Answer from last year’s MBA class.

Despite the obviously damaging issue of lead poisoning, a decision by a member of the consortium to “continue with TEL production” can nonetheless be supported or justified, as in the previous case, by referring systematically to various *right*-poles of the stable framework, as follows.

Ultimately, this project can be justified with reference to collective human needs particularly 3rd world countries inability to operate their cars without leaded gasoline.

Like any other enterprising trader throughout history, we as a company are simply attempting to meet a market demand for a product that we know how to produce and distribute. By supplying TEL to these countries, this is demonstrating a tradeoff of consumer preference versus their general well-being.

The profits from TEL are being reinvested into “good” things such as green products in an effort to justify its negative impacts. Because although GLC is a “cash-cow” in this particular market, by redistributing the profits into “good” investments, this is offsetting the damage caused.

 Another way to offset the negative impacts would be through informing consumers of the health impacts lead based gasoline has. This will be done working with our buyers (big oil) to develop initiatives like providing of warning labels where the end product is sold that will teach consumers about the impacts of using lead gasoline and also informing consumers of alternative options. Lastly, stakeholders can benefit from the financial growth of GLC.