International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods (IJARESM)
ISSN: 2455-6211, Volume 4, Issue 10, October- 2016, Impact Factor: 2.287

The Corporation as a Nexus of Contracts and Autonomy

Rajesh Kumar

Advocate, District Court, Karnal, Haryana

ABSTRACT

One of the central problems of contracts jurisprudence is the conflict between autonomy theories of contract and efficiency theories of contract. One approach to solving this conflict is to argue that in the realm of contracts between corporations, autonomy theories have nothing to say because corporations are not real people with whose autonomy we need to be concerned. While clearly amazing, this contention at last comes up short since it certainly accept hypotheses of the enterprise inconsistent with monetary speculations of law. Financial matters thus offer a dream of the firm that is very affable to self-rule hypotheses of agreement. The disappointment of this contention recommends that an increasingly productive road for accommodating these contending methodologies is to locate a principled method for incorporating them into a solitary hypothesis.

INTRODUCTION

Many contracts scholars have long had an intuition that corporations present a special problem for autonomy theories of contract law. Most of these theories implicitly or explicitly assume that contracting parties are human beings rather than institutions. Hence, there seems something suspect about applying such theories to corporations. Recently, scholars have tried to use this intuition to solve some basic problems in the philosophy of contract law. In this paper, I hope to demonstrate that this approach will not work. Ultimately, the injection of corporations into contract law theory throws up new versions of some old problems, but corporations do not pose a unique or fundamental challenge to autonomy theories of contract.

The most recent use of corporations in the debate over contract theory comes at a time when that theory is deeply divided. Contracts scholarship suffers from an embarrassment of theoretical riches. Philosophers, historians, and economists have all entered the conversation. A few generations ago, discussion centered on questions of the extent to which contracts reflected the will of the parties or the rules of society and the relative merits of achieving fairness or freedom. The debates had the advantage of occurring in essentially the same language. In contrast, the contracts theorists of today find that it is difficult to talk with each other even when discussing the same issues that exercised their predecessors. While each approach operates with its own criteria for successful theories, contracts scholars have not found a powerful and widely accepted meta-theory that would allow them to adjudicate between the competing approaches. The search for such a meta-theory is one of the major tasks of contemporary contracts scholarship.

One of the troubles going up against an agreements scholar is simply the rambling idea of agreement law. Contracts can possibly oversee everything from the clearance of dairy animals by an individual rancher to disagreements about the securing of a multi-billion dollar oil company. One procedure for managing the hypothetical pluralism is to limit the field of request to simply business exchanges. The case is that whatever its constraints somewhere else, in the domain of firm-to-firm contracts, monetary investigation should rule. Thus, regardless of whether a brought together hypothesis of all agreements is troublesome, a bound together hypothesis of some critical subset of agreements might be conceivable. The achievement of this most recent move-which I will call the new lex mercatoria (law merchant}-lays on its capacity to reject inside and out non-monetary hypotheses as inapplicable. The case is that self-governance speculations are not valuable in understanding contracts by partnerships in light of the fact that such hypotheses expect that contracting gatherings are people. At last, this contention fundamentally conjures a specific hypothesis or set of speculations about the idea of organizations. These speculations, notwithstanding, have been to a great extent denied by contemporary monetary investigation. Amusingly, contemporary law and financial aspects expressly expect a model of the enterprise that is especially cordial to the very hypotheses that the defenders of the new lex mercatoria would like to reject for the last time.

THE FICTION THEORY, THE NEXUS OF CONTRACTS, AND AUTONOMY

One of the striking things about the theories sketched in the preceding section is how foreign they seem to most of contemporary corporate law scholarship. For example, one scholar contends, "It has been over a half-a-century since corporate legal theory, of any political or economic stripe, took the concession theory seriously." While this is a bit of an exaggeration, it is safe to say that neither the real nor the concession theory represents a dominant approach in law and economics scholarship. Rather the dominant approach has been a modem version of the ancient fiction theory of the corporation. Building on an individualistic framework for understanding legal entities that goes back at least to the eleventh century, if not earlier, modem economists have conceptualized the corporation as a "nexus of contracts." As I shall argue, this concept of the firm cannot be used by the Artificial Personality Argument and is actually quite consistent with autonomy theories of contract.

