© *Academy of Management Review*
2022, Vol. 47, No. 4, 637–645.
https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2019.0456

RETHINKING CORPORATE POWER TO TACKLE GRAND SOCIETAL CHALLENGES: LESSONS FROM POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

RUTH V. AGUILERA
Northeastern University
Universitat Ramon Llull

J. ALBERTO ARAGÓN-CORREA
University of Granada

VALENTINA MARANO
Northeastern University

In this essay, we review and discuss potential changes to dominant governance approaches that may help business leaders play a more active role in global sustainability issues. Instead of refining the ideas from traditional management paradigms, we seek to be intentionally provocative by bringing in fresh ideas from new, influential works on political philosophy to unlock businesses' ability to enhance the long-term sustainability of the communities where they operate. Collectively, the reviewed books point to the importance of moving corporate governance approaches from their current dominance on *shareholders'* interests to a greater emphasis on more *collaborative* arrangements that integrate a broader set of *stakeholders' interests* in a manner that accounts for the financial as well as social and environmental implications of corporate action. It is not our intention to engage in a philosophical discussion of these works, but rather to obtain relevant insights from a related discipline that can help us add novel ideas to existing corporate governance debates.

Traditionally, wealth creation for corporate shareholders has been seen as an essential aspect of a firm's mission (Fama & Jensen, 1983; Friedman, 1970; Jensen & Meckling, 1976). This profit-making orientation is a cornerstone of capitalism as a political and economic system, which has undoubtedly played a key role in its ability to foster the economic well-being of the countries that have embraced it over time. However, in spite of its long-run association with strong economic growth, capitalism's legitimacy as a political and economic system appears to be increasingly in question nowadays, as capitalist societies wrestle with some of the negative externalities of the dominant profit logic associated with this system, such as social inequality, political and economic corruption, job insecurity, and degradation of natural environments (Barney & Rangan, 2019). Such negative externalities are often seen as a reflection of capitalist societies' key players' (i.e., corporations') inability (or unwillingness) to reconcile their profit-generation aspirations with societal well-being by privileging the interests of a few powerful actors (such as shareholders and top executives) over those of the majority (Piketty, 2018; Tsui, Enderle, & Jiang, 2018). While management as a field of inquiry has been keenly focused on the identification of practices that can help foster firms' profit-making potential, concerns about the negative externalities of the predominant profit logic have also received a great deal of attention of late (e.g., Freeman, 2010; Kaplan, 2019). This has gone hand in hand with a rich debate about how capitalist societies could be reimagined (e.g., Alvarez, Zander, Barney, & Afuah, 2020; Lazzarini, 2021; Reinecke & Ansari, 2021).

Therefore, in this review essay, we seek to contribute to these ongoing conversations by leveraging insights from three recently published philosophical works that will help us examine the role of corporate actors as key players in capitalist societies that hold

We are grateful for the partial funding received through research grant PID2019-106725GB-I00 (Spanish Research Agency, 10.13039/501100011033). We thank our associate editor, Subi Rangan, and the two anonymous reviewers for helping us make this essay much stronger. All errors remain ours.

the keys to both economic and societal progress. We chose to focus on three books that have drawn on a philosophical perspective because their conceptual underpinnings of notions such as societal progress and justice have been inspired by a moral rather than utilitarian logic. Moreover, though philosophical principles have influenced law and politics, so far, their influence on business theory remains "limited at best" (Rangan, 2018: 8). Hence, our review of these books introduces novel ideas and perspectives to rethink the role of corporations in society vis-à-vis the promotion of sustainable outcomes. In doing so, we hope to provide insights into how corporations can help achieve the goal of a more sustainable society, where the interests of many are not ignored by the few in power. Importantly, at least one of the authors in each book has been an active participant in the Society for Progress, "an academically diverse and independent group of scholars and leaders" whose "work is based on the belief that integrating perspectives from moral and social philosophy will help evolve the decentralized economic system ('capitalism') in a manner that better integrates market and society, humans and nature, and the present and the future" (Society for Progress, 2021). The authors' exposure to the Society for Progress helps explain the examined books' shared vision regarding how the lack of or weakness of moral values in economic and governance decisions is one of the primary societal challenges of our time.

