The Dual Impact of Wealth Creation and Expenditure

Introduction

"The wealthiest 1% of the world's population now own more than half of its wealth, raising questions about the broader social benefits of wealth creation" (Pimentel et al., 2018). This remarkable statistical information shows that successful business people play a decisive role in shaping up the worldwide economic situation. However, there is no consent regarding whether these people, in pursuing personal wealth, benefit society. Some people argue that through great achievements in business, successful people champion innovations, job creation, and economic development, which benefit millions of people (Schumpeter and Swedberg, 2021). Meanwhile, their appropriating an enormous portion of created wealth often undermines social justice.

There are both, benefits and harms in relation to the impact of wealth creation and expenditure by successful business people. This essay examines both perspectives to evaluate the broader impact of wealth creation and expenditure by successful business people. Firstly, it will explore the positive externalities of such activities, which can significantly enhance societal well-being (Kramer & Porter, 2011). Then, it will also address the potential negative consequences which may arise due to profit-driven motives (Stiglitz, 2012).

The essay has argued that a successful business person can benefit society substantially through both business creation and charity, so long as business creation is oriented to ethical standards and the common good. A balanced approach to profit and social responsibility can shape a more inclusive and sustainable world.

Wealth Creation: Positive Impacts

As to the most significant positive effect of successful business people becoming wealthy, it is, in my opinion, the employment opportunities they can create and the following economic growth. Take, for example, two outstanding entrepreneurs, Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos. At present, Amazon and Tesla employ millions of workers worldwide. A 2020 report by the Economic Policy Institute stated that Amazon's workforce exceeded 1.2 million employees. These workplaces span various fields, including technology, logistics, and customer service (Pathania and Netessine, 2022). In addition to providing people with means for subsistence, reduced unemployment rates help local businesses operate, which, in turn, benefits the entire economy. The secondary multiplier effect of large businesses making this possible lies in people's increased purchasing power, higher taxes, and better infrastructure (Moretti, 2010).

The generation of successful entrepreneurs has continued to drive innovation and technological advancement, creating wealth not just for themselves but also for others. Companies like Apple and Google have massively revolutionized communication, availability of information, and general living through innovative products and services. Through the innovation of the iPhone, Apple has been able to revolutionize the mobile technology market and, in the process, has since spurred the app economy, now employing millions of people worldwide (Parker, Van Alstyne, & Choudary, 2016). Equally, Google has used its investments in search algorithms and artificial intelligence to provide unparalleled access to information, thereby making it possible for anyone globally to educate themselves or further their careers (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014).

These positive externalities of such innovations go a step ahead in economic growth and facilitate the social development of other domains too. For example, due to Stanton (2002), the medical technology companies that have made so much headway in health care, starting from diagnostic tools to the treatment options that are available to humans today. These technological advancements help to provide a higher quality of life and a further lifespan, thus reflecting the social benefits of wealth generation by a successful businessperson. It is through positive impacts such as job creations and innovations that the potential of entrepreneurial success leads to substantial economic and social progress.

Wealth Creation: Negative Impacts

While entrepreneurial wealth creation can lead to economic growth and technological advancement, it also has distinct downsides, mainly related to inequality and exploitation. The negative side of the coin with the creation of wealth is widely discussed by critical commentators. According to them, businesses significantly contribute to increasing income disparity and exploit labor, mainly in developing countries. Piketty (2014) insists that when wealth is accumulated at the top social stratum, the income inequality becomes deep, thereby distinguishing between the rich and the poor. Big businesses, in their profit-maximization quest, often relocate the manufacturing process to developing countries with low labor costs. This, in turn, results in labor exploitation since workers are often paid low wages, forced to work in problematic conditions, and their labor rights are strictly neglected (Foster, 2014). For instance, many media reports highlight exploitative labor conditions within the textile industry in which workers from developing countries work in problematic conditions and for relatively low wages (Azhar and Ali, 2024).

