, 2017.
- No. 205, Jing Li and Jun Xia, “State-owned enterprises face challenges in foreign acquisitions,” July 31, 2017.
- No. 204, David Bailey, Nigel Driffield and Michail Karoglou, “Inward investment will fall in the UK, post Brexit,” July 17, 2017.
- No. 203, Karl P. Sauvart, “A new challenge for emerging markets: the need to develop an outward FDI policy,” July 3, 2017.

All previous FDI Perspectives are available at <http://ccsi.columbia.edu/publications/columbia-fdi-perspectives/>