More specifically, each book explores different societal issues connected to the exercise (and abuse) of power in a profit-driven context and their consequences for the three traditional dimensions of sustainability: social, economic, and environmental (World Commission on Environment and Development [WCED], 1987). In the first book, *On Trade Justice: A Philosophical Plea for a New Global Deal*, Risse and Wollner (2019) explored global firms' power over local communities in international trade. In the second, *Private Government: How Employers Rule Our Lives (And Why We Don't Talk About It)*, Anderson (2017) examined firms' power over workers. In the third, *The Seasons Alter: How to Save Our Planet in Six Acts*, Kitcher and Keller (2017) considered the power of a few decision makers and investors over future generations with regard to climate change.

In order to discuss the contributions of each book and their potential implications, we organize this essay into four complementary sections. First, we identify the authors' takes on capitalism's fundamental flaws. Second, we explore the sources of these flaws by discussing each book's emphasis on some of capitalism's most powerful actors, their interests, and the resulting negative outcomes for society at large. Third, we review the authors' key suggestions to ensure societal progress. Fourth, we propose ways in which insights from the examined books could inspire much-needed changes in how the management field approaches conceptualizing the role of corporations in society.

PROBLEMS WITH THE CONTEMPORARY PRACTICE OF CAPITALISM

Although the selected books differed in their structure and chosen topics, all of them were linked by their focus on the fundamental problem of the abusive use of corporate power and its implications for societal progress through firms' impacts on local communities' welfare, the workplace, and climate change, respectively. Risse and Wollner (2019: 88) conceptualized corporations' abuse of power in terms of "unfairness through power." Their synthetic conceptualization offered a useful roadmap for understanding the authors' concerns regarding how multinational corporations often use their power to cut corners on wages and safety conditions at home and overseas, settle abusive agreements with local subcontractors, and impose conditions on weak governments while offering a limited range of reciprocity. Their interest in these issues reminds us that although mutuality (i.e., a balanced exchange of benefits) may be the theoretical foundation on which the capitalist system is based (Smith, 1776), the reality of economic exchanges can yield a highly uneven distribution of benefits that some would describe as amoral (Rangan, 2018).

Similarly, Anderson (2017) challenged the legitimacy of the subordinate condition of workers in the corporate workplace when it leads to limitations of their fundamental civil rights, such as, for example, constraints on workers' freedom to express their opinions or political views. A central message in her book was that while workers with limited bargaining power may need to accept their work conditions, such limitations reflect an arbitrary, unaccountable use of power. Finally, Kitcher and Keller (2017) saw human-caused climate change as stemming from the myopic short-term financial preferences of some of the most powerful economic and political actors in capitalist societies—mainly shareholders and politicians in developed countries. Consequently, climate change will be particularly harmful for economically disadvantaged individuals and future generations.

In fact, all three examined books stressed that power-induced impositions connected to amoral profit interests result in unsustainable outcomes.

In the remainder of this article, we follow the Brundtland Commission (WCED, 1987) and define *corporate sustainability* as those corporate actions that meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Corporate sustainability requires firms to avoid the kinds of abuse of power discussed above by following the principles of "environmental integrity, social equity, and economic prosperity" (Scherer, Palazzo, & Seidl, 2013: 259). Much of the existing management research about the relationship between corporate governance and society has analyzed corporate actors' discretion and opportunities to deal with sustainability issues (for detailed reviews on these topics, see Aguilera, Aragón-Correa, Marano, & Tashman, 2021; Jain & Jamali, 2016); however, they have often retained the ultimate focus on whether a firm might increase its financial performance. Specifically, the management field has often examined the sustainability challenges of our times (e.g., climate change, inequality, or civil rights) as a potential source of risks that may limit shareholders' ability to obtain rewards from their investments (e.g., DesJardine, Marti, & Durand, 2021). Furthermore, the traditional business case for corporate sustainability has been that firms may increase their financial performance by doing good (e.g., Henderson, 2020; Porter & Van der Linde, 1995). Instead, the three books we reviewed in this article relied on the notions of morality and fairness to examine the grand sustainability challenges of our time and their consequences for less powerful societal groups.