Besides deepening income inequality and exploitation, business wealth creation is normally associated with extensive environmental outcomes. In other words, business wealth usually comes hand-in-hand with vast environmental consequences; the fingerprints of certain industries, such as those of fossil fuels or fast fashion, tend to be heavily found in the ecological space. In the case of fossil fuels, profit motives within the fossil fuel industry have driven greenhouse gas emitters around the world into the trajectory of climatic change and environmental disaster (Masson-Delmotte et al., 2019). Extraction and consumption of fossil fuel deplete natural resources and, simultaneously, lead to pollution and habitat destruction, posing a risk to biodiversity and ecological stability (Rockström et al., 2009). Similarly, the fast fashion industry, characterized by quick production cycles and disposable consumer culture, takes a hard hit on the environment. Resource-intensive work in the mass production of cheap, trendy clothing, being water, energy, and chemicals, mainly contributes to its pollution and waste (Niinimäki et al., 2020). The environmental cost of fast fashion is seen in the contamination of water bodies due to toxic dye runoff and pollution from textile landfill waste, resulting in soil and water contamination. In a way, these environmental challenges raise necessary questions regarding the sustainability of growth-driven profit and the ethical responsibilities of successful business people.

Wealth Spending: Positive Impacts

Philanthropy and social investment are some of the most important positive repercussions of wealth expenditure by successful business people. People like Bill Gates and Warren Buffet have spent billions in the course of improving health, education, and decreasing poverty using their foundations. For example, in the past, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation have committed more than $50 billion to different global health programs that operate in the areas of infectious diseases, mostly malaria and HIV/AIDs, in the process, thus saving millions of lives (Gates Foundation, 2021). All this has a very tremendous value with regard to improvements in public health, better opportunities for education, and lowered poverty rates. It goes to show how their money can be put to resolve significant issues of society.

Apart from individual philanthropy, CSR also has significant positive spillovers for society. CSR is a concept in which companies manage business processes to make positive influence on society and different stakeholders, which includes consumers, employees, investors, and government, along with local communities. So many corporations do different CSR programs that answer to grave social issues like climate change, fair trade, and community welfare. Unilever, for example, designs its Sustainable Living Plan to insulate the company's growth from its environmental influence while at the same time raising its positive influence on society (Lawrence et al., 2018). The company has, under this plan, committed to decrease greenhouse gas emission, up the efficiency in water use, and improve the living standards of smallholder farmers.

While carrying out CSR activities, environment-related issues are not the only concern; community development is also worked upon. Most companies strive to make a difference in the community by investing in the community itself, which is done in the form of school building, healthcare center improvement, and vocational training, amongst others (Porter & Kramer, 2011). For instance, Starbucks is involved with numerous community-based projects, such as supporting coffee farmers through its own Farmer Support Centers and other local education programs. These in turn help in creating sustainable communities, improving the local economies, and creating a positive link between businesses and communities. CSR can also be instrumental in providing benefits to the company as it will increase the reputation of the company and create loyalty among the consumers, thereby resulting in business growth. Consumers today are getting very conscious about their needs for performing ethical practices and are ready to support companies showing commitment to social as well as environmental responsibility (Kotler & Lee, 2008). It thus becomes a virtuous circle of benefits for the business accruing from such activities on one hand and the society from the positive effects of such initiatives. It is very true to say that the wealth spending of successful business people through philanthropy and CSR has much more positive impacts on society. The efforts contribute toward critical social and environmental issues for the overall well-being and sustainable development of the community.

Wealth Spending: Negative Impacts

While the spending of wealth by successful business people can bring about positive societal changes, it also has significant negative impacts, particularly in terms of consumerism and waste, as well as ineffective philanthropy. High levels of personal consumption and luxury spending can perpetuate consumerism, which is associated with wasteful use of resources and environmental degradation. Worldwatch Institute reports that consumer culture, promoted by the rich, leads to spread of consumption patterns that waste natural resources and cause pollution (Assadourian, 2012). Luxury goods and services are inherently environment-unfriendly; rare materials are depleted, and high carbon footprints are generated in the process of manufacture and transportation. This sort of spending means preferring the present pleasure at the cost of a sustainable future, thereby worsening such problems as climate change and scarce resources.

Besides encouraging consumerism, the money that gets spent on luxury contributes to social inequality through the generation and widening of the gap between the haves and the have-nots. According to the theory of conspicuous consumption developed by Thorstein Veblen, representatives of high society demonstrate their economic power by making excessive and expensive purchases for the purpose of social comparison. In this way, the high society stimulates envy and, as a consequence, forces lower classes to make attempts at copying their consumption, going far beyond what they can afford (Veblen, 2017). Such behavior is considered to be not only a provocation for excessive consumption but also a source of public discontent and financial instability.