The Fiction Theory of Corporations

The fiction theory of the corporation is one the oldest approaches to corporate jurisprudence. It asserts that corporations are nothing more than useful conceptual devices for understanding the relationships between individuals. Under Roman law, the dominant form of business organization, the societas, was conceptualized as a contract and lacked most of the incidents of "corporateness." During the eleventh century, the statute of companies took on another criticalness as the Catholic Church came to be conceptualized legitimately as a lot of interlocking partnerships. The medieval canonists, thusly, drew on the nominalist strand of educational idea to characterize the enterprise. As one fourteenth-century legal adviser compactly outlined the predominant universality, "All savants and canonists [believe] that the entire does not contrast truly ... from its parts." The medieval definition of enterprises as "counterfeit people" was to apply a ground-breaking effect on corporate hypothesis, and hundreds of years after the fact the Supreme Court would utilize a similar mark.

The Nexus of Contracts Theory The cutting edge nexus of agreement hypothesis of the partnership follows its inception to a 1937 article by Ronald Coase. Coase was keen on seeing how the presence of the firm could be accommodated with what he called "the principle accomplishment of monetary science," in particular the knowledge that when assets are allotted utilizing the decentralized procedure of the market what results isn't disorder however a precise development of products and enterprises as per the value instrument. Whenever decentralized market procedures could successfully sort out assets, for what reason do "we discover 'islands of cognizant power in this sea of oblivious co-activity like pieces of spread coagulating in a bucket of buttermilk?"' Coase's response to this inquiry was exchange costs. Discovering products and enterprises and arranging terms to spot contracts for each and every business exchange is costly. These expenses can be kept away from through a solitary contract that gives a focal expert the privilege of course. The agreement, as indicated by Coase, "is one whereby the factor, for a specific compensation (which might be fixed or fluctuating), consents to comply with the bearings of a business person inside certain limits.

Later financial specialists refined this model of the firm by pushing for a significantly progressively individualistic, legally binding methodology. In 1972, Alchian and Demsetz broadly contended that Coase was mixed up to consider directors to be practicing even surrounded control, since workers' readiness to pursue course was in each occasion a matter of legally binding decision. After four years, Jensen and Meckling abridged what was to turn into the standard way of thinking, composing that "[t]he private enterprise or firm is essentially one type of legitimate fiction which fills in as a nexus of contracting relationships."165 More as of late, even the nexus of agreements approach has gone under assault as deficiently legally binding. The hyper-legally binding methodology in actuality finishes the deconstruction of "control" and "possession" that Coase started. In this hypothesis, every one of the members are "speculators" contributing scholarly and reputational capital (workers) or money and different assets (value and obligation). Each arrangement of members then "controls" different members through observing and endorses.

The nexus of agreements hypothesis' emphasis on the imaginary idea of the enterprise additionally clarifies how liberal self-sufficiency scholars could break down firm-to-firm contracts. An agreement between two firms has all the earmarks of being an agreement between two discrete, non-human elements, however in all actuality between fmn contracts not completely portray the basic understandings of real people. The full terms of the understanding must be determined utilizing not just the unequivocal terms of the agreement and the standard guidelines of agreement law, yet in addition by the agreements including the "agreement" spoken to by corporate sanctions and the executives structures-which make up the partnerships that consented to the arrangement. At last contracts between partnerships are understandings between real people. The extent of the intensity of these individuals to "tie" different members in the corporate endeavor will be restricted by the foundation guidelines of corporate law. In any case, the nexus-of-agreements hypothesis instructs us that

eventually these principles can be thought of in to a great extent consensual terms. Corporate operators practicing their tact become basically closely resembling some other person whose circumspection and capacity to tie others is constrained by prior contracts. The nearness of the company structure works no conclusive move in good status. Subsequently, from the perspective of the nexus of agreement hypothesis, the Artificial Personality Argument is indefensible. It confuses a helpful shorthand-the enterprise with a conclusive contrast where no such definitive distinction exists.