In doing so, the authors challenged neither the basic assumptions of corporate dynamics in capitalist societies nor the necessity of rewarding investors, but rather the dominant amoral logic that underpins much corporate decision-making in capitalist societies. For example, Anderson (2017) accepted the need for enterprises constituted by hierarchies of authority to organize efficiently the contingencies around a worker's duties. However, she noted that efficiency cannot justify an arbitrary power over workers that it is not subject to notice, process, or appeal. Similarly, Risse and Wollner (2019) recognized the potential of free trade for generating positive changes internationally, but they emphasized that the principle of distributive justice associated with trade is that any "distribution of gains from global trade is just only if these gains have been obtained without exploitation" (p. 187). In fact, the central idea of the three books was that an amoral approach to decision-making and the abuse of power are the real problems that our society needs to tackle to address the grand sustainability challenges of our time.

ADDRESSING THE EXERCISE AND ABUSE OF POWER

Socioeconomic outcomes may be analyzed as a product of the involved actors' power and interests. Rangan (2018) suggested that understanding who the powerful actors and their interests are is essential in order to make sense of their actions and outcomes. The examined books agreed on the primacy of investors in capitalist societies—a relatively small but very powerful group of actors that are intrinsically connected to the profit logic in the modern corporation. Additionally, they all highlighted the occasionally abusive power of executives and managers in firms (over employees, local communities, and the global commons) that often rely on what could be defined as an amoral decision-making model through which the particular benefits of this small group of actors determine the acceptable operations of firms and even the aims of society. Lastly, the reviewed works paid special attention to regulators around the world, and in the United States in particular, by providing a critical view of how policy makers have failed to control potential abuses of power because of either their limited skills and capacity relative to that of powerful lobbies or the recognition that some regulatory actors have favored a coalition with other powerful actors to better serve their own interests.

The most conspicuous interests of all these powerful actors are related to obtaining financial rewards, including the maximization of profits for investors and compensation for executives. For example, Kitcher and Keller (2017) explicitly identified the short-term, selfish financial interests of powerful decision makers as the ultimate antecedents of the growing risks of climate change. They also claimed that climate change skepticism is more closely related to concerns about the financial implications of solutions than scientific evidence. At the organizational level, Risse and Wollner (2019) analyzed how abusive pressure from powerful actors to gain additional profits generates abusive discrimination against non-qualified employees, subcontractors, and local communities. It is also worth highlighting that powerful agents' interests are not always necessarily based on financial conditions but on maintaining or increasing their power status instead. For example, Anderson (2017) insisted that the severe limitations on some fundamental rights that are experienced by many who work for large corporations are not necessarily implemented because of their associated efficiency gains, but rather because they are a by-product of some misguided social design. Meanwhile, Kitcher and Keller (2017) underscored that short-termism (versus a real long-term cost–benefit approach) is associated with dominant climate interests. They considered the prioritization of financial and power rewards as intrinsically linked to powerful actors in contemporary society, while the interests of future generations and moral justice aspirations are alarmingly absent. Kitcher and Keller (2017) highlighted that regulation may be useful in triggering certain actions that may benefit disadvantaged collectives; however, they also criticized governments for generally failing to encourage or enforce moral interests on the part of powerful actors and organizations. Drawing on these insights and our own assessment, we recognize that powerful actors' interests often generate abusive decisions and private government forms that are "dictatorial" because the resulting actions are a product of unbalanced power between participant actors and amoral criteria.

