**. Introduction & Case: *BASF*(p1)**

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

   The pollution would destroy local wildlife and disrupt the ecosystem (*ethics*: ‘should not harm sentient(?) beings’  *economic way of thinking*: focus on the long term monetary value for DM purposes. It can be argued that these are ultimately the same thing (??)

   It would decrease tourism revenue and the overall image of Hilton Head.

  It would hurt local businesses due to less tourism revenue.

  Discourage larger potentially polluting  corporations from coming in because of Hilton Head’s new reputation for being a ‘green’ area.

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

  This ‘option’ will provide jobs to an area with a high need for them.

   By minimizing pollution we would leave the area attractive for vacationers.

   This option is a ‘reasonable compromise’ for both sides of the argument.

  

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

   The state pollution centre has already given us the ‘all clear’ to continue with the development, saying there should be no issues.

   80% of citizens in the county are in favour of it ‘those who aren’t rich’; it also raises the per capita income of the region because it will bring in jobs.

   They have already purchased the land needed for the factory.

  They allocated 1 million dollars to help with the pollution control in Beaufort.