

The Corporation  
2<sup>nd</sup> in a series  
© 2010  
by Michael Keehn  
mhkeehn@gmail.com

In the last column we left off saying, “Having acquired the legal rights of a person, the question arises, what kind of person is a corporation?”

We begin our understanding of a corporation’s character by acknowledging that an *artificial person* (the corporation in this case) has no moral conscience. There is no sense of right or wrong, good or bad, evil or divine. Consequently, there are no moral restraints upon the character of a corporation. The corporation is a special kind of person who has only one concern, a substantial financial return to the corporation stockholders. The corporation has no concern for, or loyalty to, the community where it resides. The corporation is not like the people in the community or workforce, accepting responsibility and obligation of citizenship. Corporations have no loyalty to any community. They are there only so long as it is the most profitable place to be, and when it is not, the corporation will move elsewhere, often causing considerable harm to the community and its employee’s.

The problem with having corporate citizens is that they have no soul to save nor do they have a body to put in jail when they break the law. When corporations break the law, the only thing government does is fine them. But that is a two-edged sword. Government is also dependent upon the commerce created by corporations. If government makes the fines too high and un-payable, they put a business partner out of business. Then the government loses whatever commercial wealth that corporation was providing government.

It is not the corporation that breaks the law and causes injury to people that concerns government. It is the corporate giants, like AT&T, who are gaining so much wealth and power they become a threat to government. Government is also threatened by the smaller feisty and honorable corporation that stands up for its rights and in so doing, is showing other business how to stand up for their rights as well. That’s why AT&T was broken up under monopoly statues some years back, and it’s why little local Orland Sand and Gravel has been so heavily attacked by county government. And while I recognize I’ve said it before, I’m going to say it again... We’re now under the private copyrighted law of this nations creditor and it’s all commercial.

Although corporations put forth a great deal of financial resources in a phoney baloney *public image*, the corporation is obligated to put its bottom line profits ahead of everything else. The *bottom line profit* even comes before the public good. Corporate investors are not interested in the public, humanity, or injury caused to the public, they are interested in their returns. If it comes down to a dollar and the public good, the dollar generally wins.

The idea is to become as profitable as is possible, and in doing so, the corporation engages in activities to make others responsible for the negative impact a corporation may have on society. This has the effect of making a third party, who has not consented, responsible for certain

consequences of the activities of a corporation. Let's allow someone else worry about this problem. For example, let's find a way for someone else provide for the disposal of the carpets this corporation manufactures. If possible, let us make the general public responsible for the road improvements that will be necessary because of the increase in traffic this corporation will cause. The corporation will externalize any costs or activities that the apathetic or unwary public will allow, often by buying off political leadership.

To analyze the personality that causes the corporation to behave like an externalizing machine, we can analyze it like a psychiatrist would a patient. A diagnosis can be formulated from the analysis of case histories of the harm corporations have inflicted on others. Harm to workers: 1) layoffs; 2) union busting; 3) factory fires; 4) sweat shops.

As an example we examine a shirt that sells for \$12.99 and find it was made by sweatshop women who were paid \$0.03 (3 cents) for the making the shirt. Would an American woman sew and sell shirts when her labor returns only 3-cents? Highly unlikely, but there are many women in other parts of the world who do exactly that. A Claiborne jacket made in El Salvador sells for \$178.00 and was made by a sweatshop corporation who paid the person who made the jacket \$0.74 (74 cents).

Alpine car stereos, one of the most expensive, are constructed by people who are paid \$0.31 (31 cents) an hour. And it's this way for virtually everything we buy. Why? Because the leadership of the United States passed NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) and GATT (General Agreement on Tarriffs and Trade), which allowed corporations chartered in the United States to leave and set up shop where labor cost is much less than it is here.

Virtually nothing is made in the United States today. When I was young, back in the 1950's and 1960's, virtually everything we bought was made in the United States, except for a few cheap plastic toys. Today, the corporations, who have no stake in the community in which they were chartered, who have no stake in the people whose livelihood is embedded in the corporation, and with no care or concern for anything other than high profits and returns, move out of the country.

From a garbage dump in the Dominican Republic, we are able to get the picture from internal pricing documents of Nike that were recovered and examined. Nike assigns a *time frame* to every operation in the manufacture of their products. They don't talk about minutes, the time frames are broken down to one-ten-thousands of a second (1/10,000 second). When we got to the bottom of all operations, the time to make a shirt is 6.6141 seconds. At their pay scale and the number of workers involved, the money earned by all the workers in the process of manufacturing this shirt is approximately \$0.08 (8 cents) or, put another way, three-tenths of one percent (0.003) the retail selling price of the shirt.

So, the leadership we Americans have elected has sent our manufacturing, along with the jobs, to other countries, then saddled us with trillions more debt when the economy failed in the latter half of 2008, which is presumably what we want since we elected them and return them to office nearly every time we vote. Do we think our actions, or lack thereof, may have consequences?

Beginning in the next column, we begin a checklist of personality traits that corporations possess.