**Issue 1: Profits the Only Business of Business?**

Every day businesses are confronted with many difficult challenges. These issues must be decided upon in one of two controversial ways. Is the solution to the problem one that will cost the business money in the immediate future, but make gains in the long run, or is the solution going to cause the business to reap additional profits now? This decision leaves us with an important question. Are profits the only business of business?

Milton Freedman writes that YES! profits are the most important part of a business, it is the whole livelihood and purpose for having a business in the first place. He states that "social responsibility should come from the shareholders, not the corporate executives." This being said, if a company decides to make a decision that would benefit itself, but harm the public, that is okay. It was the shareholders of that particular business who should have raised the red flag. Though this entire statement should be taken with a grain of salt. Freedman brings up the point of "You (the businesses) shouldn't go as far as killing people for profits... but, if taking a life will benefit the majority then there is nothing wrong with that." Steve firmly grasped this idea and made several very good points. If a business isn't there to make profits, then what more is its purpose? Yes, they supply goods to the people, but if that company isn't taking in profits they will not be able to sustain, grow, and adapt to the changes and demands of society. This was a very good point and really creates a river of thoughts wondering if this is really the way a business should be run.

On the other hand Tyler made a very strong argument saying that a price cannot be placed on any human life. One person is not worth any more or less than the next. By killing one person to gain a profit, you just lost the value of that life and customer. "You can't go around killing people for the *"better"* of a business. It will, in the long one destroy it." This is a valid point, and Robert Almeder, the opposing opinion in the profits of business article would wholeheartedly agree. His main point throughout the entire argument was that a business must operate within limits. They must always choose the ethical approach to operating because for those who don't, it never ends well.

All in all, both presentations showed great strengths and some minor weaknesses, but it all boils down to my final opinion. I believe that Steve made a much stronger argument than Tyler had. He was far more familiar with the opinions with the author, being able to answer almost every question or concern that would come to him with ease. His thoughts flowed smoothly and his presentation flowed in order of importance making for a very strong argument. In the end, which even strikes me as surprising, I was not swayed by Steve's arguments. Why? Not because his presentation could have been stronger or more persuasive, but because I have a firm moral fiber that is nearly impossible to sway. I am a firm believer in doing what is best for the customer (society), and if it means the business going under then those are the consequences of whatever action they took and they must settle with the results of those actions.