The authors of the three books agreed that, unfortunately, any kind of action that serves powerful actors' self-serving interests is usually institutionally accepted in a context in which actions do not follow a moral but rather a utilitarian justification. Collectively, these works suggested that the unsustainable exploitation of forests, the intensive utilization of oil, the reliance on abusively low wages, the imposition of exploitative regimes on subcontractors or agreements, and the limitation of employees' basic civil rights to receive information or offer their personal views in the workplace are all too common in the corporate world. Even worse, these actions are frequently viewed as acceptable (or unavoidable) by the public at large as they serve the financial interests of the most powerful actors well and are legitimized by offering limited benefits to other collectives. Hence, the amoral antecedents and unfair implications deriving from everyday corporate actions are usually not subject to debate in the public and corporate domains.

Lastly, the socioeconomic externalities emerging from the pursuit of self-serving interests by powerful actors in corporations include some of the most worrying and unsustainable developments in contemporary societies: irreparable damage to the planet (Kitcher & Keller, 2017), fundamental employee abuses (Anderson, 2017), and the suffering of disadvantaged people (Risse & Wollner, 2019). While wealthy, powerful actors will, of course, also be affected by the future negative impacts of unsustainable outcomes, their effects are and will be particularly negative for the less powerful actors within society or those who do not have a voice, such as less economically advantaged individuals (especially in the developing world), the environment, and future generations. It should concern us that such long-term outcomes are not usually associated with short-term negative financial, health, or reputational implications for the powerful actors that contribute to determining them.

In general, tangible negative outcomes, such as rising temperatures or income deterioration, are for the majority tied to different forms of more intangible consequences, such as abusive exploitation of corporate stakeholders, amoral preferences of corporate decision-makers, or violations of distributive justice within the local communities where corporate actors operate. Moreover, it is often the case that even those actions that lead to the adoption of potential solutions to unsustainable outcomes, such as intergovernmental cooperation or corporations' investments in environmental and social initiatives, are only likely to take place when some financial rewards are in sight for the powerful actors involved (Kitcher & Keller, 2017). As a rule, negative outcomes are ignored, not because they cannot be identified or even solved but because of their unbalanced distribution among participating actors.

TOWARD A MORAL INTEGRATION OF PERFORMANCE AND PROGRESS

Philosophy's mission is not to offer policy prescriptions that can be readily implemented, but rather to guide a person's reasoning, especially in the face of moral dilemmas. Moral dilemmas are challenging because there tend to exist good reasons for and against the available choices. While modern decision theory seeks to solve trade-offs by comparing "how much of one consequence (or good) one would exchange for one unit of another consequence (or good)," only a value system embedded in social norms may be useful for decisions that compare highly heterogenous implications and break down the walls between philosophy and economics (March, 2018: 85). For instance, one could argue that the Amazonian deforestation may provide some relevant financial opportunities for certain interest groups or even countries, but it would also destroy the habitat of certain species and indigenous groups. It might be difficult to compare the financial implications of each consequence, but we could agree that it is morally wrong to irreversibly destroy a natural environment for short-term financial benefits. In fact, the societal issues of climate change, the exploitation of employees, and of local communities as a result of free trade that were discussed in the three examined books all generate moral dilemmas, and only a renewed moral perspective may help in these situations.

At a general level, the authors of the three books agreed in proposing that, in order to address the most pressing societal and environmental challenges of our time, the decision-making calculus of the dominant actors in society (including corporations) should change from its current short-term, profit-oriented, and selfish focus to one of moral responsibility. Specifically, Risse and Wollner (2019) claimed that a form of "trade justice" should be anchored on the philosophical merits of firms' operations in distributing benefits from trade that do not derive from exploitative actions. Kitcher and Keller (2017: 89) called for the idea of an "equal moral standing" (i.e., all people should count equally in moral deliberations). Lastly, Anderson (2017: 130) highlighted that a "free society of equals" cannot be founded in an institutional corporate structure in which the vast majority of workers labor under private forms of governance consisting of arbitrary, unlimited power for employers. We also observe consistency in how the authors suggested achieving such goals through three main mechanisms.

