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| |  | | --- | | The following appeared in a memo from the Mayor of the city of Hillview:  “In order to alleviate the serious unemployment problem in our town, we should encourage Autotech to build its automobile manufacturing plant in our area. The Hillview landfill, which has been undeveloped for decades, is a perfect site for this plant. The building and staffing of this plant will put to work thousands of Hillview residents left unemployed after Computech computer software programming company abandoned its national facility last year. I am asking the City Council to authorize a large campaign to attract the company and offer significant tax incentives to make our town attractive to this giant of car manufacturing.”  Write a response in which you discuss what questions would need to be answered in order to decide whether the recommendation and the argument on which it is based are reasonable. Be sure to explain how the answers to these questions would help to evaluate the recommendation. | |

The Mayor of Hillview reaches the conclusion that Autotech should be encouraged to build a manufacturing plant in the city, and that a large campaign must be authorized to attract the company. They also consider offering significant tax incentives to make the region more attractive to the automobile giant. This argument has been made on the premise that the Hillview landfill is a perfect site for the plant, and that such measures would help ameliorate the city's unemployment problem. However, the argument fails to answer three important questions, the answers to which could drastically affect the veracity of the Mayor's logic.

First, would the construction of an automobile manufacturing plant effectively employ the people who were forced out of their jobs at Computech? It may be the case that the former employees of Computech, who were software programmers, are not adequate for employment by Autotech, which deals in automobiles. Even if there were software-related jobs at Autotech, it is possible that these programmers found jobs elsewhere, or have already moved to a different sector. Another possibility is that the jobs at Autotech pay less than those of other companies; the salaries may not be competitive. If evidence arises that any of these situations are true, then the answer to this question would be 'no.' This would damage one of the Mayor's main points, which relies on Autotech being able to employ these 'ex-employees' of Computech. Hence, the Mayor should deduce the exact answer to this question before asking the City Council to go forward with the mentioned plans.

Second, would the landfill function as a perfect site for the automobile plant? It may be possible that the area being underdeveloped would be considered as a disadvantage for the company, considering they have to build their plant from scratch. This landfill may also be too far from the city, making it less inviting to potential employees who live on the other side of the city. It may also be the case that the area around the landfill has inadequate water or electricity infrastructure, and there may be persistent bad smells arising from the age-old landfill, the contents of which have not been elaborated. The Mayor has suggested that the answer to this question is 'yes,' but fails to substantiate their response, by not providing any further evidence for their claim. Even if Autotech is likely to solve the employment problem, the location of the landfill, or the conditions of the area - may be a dealbreaker for the company.

Finally, even if the answers to the questions above are in favour of the Mayor's conclusion, would tax incentives and large campaigns be sufficient to attract Autotech to the city? The argument makes the assumption that these measures are enough, but does not consider possibilities of the answer to this question being 'no.' What if Autotech already has a manufacturing plant in a nearby city, and hence decides that building another one in close proximity is redundant? Autotech may not even have the funds necessary to build a new plant, even with tax benefits. Furthermore, it may also be the case that the automobile parts (raw materials) are too expensive at locations in and around Hillview, and that setting up a plant in this location may not be a sound plan in the long-term. Thus, answering this question is important to prove to the City Council that its efforts would not go in vain.

In conclusion, the argument, as it stands now, fails considerably in making a persuasive case for itself. The mayor has failed to answer the aforementioned questions, and has thus not made an argument that would be convincing enough for the City Council to accept the proposal put forth. The argument should consult reliable sources, and provide evidence that effectively backs up its stated and unstated assumptions. Thus, only after such an overhaul, can the Mayor pose a valid proposal.