The nexus of contracts theory, thus, turns the table on efficiency theorists who would invoke the Artificial Personality Argument. Just as the Artificial Personality Argument claims one has nothing to say when viewing firm-to-firm contracts through the lens of autonomy theories, when one views the Artificial Personality Argument through the lens of economics one finds that the conception of the corporation that the argument requires is not the one endorsed by contemporary law and economics scholarship. One might object that the nexus of contracts response to the Artificial Personality Argument rests on an equivocation. The term "contract" in the nexus of contract theory does not mean the same thing that "contract" means in contract law and therefore the argument is fallacious. This criticism can be met in the following way. Economics and law clearly do not use the term "contract" in precisely the same way. When economists speak of contracts they are generally using the term broadly to include all voluntary transactions. It can encompass everything from simultaneous exchanges and informal deals to highly formalized long-term written agreements. The important point is that the transactions are consensual rather than required by government regulations or some other external source of coercion. In contrast, lawyers use the term contract in a much more limited way. Thus, the Restatement (Second) Contracts defines a contract as "a promise or set of promises for the breach of which the law gives a remedy, or the performance of which the law in some way recognizes as a duty." Generally, a contract requires the formalities of offer, acceptance, and consideration.

A LESSON FOR CONTRACT THEORY

The demise of the Artificial Personality Argument illustrates one of the key problems facing the "horizontal independence" strategy. Recall that the horizontal independence strategy seeks to resolve the conflict between autonomy theories and efficiency theories by demonstrating that they are actually theories of different things. The Artificial Personality Argument ultimately flounders on the fact that both the economics relied on by the welfare theorists and the liberal political philosophy relied on by the autonomy theorists are essentially individualistic. This promise to independence implies that neither one of the approaches can reliably conjure some non-individualistic idea, for example, the partnership to avoid any contentions. Certainly, they use independence in various ways, yet at last, they are discussing very similar things: genuine individuals. This combination is absolutely what the even freedom methodology tries to deny.

A definitive union of both welfare and independence hypotheses on the individual originates from two types of reductionism that is vital to contemporary financial matters. To begin with, financial aspects in its positive structure are reductionist, concentrating on the individual reasonable entertainer as the essential unit of social clarification. Second, financial aspects is normatively reductionist in that it by and by utilizations people as the essential unit of estimation. At the point when market analysts discuss productivity or riches augmentation they are talking as far as social totals. What market analysts are accumulating, notwithstanding, are the fulfillments of people. Henceforth, there is no sense where society is esteemed to have or encounter fulfillment autonomous of the people who make it up. These two types of reductionism are what make financial aspects such an appealing apparatus for arrangement examination. The normal entertainer model enables an arrangement expert to anticipate the impacts of specific strategies by reasoning how specialists bowed on fulfillment of their inclinations would carry on accordingly.

The equivalent deductive model enables us to make similar decisions about the degree to which contrasting arrangements fulfill inclinations. Both the positive and the standardizing decisions concentrate tenaciously on the individual, and it is now that the contention with independence speculations ends up unavoidable. By far most of law and financial matters writing on contracts is certainly or expressly standardizing. Monetary scholars of agreement law don't see proficiency as essentially one conceivably fascinating harmony point anticipated by their positive model of contracting conduct. Or maybe, they use it as criteria for making a decision about the attractive quality of varying standards of law. When combined with the methodological independence of eco nomics, proficiency speculations of agreement will essentially talk about indistinguishable things from self-governance hypotheses on the grounds that while every hypothesis conceptualizes human uniqueness in an unexpected way, the two methodologies are at last aimed at real individuals. The contention must be settled utilizing the flat freedom technique on the off chance that one of the hypotheses relinquishes its case to being standardizing.

This upbeat arrangement is probably not going to work. In spite of the fact that self-rule hypotheses may be conceptualized absolutely as understandings of existing lawful teachings, the truth is that the individuals who embrace self-governance speculations generally will in general do as such on the grounds that they discover the speculations normatively appealing on the benefits. In like manner, the intermingling of positive and standardizing independence in financial matters implies that couple of law and financial aspects researchers are going to surrender their job as prescriptive approach investigators. Inasmuch as proficiency scholars and self-rule scholars both offer contentions for how contract law ought to be, a contention stays to be illuminated. The possibility of another lex mercatoria may assume a job in such a goals, yet on the off chance that it does it will probably utilize a vertical mix technique, for example, that set forth by Farber, as opposed to the flat autonomy approach of the Artificial Personality Argument.