First, the authors all agreed that morality matters as corporations seek to become part of the solution to the grand challenges of our time. In moral theory, considering a corporation as a subject generates requirements applying to the corporation's actions regarding both its internal structure (e.g., salaries and treatment of employees) and its responsibility to outside actors (e.g., the communities in which the firm is located and subcontractors). Additionally, the individual moral criteria of executives and investors are necessary complementary requirements because they directly and indirectly influence the capacity of organizations to act morally. It is particularly important for this moral criterion to include assuming responsibility for the wrongs committed by entities with which the focal actor may have an arm's-length relationship (e.g., subcontractors).

Second, education and dialogue at all levels of society will need to be reinforced in order to stimulate moral behavior and reinforce the expectations of accountability of those in power. The authors recognized the importance of informed decisions as a prerequisite for implementing moral decisions. Kitcher and Keller (2017) were particularly optimistic about the potential of education. Better education, greater attention to experts, and an increased dialogue would permit an improved understanding of the relevance of the issues involved and should allow most people to come to the conclusion that the current priorities are not acceptable for the shared future of the planet. Risse and Wollner (2019) recognized that moral justice is not possible within global supply chains unless all the key actors are brought to the discussion table. Consequently, every actor and institution has a moral duty to create the necessary conditions for equitable distribution, and dialogue will be necessary to coordinate their respective obligations. Finally, Anderson (2017) highlighted the importance of recognizing workers' voices at the corporate governance level. Hence, rather than discussing the potential (economic) implications of this approach, the authors mainly highlighted that having a greater say is a basic human need and constructive dialogue is a moral condition of any equitable relationship.

Third, the examined books emphasized the significance of actors' self-governance as a way to reinforce the morality of any decision-making effort. Similarly, they criticized governments' actions to date for failing to create the appropriate conditions for the emergence of moral behavior among corporate actors and redress their more reprehensible actions. The reasons for this failure are manifold. For example, governments have different interests in the international trade arena, and they often try to impose their own commercial interests on others. Additionally, the inexistence of a global authority with the capacity to set common regulations generates issues with "free riders" (Risse & Wollner, 2019). In the domestic environment, regulators tend to use their power to prioritize the interests of the most influential actors rather than being committed to the least well-off (Kitcher & Keller, 2017). The books called for necessary changes in regulation, but rather than relying on external governance alone, they agreed on the importance of individual self-governance in setting the criterion of an "*impartial agent* who is able to reason with integrity from a reflective distance" (Rangan, 2018: 7; emphasis in the original).

The authors recognized the complexities of disrupting or changing how corporations go about making decisions that impact the well-being of society since they draw significant benefits from the status quo. For instance, Risse and Wollner (2019) acknowledged the difficulties of working through the multiple practical dimensions of managerial decision-making in multinational corporations and accepted that certain types of exploitation may be tolerated temporarily in a progression from the current unfair state of the world to a fairer one. This vision differs from that of Kitcher and Keller (2017), who were highly critical of the conditional funding of investors in developing regions and called for immediate action grounded in fair justice rather than generosity, benevolence, or shared financial interests.

In fact, Risse and Wollner (2019: 251) claimed that "they are *realistically-utopian* in the sense that they are well within our capacities and connect to normative convictions many people have, or could find persuasive" (emphasis in the original). Similarly, Anderson (2017: 133) shared that it was beyond the scope of her research to answer the question of what the best workplace constitutions ought to be, although she suggested different ways of promoting them (e.g., the reinforced right to exit), even when the specific measures would alone be insufficient. All of the authors suggested that a new version of capitalism is possible in which powerful agents are responsible for promoting new mechanisms that provide a fair deal for the environment and for the least powerful groups in society.