Another drawback of this part of the expenditure of the affluent is that it has to do with inefficient philanthropy. While most business people commit to philanthropic work with the noble intention of making a difference, there are those cases where these efforts are poorly managed and do not work towards the actual root causes of issues. Strictly speaking, most philanthropic efforts are top-down, and in the process, the view of the people concerned is not realized for the sake of giving favor to the donors' vision (Edwards, 2008). For example, contributions to education institutions and healthcare systems in large amounts make the recipients dependent without building local capacities, which leads to unsustainable solutions (Moran, 2023).

On the other hand, there are cases when philanthropic efforts are more about the image of the donor rather than achieving a huge social effect. "Philanthrocapitalism" is in favor of the market-based solutions that are not in tandem with the socially complex nature of the problem (Bishop & Green, 2010). Opponents of such approaches argue that they maintain the existing power relations and are not able to make changes last.

Conclusion

In summary, successful business people can be of paramount benefit to society through job creation, economic development, and innovation. Moreover, their creation of wealth translates into positive contributions from philanthropic activities and corporate social responsibility (CSR) to the resolution of critical social and environmental issues. While these occurrences promise to be positive, the negative effects include income inequality, labor exploitation, environmental degradation, and, shockingly, unproductive philanthropy. While prosperity is a driver of progress, it also presents serious risks if not responsibly managed.

References

Pimentel, D. A. V., Aymar, I. M., & Lawson, M. (2018). Reward work, not wealth.

Kramer, M. R., & Porter, M. (2011). *Creating shared value* (Vol. 17). Boston, MA, USA: FSG.

Schumpeter, J. A., & Swedberg, R. (2021). *The theory of economic development*. Routledge.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future*. WW Norton & Company.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. WW Norton & Company.

Pathania, V., & Netessine, S. (2022). The impact of Amazon facilities on local economies. *Available at SSRN 4116645*.

Moretti, E. (2010). Local multipliers. *American Economic Review*, *100*(2), 373-377.

Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). *Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy and how to make them work for you*. WW Norton & Company.

Stanton, J. (2002). Innovations in health and medicine. *Diffusion and resistance in the twentieth century*.

Azhar, S., & Ali, A. (2024, May). Global Accumulation & Gendered Class Exploitation: Theory and Evidence from the Garment Industry During the Covid Pandemic. In *Forum for Social Economics* (pp. 1-21). Routledge.

Foster, J. B. (2014). *The theory of monopoly capitalism*. NYU Press.

Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pörtner, H. O., Roberts, D., Skea, J., Shukla, P. R., ... & Waterfield, T. (2019). Global warming of 1.5 C. *An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of*, *1*, 93-174.

Niinimäki, K., Peters, G., Dahlbo, H., Perry, P., Rissanen, T., & Gwilt, A. (2020). The environmental price of fast fashion. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, *1*(4), 189-200.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., ... & Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *nature*, *461*(7263), 472-475.

Houtenville, A., Bach, S., & Paul, S. (2023). Annual Report on People with Disabilities in America: 2023. *Institute on Disability, University of New Hampshire*.

Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2008). *Corporate social responsibility: Doing the most good for your company and your cause*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kramer, M. R., & Porter, M. (2011). *Creating shared value* (Vol. 17). Boston, MA, USA: FSG.

Lawrence, J., Rasche, A., & Kenny, K. (2018). Sustainability as opportunity: Unilever's sustainable living plan. In *Managing Sustainable Business: An Executive Education Case and Textbook* (pp. 435-455). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Assadourian, E. (2012). The rise and fall of consumer cultures. *21st Century*, (2 (12)), 5-45.

Bishop, M., & Green, M. (2010). *Philanthrocapitalism: How giving can save the world*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Edwards, M. (2008). Just another emperor: The myths and realities of philanthrocapitalism.

Moran, M. (2023). Global philanthropy. In *International organization and global governance* (pp. 440-456). Routledge.

Veblen, T. (2017). *The theory of the leisure class*. Routledge.