Comments on Hill, *Directors' Duties, the Courts and the Public/Private Divide*

Adam Feibelman, Tulane Law School

EMF, Mumbai, Dec. 13, 2019

Comments on *Directors' Duties*

Basic argument:

There is a growing appreciation, or expectation, that corporations serve public functions – e.g., to avoid harms, to benefit society, to have a "positive corporate culture"

Comments on *Directors' Duties*

Basic argument:

There is a growing appreciation, or expectation, that corporations serve public functions – e.g., to avoid harms, to benefit society, to have a "positive corporate culture"

This has implications for directors' duties -- reconsidering the Berle/Dodd debate over whether duties extend to shareholders only or other stakeholders as well.

Comments on *Directors' Duties*

Basic argument:

There is a growing appreciation, or expectation, that corporations serve public functions – e.g., to avoid harms, to benefit society, to have a "positive corporate culture"

This has implications for directors' duties -- reconsidering the Berle/Dodd debate over whether duties extend to shareholders only or other stakeholders as well.

Focus on the comparative legal treatment of director oversight for the benefit of non-owner stakeholders. Evidence of an expanding scope of such duties in the US, with explicit if under-enforced duties in the UK and Australia.

Comments on *Directors' Duties*

Queries:

1) Descriptive or normative? I.e., directors should have a duty to monitor for managerial integrity and corporate social responsibility ?

Comments on *Directors' Duties*

Queries:

1) Descriptive or normative? I.e., directors should have a duty to monitor for managerial integrity and corporate social responsibility?

2) If corporations have a public function, what is the scope?

-- just avoid negative externalities, or

-- a more affirmative duty to benefit (e.g., provide essential goods, allocate credit)

Comments on *Directors' Duties*

Queries:

1) Descriptive or normative? I.e., directors should have a duty to monitor for managerial integrity and corporate social responsibility

2) If corporations have a public function, what is the scope?

-- just avoid negative externalities, or

-- a more affirmative duty to benefit (e.g., provide essential goods, allocate credit)

3) And regarding directors, should their duties extend to monitoring to avoid negative externalities that don't create liability for the firm or to provide social benefits

Comments on *Directors' Duties*

General comment:

If the scope of the corporation's/director's duty to provide oversight is ultimately coextensive with law and regulations, is that enough to support a public conception of the corporation.

Comments on *Directors' Duties*

General comment:

If the scope of the corporation's/director's duty to provide oversight is ultimately coextensive with law and regulations, is that enough to support a public conception of the corporation.

In that case, it seems that

- the avoidance of negative externalities is imposed from outside

- the corporation's role is a matter of compliance in an otherwise private pursuit