

I agree with many who said above that: Transnational Corporations should EVENTUALLY be regulated in each country so that each one has to follow very specific legal guidelines, so that outsourcing to poorer countries where workers are willing to work for less money and at terrible hours of the day and for long duration is something that is legally binding by every Transnational Corporation. I've seen documentaries on companies exploiting poorer workers, some in the conditions of their building and the pay they receive, and others, that are in good conditions and get decent pay, but are given unreasonable deadlines and goals to achieve and in a sense, making working conditions bad by enforcing these goals for the company's profit, although on the surface, they are paid well and the building looks in good condition. They might lose their job that they need and put up with this unreasonable goal while they work so that their job is not given to someone else in line waiting for one who would be willing to put up with it.

The advantage of the classic route of an intergovernmental, legally binding instrument is that it is the international business and human rights law that every transcontinental corporation must follow. The disadvantage of the classic route of an intergovernmental, legally binding instrument, is that it is currently too complex to be achievable in such a diverse and complicated international environment, but it should be set as a goal to attempt to be achieved and work toward as time goes on, and AS SOON AS POSSIBLE too. The route grounded in 'polycentric governance', as advocated by John Ruggie of Harvard in January 2014, during his tenure as the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises is complementary to the classic legally binding route, since John Ruggie says it would be best to make it legally binding and to set that as a goal, but it is currently impossible to achieve spontaneously in a complex and diverse international community but that it is something we should immediately begin working toward as a goal. So the 2 approaches are not mutually exclusive. I think it would add value to what the international human rights law already imposes on States, since it would be part of each Transnational Corporation's Company goals, stated within the company, and employees of the company made more aware, to work with the international human rights laws already imposed on States.