**1. Introduction & Case: *BASF*(p1)**

  “**we are going to abandon this plan and build somewhere else”** because…

  The fish in the river deserve to be treated as sentient beings, not harmed.

  The pollution will drive away some of the tourism to Hilton Head, hurting the local economy.

  The river’s pollution flows into oceans.

 Shipping to and from plant and passing so close to Parris Island has been deemed too dangerous.

 “**we are going ahead but with the expensive pollution minimisation**” because…

 The fish in the river deserve to be treated as sentient beings, not harmed significantly (well-managed fisheries are an economic asset and social good)

  The fines from the pollution administration will be far  higher and more expensive than taking immediate action and minimizing pollution.

  We still want to bring more jobs to the area (various economic benefits, including the satisfaction of the employee) but not sacrifice the wellbeing of the fish

  The county can benefit from the job creation, while minimizing environmental harm



**“we are going ahead with the new plant, as planned”** because...

  It will bring employment opportunities to residents, boosting the local economy (various economic benefits, including the satisfaction of the employee).

  80% of the residents said that they would be in favour of the implementation

  There are fewer locations that fit BASF’s requirements