CONCLUSION

Despite the criticisms that I have made of attempts to establish efficiency as a master norm for contract law, this article is not an exercise in econophobia. I believe that economics offers important insights into the law and that ultimately no theory of contract can afford not to incorporate the insights of law and economics. Nor, despite the fact that I have spent much of this article defending them, am I ultimately persuaded by autonomy theories of contract. Rather, I believe that contract theory must find some principled integration of the two approaches. Unfortunately, the Artificial Personality Argument cannot harmonize the discordant voices of autonomy and welfare theories of contract. While it appears superficially appealing to efficiency theorists, on closer examination the theories of the corporation that it requires in order to be coherent cannot be reconciled with the methodological individualism of economics. Armed with the nexus-of-contracts theory of the corporation, autonomy theorists can deploy arguments developed in other contexts to account for firm-to-firm contracts. Obviously, the autonomy arguments that I have discussed are deeply controversial and not without their weaknesses. However, one need not be a partisan of such approaches to appreciate the key insight of this paper: While the injection of the corporation into contract theory throws up new examples of old problems, it does not pose any fundamentally new or unique issues for autonomy theories. A new lex mercatoria may indeed hold the promise of reconciling the competing approaches to contract, but the promise does not lie in the fact that autonomy theories can be summarily banished from its domain. Rather, the meta-theoretical advantage of a new lex mercatoria must lie in its ability to make the principled integration of autonomy and welfare theories into a single approach more tractable.

REFERENCES

[1]. See generally Farber, supra note IO (arguing that in the context of commercial law an efficiency standard can be derived from an autonomy norm).
[2]. Van- den, B. K., Müller, P. A. and Van, B. A. A. L. (2009) ‘Helping to overcome intervention inertia in bystander’s dilemmas: Behavioural disinhibition can improve the greater good’, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45, pp. 873-878.
[3]. Indeed, elsewhere I have offered a traditional law-and-economics analysis in defense of the use of legislative history to construe statutes. See Nathan Oman, Statutory Interpretation in Econotopia, 25 PACE L. REV. 49, 72-83 (2005).
[4]. Veal, A. J. (2005) Business Research Methods: A Managerial Approach. 2nd edn. Sydney: Addison Wesley, ISBN 1741032539.
[5]. See Oman, supra note I2, at I504-06 (arguing that an adequate theory of contract must incorporate economic arguments).
[6]. !d. at 11 ("The articles [of incorporation] may also contain other significant discretionary provisions authorized by statute.").
[7]. Sharma, P., Chrisman, J. and Chua, J. H. (1997) ‘Strategic Management of the Family Business: Past Research and Future Challenges’, Family Business Review, March 1997, 10, pp. 1-35, available at DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-6248.1997.00001.x (accessed on 12/10/2012).
[8]. For example, the non-recourse loan in the preceding paragraph might contain a covenant not to sell the widget-making machine, the violation of which would subject our entrepreneur to full personal liability for the loan.
[9]. Sheridan, T. and Kendall, N. (1992) ‘Corporate Governance - An Action Plan for Profitability and Business Success’, Working Paper, Marshfield Mass: Pitman.
[10]. Schumann, P.L. (2001) ‘A Moral Principles Framework for Human Resource Management Ethics’, Human Resource Management Review, 11, pp. 93-111.
[11]. Adu-Amoah, A., Tsamenyi, M., and Onumah, J. M. (2008) ‘The influence of social and political relations on corporate governance systems: The case of rural banks in Ghana’, in Tsamenyi, M. and Uddin, S. (eds.)

Corporate governance in less developed and emerging economie. Bingley: Emerald Group Pub Ltd, pp. 311-334.

[12]. Ross, S. A. (1973) 'The Economic Theory of Agency: The Principal's Problem', American Economic Review, 63(2) American Economic Association, Pages: 134-139.

[13]. Patton, M. Q. (1990) Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publication, pp. 21-39.

[14]. Schwartz & Scott, supra note 10, at 550-51 ("A firm is direct by its owners, who often are shareholders. Shareholders prefer their firms to maximize profits").