Introduction

The prevalent view is that the generation of profits by firms is a zero-sum game, where companies maximize profit margins at the expense of both consumers and society. This belief leads to calls for greater government control over businesses or for firms to be organized around motives other than profit. However, as Adam Smith noted long ago, [1] firms do not need to aim at social welfare to enhance it, as market incentives guide them to do so indirectly. In other words, the generation of profit brings with it an increase in social welfare.

In this essay, I will argue that profit motivated firms (PMF's) are superior to government or charity run firms in delivering outcomes that matter to society, specifically efficiency, innovation, responsibility and accountability.

PMF's are defined here as organizations that aim to maximize returns to their owners and shareholders by efficiently responding to consumer demands. Government and charity run enterprises, by contrast, prioritize equity and universal access. This essay proceeds by examining behaviours engendered by the profit motive, contrasting that with those seen in public and charitable firms and analysing them on specific metrics.

Behaviours created by the profit motive

Profit is the difference between the cost of producing a good and the revenue it generates. Firms that seek to maximize this difference are allocatively and productively efficient as a consequence. Allocative efficiency is achieved when firms produce the quantity that consumers desire and productive efficiency is when inputs are used in the least costly way. [2] These efficiencies are essential for maximizing profits and are adopted naturally under competitive conditions. For example, producing too much or too little relative to demand leads to unsold inventory or missed revenue opportunities respectively.

Moreover, the presence of profit can be an important signal in detecting whether resources are being wasted. If there's no profit in making an article, it's a sign that the labour, inputs and capital devoted to its production are misallocated. [3]

The profit motive also encourages responsiveness to consumer needs, as competitive pressures ensures that any firms neglecting the same will lose consumers. This is a form of self-policing- high powered incentives (performance- dependent benefits) ensure that firms are held in check by the market. [4]

In a well functioning competitive market, firms must continuously improve to maintain and consolidate profits. This leads to innovation, driven by the forces of creative destruction.[5] Firms that innovate can command higher margins, while slackers lose out.

In the banking sector, cost efficiency has been positively correlated with welfare outcomes. Cost efficient banking operations are positively correlated with social welfare gains. Banks that operate more efficiently are better positioned to compensate for welfare losses. For instance, a study of the Ghanian banking system showed that cost efficient banks were better at shielding against welfare losses, particularly while competing with foreign institutions. [6] Additionally, under competitive conditions, a firm must either offer lower prices or higher value than its rivals, thereby benefiting the consumers. [7]

Research shows that a one standard deviation in average cost efficiency can result in welfare gains ranging from 2.5% to 6.2%, allowing us to infer that welfare enhancement and profit maximization are not mutually exclusive. In this way, profit seeking banks that focus on cost discipline, and thus profit maximization, contribute materially to financial consumer protection and societal welfare.

Ultimately, profit rewards the creation of products that people want, the effective delivery of those products, and even the efficiency with which these outcomes are achieved. Since these processes are often invisible to the consumer, it leads to the false belief that the generation of profit is a zero-sum game. This perception is particularly common when the short-term disruption caused by creative destruction, like unemployment, bankruptcies, etc, are prioritized in the public eye while long term gains are overlooked. As Schumpeter argued, creative destruction is the driving force of capitalist progress and although it may appear harmful in the short term, it is through this mechanism that older, less efficient firms and practices are replaced by better alternatives.

Behaviours caused by government or charity owned enterprises

Firms not driven by profit, while government owned or charitable prioritise equity, access and universal service over efficiency or innovation. While these goals are attractive in theory, such organizations suffer from weaker incentives and time lags in their actions. [7]

The first outcome can be explained by the principal-agent problem: government officials (agents) may not act in the interests of citizens (principals), especially when monitoring is weak.[8] Also, when some firms are given the support and funding of the government, it crowds out other players, thus creating an imperfectly competitive market due to the absence of low barriers to entry.

According to the X inefficiency theory, these organizations tend to operate bellow their production possibility curve because they lack the performance pressure present in PMF's and competitive markets. [9]

Nonprofits often treat symptoms rather than structural causes due to short funding cycles, changing funders and limited capital formation, causing their long term gains to be less than that of PMF's.

Public programs on the other hand, empower bureaucrats and professionals, giving these workers the control while the people they serve get none. Doing so undermines the confidence of consumers, and competence of workers, creating dependency. [10] Furthermore, government operated firms and programs lack the flexibility to adapt or innovate. Without competitive pressure or the risk of failure, there is little incentive to adopt novel technologies or processes. In other words, the lack of performance based rewards and feedback often results in stagnation and low growth.

Comparative analysis

PMF's are, by design, more efficient. Their survival depends on reducing costs and responding to consumer demand, while government and charitable firms often operate with fixed budgets and little competition. The lack of competitive pressure in the latter can allow inefficiencies to persist. Profit motivated firms are also more innovative, as they must adopt to new technologies or be replaced. Charities and public firms, constrained by budget and supervision, are less likely to pursue novel techniques, as discussed earlier.

In terms of responsiveness, PMF's respond directly to market signals. A drop in demand immediately signals that resources should be reallocated. Government run firms by contrast lack such signals, and this disconnect leads to rigid service delivery that often fails to adapt to evolving needs and always grapples with a time-lag.

On the other hand, equity is often better pursued by non-profit or government actors. PMF's may neglect less profitable goods where they lack the monetary incentive to operate, as in the case of providing healthcare in rural areas (raises limited revenue) and special education (limited market and higher costs). Nevertheless, this does not justify eradicating PMF's altogether. Instead, targeted government regulation and subsidies can be used to prevent the under provision of non profitable goods and services.