CONVERGENT MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

While the three books focused on different facets of the grand societal challenges of our time (i.e., climate change, civil rights in the workplace, and interfirm trade relationships), they converged in their critiques of important aspects of the corporate capitalist logic. None of the books claimed to provide an alternative to capitalism, but they all suggested making fundamental changes to many normative criteria with the potential of adding to the growing interest within management in reconciling the corporate ability to contribute to both performance and progress. Table 1 provides a summary of the main differences between the traditional profit perspective in management and the main aspirations of the reviewed works. In this section, we identify and discuss three main categories of suggestions that emerged from the examined books to generate transformative changes to some traditional management tenets (i.e., a revision of the primacy of the most powerful actors, the dominance of moral criteria, and the relevance of self-governance).

First, the three books challenged the primacy of the most powerful actors' interests as key guiding principles for decision-making (i.e., mostly investors'

TABLE 1
Three Main Differences Between the Profit Logic and the Political Philosophy Perspectives

	Profit Logic Perspective	Learning from Political Philosophy
Primacy of the most powerful agents' interests:	The key binding principle for a firm is to serve shareholders.	Firms should always operate on terms that satisfy moral principles.
	The agency perspective places the emphasis on two categories of powerful agents (i.e., executives and owners).	Power relations between multiple internal and external actors related to the firm's operations are all important.
	Stakeholders might be considered depending on their different capacity to influence the firm's financial success.	Each of the multiple actors has moral rights to be considered independently of their power to influence corporate operations.
Dominance of moral criteria:	Profit maximization is the corporate aim and a key proxy of managers' successful operations.	Profits are permissible and desirable if they are obtained without an abuse of power (and translated into a fair and sustainable distribution of benefits).
	Certain forms of intermediation (e.g., offshoring or outsourcing) can bypass the moral obligations of the involved agents.	If it is not morally acceptable for an actor to engage in a specific economic action, it is also not possible for them to accept that others would do so on their behalf.
	Local regions in which the company operates are relevant inasmuch as they serve its financial interests.	Corporate operations can affect regions around the world, and the rights of communities deserve fair consideration.
Relevance of self-governance:	Regulatory coercive pressures are the main restrictions on executives and investors to operate responsibly.	Self-normative moral criteria must be the guiding principle for operating in a responsible way.
	Normative values mainly emerge from industry competitors' approaches and are relevant to gaining profitable legitimation.	Normative values emerging through education and moral criteria are a prerequisite for making management decisions.

profitability). In fact, they all assumed that rewarding investors will contribute to capitalism's ability to promote economic wealth, but they were critical of the practice of measuring everything that firms (and society) do from a stockholder's viewpoint. This point represents a radical departure from the dominant assumptions guiding most management research. Even those management approaches that have focused on the importance of considering multiple actors have been instrumental (the stakeholder perspective being among the most popular ones) and have claimed that stakeholders' claims should be assessed based on their respective power and legitimacy to influence the firm's performance (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). Certainly, it is a challenge for most management scholars and practitioners to take into account multiple actors' interests on their own.

Second, thinking about multiple actors may not be enough when the interests of the dominant decision makers are biased; in fact, the works under discussion pointed out that a moral perspective must be the key guiding principle for all the participating actors. Management paradigms have tended to ignore moral criteria and philosophy (Rangan, 2018). For example, the vast majority of academic research in top tier management journals has only used a few forms of financial criteria to evaluate firms' operations (and their executives). The fact that the very top financial performers may be also guilty of failed management when they generate negative impacts for society is usually overlooked. Thus, Kitcher and Keller (2017) highlighted the importance of prioritizing the preservation of the planet because it is a fair approach for future generations; however, previous findings have shown that firms' progress in the socioenvironmental arena is mostly motivated by enforced regulation (Aragon-Correa, Marcus, & Vogel, 2020). Similarly, Risse and Wollner (2019) stressed that the distribution of gains from global trade is fair only if these gains were obtained without exploitation (i.e., without the abuse of power). However, the management literature has found that multinational corporations tend to focus more on actions that may help them avoid external liabilities (e.g., increasing corporate political spending; Shi, Gao, & Aguilera, 2021) rather than on those that engage with fair causes. So far, utilitarian rather than moral criteria seem to dominate even in those firms that are making positive contributions to sustainable outcomes.

