**Part one is The War on Drugs:** Federal marijuana prohibition is a form ofviolent, racist social control that targets black and Latin@ communities at home and abroad. Marijuana convictions cut individuals off from **essential support systems** such as food stamps, housing, and other federal aid. **One in three black men** can expect to go to jail in their lifetimes. And **60,000** have died in Mexico since 08 as a result of the War on Drugs. We must connect the dots between the history of marijuana policy, mass incarceration, and broader structures of oppression. **Shipps 14[[1]](#footnote--1)**

U.S. Marijuana Prohibition Is Recent and Racist The criminalization of marijuana is relatively new in the United States, and deeply tied to some of most shameful moments in our country's history. From the 1600s into the 1890s, the U.S. government encouraged and incentivized the production of hemp -- the plant from which marijuana is derived. In the early 1900s, Mexican immigrants reportedly introduced recreational marijuana use to the United States. After the Mexican Revolution of 1910, the presence of Mexican immigrants in the United States surged. And though President Abraham Lincoln officially signed the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, the post-slavery system of convict leasing, frequently more violent and inhumane than the system that preceded it, ensured that black Americans continued to be brutally exploited for unpaid labor and profit, until the United States formally prohibited the practice in response to embarrassing propaganda campaigns by the Axis powers in the early years of World War II. Notably, in an era where the United States encountered unprecedented levels of Mexican immigration, and arguably the first true liberation of black Americans in its history, the legal fight against marijuana -- and the criminalization of its consumers -- began in earnest. During the 1930's, the height of eugenics, dubious but nevertheless influential research linked so-called "racially inferior communities," criminality, and marijuana use. By 1931, 29 states had outlawed marijuana. The Marijuana Tax Act of 1937 was the first piece of federal legislation to effectively criminalize the drug, restricting marijuana possession to individuals who paid excise taxes and who were only permitted a limited number of authorized medical and industry uses. The Civil Rights era brought in a new and harsher wave of marijuana restrictions. As black Americans struggled and died for equal rights to public school access and voting representation, the country that had oppressed them for centuries passed law after law making marijuana possession a crime worthy of imprisonment and a lifetime of limited citizenship rights. Between 1951 and 1956, the United States enacted federal laws requiring mandatory sentencing for marijuana possession. Richard Nixon, who rose to the presidency by embracing the "Southern Strategy," introduced the "war on drugs" concept in 1971, and established the Drug Enforcement Administration in 1973. And Ronald Reagan, who counted among his advisors the infamous Lee Atwater -- outspoken champion of using coded racist language to win elections in a more linguistically gentile post-Civil Rights Act era -- signed the Anti-Drug Abuse Act into law in 1986, instituting mandatory sentences for drug-related crimes. In 1989, President George H.W. Bush -- whose campaign had been managed by none other than Lee Atwater -- launched in a presidential address the more forceful, multi-billion dollar, modern incarnation of the "War on Drugs." We're Paying in Blood: The Staggering Costs of Marijuana Prohibition The prohibition of marijuana in the United States may have happened only recently, but its consequences have been swift and dire. The Sentencing Project reported last year that one in three black males can expect to go to jail in their lifetimes. Given that felons are often stripped of their voting rights even after they have served out their sentences, and given the seemingly unstoppable expansion of carcerality plaguing our nation, the number of disenfranchised felons in the United States grew from 1.17 million in 1976 to 5.85 million by 2010, and at a rate of 500 percent since 1980. In some Southern states, including Florida, Kentucky, and Virginia, the consequences of harsh sentencing policies, the War on Drugs, and life-long post-imprisonment voting restrictions, mean that one in five black Americans is prevented outright from going to the polls on election day ever again. Today, the United States has the highest imprisonment rate of any country, including North Korea, China, and Iran, in the world. And in our modern era of mass incarceration, as civil rights lawyer and acclaimed scholar Michelle Alexander documented in her book, "The New Jim Crow," there are currently more black American men behind bars in the United States than there were enslaved in 1850. Internationally, it is unusual -- if not virtually unheard of -- to lock people in cages for non-violent drug offenses. And yet the United States does this with prolific and alarming regularity. In 2012, some 1.5 million people -- a population greater than those residing in about 10 states -- were arrested on non-violent drug charges. Of those, 749,825 were for marijuana law violations, and 658,231 were for marijuana possession only. Considering that our last three U.S. presidents admit to having smoked marijuana, it boggles the mind that the country whose drug policies they determine continues to cage marijuana users on such a massive scale. Tragically, once convicted on marijuana charges, a U.S. citizen's capacity to improve his or her life circumstances is forever imperiled. What follows are a partial list of restrictions that, depending on which state one is lucky or unlucky enough to be arrested in, an American can expect to face -- into perpetuity -- even after he or she has served out any time in prison associated with marijuana possession or sales: ineligibility for adoption or foster parenting, ineligibility for "food stamps" or Temporary Assistance to Needy Families; legal discrimination in hiring and ineligibility for professional licensing programs; ineligibility for federal student loans and financial aid; revocation of driver's licenses; and, as noted above, outright prohibitions on voting. In short, without outside sources of wealth, an American convicted for marijuana possession can be legally prohibited from working, going to college, receiving welfare, or voting for the rest of his or her life. By policy design, the United States is effectively erasing the humanity and citizenship of hundreds of thousands of Americans, year after year after year. Moreover, American marijuana prohibition policies have lethal consequences even beyond our country's borders. Mexico, the United States' biggest marijuana supplier, has been particularly devastated by the War on Drugs. Human Rights Watch reports that, from 2006 to 2012, 60,000 deaths in Mexico were directly attributable to the War on Drugs and the gang violence that inevitably occurs when the sale of a highly popular commodity -- in this case, marijuana -- is prohibited from being sold in the open and is driven into an underground market dominated by violent drug cartels. Notably, U.S. firearms policies have contributed significantly to gun violence in the country from which we import much of our international marijuana supply. While there is only one licensed gun dealer in all of Mexico, there are approximately 6,700 firearms retailers along the U.S. side of our southern border. Roughly 70 percent of guns recovered from Mexican criminal activity in the United States between 2007 and 2011 were traced back to U.S. origins. By keeping marijuana illegal, the United States is effectively fueling international crime rings and cross border violence, and at a cost to human lives, the livelihoods of people we incarcerate and their families, and U.S. tax payers generally. Since its inception in 1971, the War on Drugs has cost the federal government more than $1 trillion -- an average of over $20 billion a year. Comparatively, the president's fiscal year 2015 budget calls for $7.9 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency, $11.8 billion for the Department of Labor, and $17.5 billion to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The War on Drugs also has a disproportionate impact on women, particularly women of color, who have the **fastest growing prison population** and **bear the brunt of the stigma** of marijuana due to patriarchal conceptions of motherhood. **Castillo ‘15[[2]](#footnote-0)**