For instance, the adoption of optimal incentive regulation in the electric utility industry, [11] imposed with the aim of making firms internalise the negative externality of its production, has been shown to yield significant welfare gains. Similarly, the integration of cost efficiency policies with robust information-sharing mechanisms has been proposed as a means of hedging against welfare losses in the banking sector.

A good way to empirically see the benefits of profit maximization is to analyse welfare gains after privatisation. Privatisation refers to the transfer of enterprise ownership from public to private hands, consequently accompanied by a change in the firm's primary objective from maximization of social welfare to that of profit. Critics say that this shift comes at the cost of equity and public accountability. However, evidence suggests that in many cases, the result has been improved efficiency, innovation and improved service quality, especially when privatisation is paired with competitive market reforms or independent regulation.

Empirical research on global privatisation outcomes shows that, under certain conditions, shifting firms from public to private control can lead to measurable welfare gains. These gains are often attributed to reduced monopoly behaviour, increased competition, and improved cost efficiency- all of which raise consumer surplus and economic welfare. [12]

The privatisation of Canadian National Railway (CN) illustrates exactly how transitioning from a public service model to a profit driven one can improve operational efficiency. Post privatisation, CN experienced statistically significant increases in profitability, productivity, capital investment and tax contributions while maintaining a stable capital structure. Although employment declined, the firm's performance on key indicators like return on assets and dividends outpaced its earlier state and its competitor, Canadian Pacific. This shows us how aligning welfare objectives with profit incentives can increase consumer surplus and social welfare, without sacrificing operational viability. [13]

Counterarguments and refutation

Critics argue that the pursuit of profit leads to negative externalities, such as environmental degradation, inequality and the under-provision of public goods. Profit maximizing firms may ignore the social cost of their action when private costs are lower, creating market failures. Natural monopolies, like electricity and water, may not be profitably served without government intervention. Additionally, PMF's may ignore ethical concerns like exploitation and exclusion. For example, private firms may not serve underprivileged patients or disabled students unless forced to by law.

Some propose corporate social responsibility (CSR) or hybrid models like social enterprises as solutions. However, in these systems, the lack of a well-defined goal allows for exploitation by managers and reduces their accountability. Expecting firms to benefit conflicting interest groups simultaneously is impractical. Furthermore, CSR can be seen as a form of taxation without representation as argued by Milton Friedman. Social goals should be addressed through democratic channels, not through the discretionary philanthropy of firms. [1]

Ultimately the best solution is not the abandonment of PMF's, but the implementation of effective regulation and taxation. Profit and public interest can coexist when markets are competitive, and externalities are internalized.

Conclusions

While neither model is perfect, profit-motivated firms can generally outperform government and charity operated firms in the metrics of efficiency, innovation and responsiveness. The competitive pressures of well-functioning markets ensure that resources are allocated to their most valuable uses, innovation is rewarded, and firms remain accountable to consumers.

Concerns about equity and externalities are valid but do not justify dismantling the profit motive. Rather, these issues can be resolved through regulation, targeted subsidies, and public policy.

As Milton Friedman wrote, the sole responsibility of business is to maximise profits "so long as it stays within the rules of the game; in other words, within the bounds of law, ethical norms, and competitive fairness. Profit, when properly constrained, is not a threat to the public interest; it is a powerful ally.

Endnotes

1. 1 Smith, A. (1776). An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations. In *Oxford University Press eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.10 3/oseo/instance.00043218
2. Pettinger, T. (2019, December 7). *Productive vs allocative efficiency*. Economics Help. https://www.economicshelp.org/blog/2412/economics/productive-vs-allocative-efficiency/
3. 3 *Does privatization serve the public interest?* (1991, November 1). Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/1991/11/does-privatization-serve-the-public-interest
4. 4Clyde, P., Sivadasan, J., Karnani, A. G., Manchanda, P., & Narayanan, M. P. (2018, March 29). *The social impact of profit-maximizing firms* [Working paper]. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3284113
5. *Creative Destruction - Econlib*. (2023, May 12). Econlib. https://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/CreativeDestruction.html
6. Adeabah, D., & Andoh, C. (2019). Cost efficiency and welfare performance of banks: Evidence from an emerging economy. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMF-06-2019-0212

7. 7 Bhattacharjee, A., & Dana, J. (2017, November 28). *People Think Companies Can't Do Good and Make Money. Can Companies Prove Them Wrong?* Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2017/11/people-think-companies-cant-do-good-and-make-money-can-companies-prove-them-wrong

8. Shonk, K. (n.d.). *principal agent theory*. PON - Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. https://www.pon.harvard.edu/tag/principal-agent-theory/

9. Kenton, W. (2022, August 31). *X-Efficiency: Meaning and history in Economics*. Investopedia. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/x/x-efficiency.asp
10. Osborne, D. T., David Osborne, & Ted Gaebler. (1993). Reinventing government. *League for Innovation in the Community Coll.* https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED367424.pdf
11. Abito, J. M. (2017). *Measuring the Welfare Gains from Optimal Incentive Regulation*. https://faculty.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/abito_pollutionpriceregulation.pdf
12. Hassan, T., Hassan, M. K., Ariff, M., & Mohamad, S. (2015). Productive efficiency and welfare gains from privatization in Malaysia. *Journal of Economic Cooperation and Development, 36*(1), 133–164. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3263357
13. Boardman, A., Laurin, C., Moore, M., & Vining, A. (2013). Efficiency, profitability and welfare gains from the Canadian National privatization. *Research in Transportation Business & Management, 6*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rtbm.2012.11.011
14. Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). A Friedman doctrine: The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/1970/09/13/archives/a-friedman-doctrine-the-social-responsibility-of-business-is-to.html