Third, self-governance may be a powerful means of making a difference when moral principles are king. All the authors reviewed in this essay expressed frustration with the limited effectiveness and biases of government regulation in tackling the grand societal issues of our time. They argued that governments have a role to play and looked for regulatory changes to limit the abuse of power in firms and society; nonetheless, the authors' shared feeling was that it is the responsibility of each individual actor—particularly the most powerful ones—to avoid abusive situations. In general, while management scholars have often assumed that limitations to the external negative impacts of business operations are externally imposed by regulators (or the market), philosophers have tended to look at individual moral responsibility. For example, Suzumura (2018) explicitly supported unilateral moral reasoning as the central guide for action taken on the specific dilemmas relating to climate change. From this perspective, the self-governance of an agent who can reason with integrity is likely to guarantee more progress than a heterogeneous collection of external restrictions.

CONCLUSION

When it comes to climate change, abusive power in the workplace, and unfair international trading relations, the examined books suggested that the decision maker's moral compass is centrally important to bringing about more equitable and sustainable outcomes. Although the three books differed in their structure and style, the shared wisdom that emerged from them is that we should abandon utilitarian approaches and embrace morality and self-governance at both the individual and organizational level in order to overcome the profit-making logic that dominates much of corporate action in today's capitalist systems. Self-governance would morally drive decision makers to exercise their freedom without imposing arbitrary and abusive criteria onto other less powerful agents. However, in order for it to succeed, new social norms and a renewed emphasis on the importance of moral values will be necessary.

The three examined books highlighted the importance of recognizing the moral rights of individuals along with the opportunities to make self-governance possible. Information and educating must play a role in not only changing the norms that determine what it is good and bad in corporate performance but also in training people about the importance of seeking others' views and valuing differences. While all of the authors viewed regulatory efforts as important for achieving more just and sustainable outcomes, the advent of the business judgment rule, dual class shares and owner-led firms (e.g., Meta, Tesla, and Amazon), and the increased lobbying capabilities of corporations suggest that it is only through education and self-governance that capitalism stands a chance of reforming itself from within and promoting both economic wealth and societal well-being (Rangan, 2018).

However, opacity and misunderstandings about the real roots of the sustainability challenges of contemporary capitalist societies may disrupt their potential for improvement. One of Anderson's (2017) main concerns was that both the theory of the firm and public discourse often deny that workers are subject to arbitrary forms of government. Kitcher and Keller (2017) and Risse and Wollner (2019) expressed similar concerns about our limited collective capacity to identify how the unbalanced distribution of power and actors' amoral orientations are the main reasons for the terrible outcomes around trade inequalities and climate change. Consequently, integrating morality into the business paradigm is the most imperative challenge to overcome if we are to transform fundamentally how corporations tackle the grand sustainability challenges of our time.

REFERENCES

Aguilera, R. V., Aragón-Correa, J. A., Marano, V., & Tashman, P. A. 2021. The corporate governance of environmental sustainability: A review and proposal for more integrated research. ***Journal of Management***, 47: 1468–1497.

Alvarez, S. A., Zander, U., Barney, J. B., & Afuah, A. 2020. From the editors: Developing a theory of the firm for the 21st century. ***Academy of Management Review***, 45: 711–716.

Anderson, E. 2017. ***Private government: How employers rule our lives (and why we don't talk about it)***. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Aragon-Correa, J. A., Marcus, A. A., & Vogel, D. 2020. The effects of mandatory and voluntary regulatory pressures on firms' environmental strategies: A review and recommendations for future research. ***Academy of Management Annals***, 14: 339–365.

Barney, J., & Rangan, S. 2019. Editors' comments: Why do we need a special issue on new theoretical perspectives on market-based economic systems? ***Academy of Management Review***, 44: 1–5.

DesJardine, M. R., Marti, E., & Durand, R. 2021. Why activist hedge funds target socially responsible firms: The reaction costs of signaling corporate social responsibility. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 64: 851–872.

Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. 1983. Separation of ownership and control. ***Journal of Law & Economics***, 26: 301–325.

Freeman, R. E. 2010. ***Strategic management: A stakeholder approach***. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, M. 1970, September 13. A Friedman doctrine: The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. ***New York Times***. https://www.nytimes.com/1970/09/13/archives/a-friedman-doctrine-the-social-responsibility-of-business-is-to.html

Henderson, R. 2020. ***Reimagining capitalism in a world on fire***. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

Jain, T., & Jamali, D. 2016. Looking inside the black box: The effect of corporate governance on corporate social responsibility. ***Corporate Governance***, 24: 253–273.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. 1976. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. ***Journal of Financial Economics***, 3: 305–360.

Kaplan, S. 2019. ***The 360 corporation: From stakeholder trade-offs to transformation***. Stanford, CT: Stanford University Press.

Kitcher, P., & Keller, E. F. 2017. ***The seasons alter: How to save our planet in six acts***. New York, NY: Liveright Publishing.

Lazzarini, S. 2021. Capitalism and management research: The worst of times, the best of times. ***Academy of Management Review***, 46: 613–622.

March, J. G. 2018. Decision processes and value endogeneity. In S. Rangan (Ed.), ***Capitalism beyond mutuality? Perspectives integrating philosophy and social science***: 84–89. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. 1997. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. ***Academy of Management Review***, 22: 853–886.

Piketty, T. 2018. ***Capital in the twenty-first century***. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Porter, M. E., & Van der Linde, C. 1995. Toward a new conception of the environment-competitiveness relationship. ***Journal of Economic Perspectives***, 9: 97–118.

Rangan, S. 2018. Introduction. Capitalism beyond mutuality. In S. Rangan (Ed.), ***Capitalism beyond mutuality? Perspectives integrating philosophy and social science***: 1–22. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Reinecke, J., & Ansari, S. 2021. Microfoundations of framing: The interactional production of collective action frames in the Occupy movement. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 64: 378–408.

Risse, M., & Wollner, G. 2019. ***On trade justice: A philosophical plea for a new global deal***. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Scherer, A. G., Palazzo, G., & Seidl, D. 2013. Managing legitimacy in complex and heterogeneous environments: Sustainable development in a globalized world. ***Journal of Management Studies***, 50: 259–284.

Shi, W., Gao, C., & Aguilera, R. V. 2021. The liabilities of foreign institutional ownership: Managing political dependence through corporate political spending. ***Strategic Management Journal***, 42: 84–113.

Smith, A. 1776 [2010]. ***The wealth of nations. An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations***. London, U.K.: Harriman House Limited.

Society for Progress. 2021. The society. Retrieved from http://societyforprogress.org/

Suzumura, K. 2018. Intergenerational equity and responsibility for future generations. In S. Rangan (Ed.), ***Capitalism beyond mutuality? Perspectives integrating philosophy and social science***: 107–131. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Tsui, A. S., Enderle, G., & Jiang, K. 2018. Income inequality in the United States: Reflections on the role of corporations. ***Academy of Management Review***, 43: 156–168.

World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. Our common future (Brundtland Commission Report). Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/5987our-common-future.pdf

Ruth V. Aguilera (r.aguilera@northeastern.edu) is the distinguished Darla and Frederick Brodsky trustee professor in global business at the D'Amore-McKim School of Business at Northeastern University and a visiting professor at ESADE Business School. She is interested in research at the intersection of strategic organization and international business with a focus on comparative corporate governance and corporate social responsibility.

J. Alberto Aragón-Correa (jaragon@ugr.es) is the Alight talent and leadership chair and professor of management at the University of Granada. His research explores the relationships between organizations and the natural environment with a focus on the sustainability implications of strategic and governance decisions.

Valentina Marano (v.marano@northeastern.edu) is an associate professor in the Department of International Business and Strategy at the D'Amore-McKim School of Business at Northeastern University. Her research explores the practice adoption, organizational legitimacy and performance of multinational corporations from both emerging and advanced economies and broader issues of comparative corporate governance and corporate sustainability.