One glance at the mass of black and brown faces locked in prison on nonviolent drug charges and it’s clear that the so-called War on Drugs has deep roots in racism. But what about the drug war’s impact on gender? While not as widely discussed as racism, sexism infiltrates every aspect of drug policy, even within the reform movement itself, impacting how women who use drugs are viewed, treated and punished. Women are currently the fastest growing segment of the U.S. prison population. According to the ACLU report [“Caught in the Net,”](https://www.aclu.org/files/images/asset_upload_file431_23513.pdf" \t "_blank) over the past three decades, the number of females in prison has increased at twice the rate of their male counterparts—even more so for women of color. From 1977 to 2007, the female prison population grew by 832%, while the male population grew by 416%. Two-thirds of these women are serving time for nonviolent offenses and more than three-quarters are mothers. The staggering increase in the number of women in prison does not reflect larger numbers of women using drugs, but rather, changes in criminal sentencing. Many of the women in prison are there for co-habitating with a boyfriend or husband who committed drug offenses in the home. Women who refuse to testify against a partner could face conspiracy charges on top of the drug charges, in many cases causing them to serve longer sentences than the partner who actually committed the crime. Women who don’t serve prison time for a partner’s offense are often left behind as sole caretakers of the next generation. When men come out of prison, dehumanized, angry, and unable to get decent jobs due to criminal records, they re-enter households dominated by women, who now have an extra mouth to feed and a potentially volatile situation on their hands. “Men come back from prison with trauma and not much marketability because employers won’t hire formerly incarcerated people,” says Xochitl Bervera, co-director of the Racial Justice Action Center in Georgia. The R.J. Action Center runs a program organizing currently and formerly incarcerated women to reduce the number of women in jails and prisons. A growing prison population is not the only bad news for women and drugs. While drug overdose fatalities for men have tripled in the past decade, [the number of women dying of opioid drug overdose](http://www.bmj.com/content/347/bmj.f4415" \t "_blank) has risen fivefold during the same period. African-American women are also the fasting growing demographic of people with HIV, which can be acquired through injecting drugs or having sex with a partner who has injected drugs. Because of the high standards that society holds to mothers, women also bear the brunt of stigma against drug users. While absentee fathers who use drugs might be given a pass, being a mother on drugs is an unforgivable offense. Women who admit to drug use are at risk of losing their children and suffer greater economic and social consequences than those born by men. Some states have even passed laws criminalizing pregnant women who use drugs. Last year, Tennessee enacted a law that allows pregnant women to be criminally charged with an assaultive offense if their baby is born with withdrawal symptoms indicative of opioid use. The law passed despite strong dissent from the medical community, which pointed out that criminalizing pregnant women deters them from seeking drug treatment and prenatal care, putting both mother and fetus at greater risk for poor birth outcomes. “Society views drug use as a moral problem and women, especially mothers, are judged the most harshly,” says Senga Carroll, Training Director at UNC Horizons, a program that works with pregnant and parenting women with substance use disorders in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. “A number of women [in our program] have described delivering babies in small hospitals and being made to feel like ‘dirt beneath the dirt’ by medical staff. This is a major concern because women who feel judged will often lie to health care providers about their situation and if we don’t have a clear picture of what is going on, we can’t get the best help for the mother and baby.”

**Part two is The Plan:** Plan Text: In the United States criminal justice system jury nullification ought to be used during all criminal trials related to cannabis. I reserve the right to clarify, here’s the solvency advocate. **Green 13**[[3]](#footnote-1)

Although its usage is increasing in the American legal system, **far too few people know about**, and understand one of the biggest weapons we have in our civil-rights arsenal; jury nullification. **Jury nullification** is a practice that dates back to before our nation was formed, and is the act of a jury acquitting someone of a charge, even if the evidence is clear, by finding them “not guilty”. By doing so, people can make sure that an individual doesn’t fall victim to unjust, archaic laws. **As a juror, taking this path is simple: Vote “not guilty” to someone** who is **being charged with a bad law**. A bad law being something **like**, say, **cannabis prohibition**. Or most non-violent convictions made under the drug war. No matter how small the charge, such as possession of a roach – or how large, such as an 1,000 plant grow operation, a jury is completely within their legal right to find that person “not guilty”, regardless of what either attorney or the judge has to say. It’s not easy, but it’s possible. If you’re called in for jury duty, you should accept it if you wish to have the opportunity to nullify someone of an unjust conviction. **If you happen to be placed on a jury for a trial where someone’s being convicted of** a non-violent, victimless crime, such as **cannabis possession**, **cultivation or** even **distribution** if it’s clear the person had no ill intentions, than **you should lobby**, hard, **the rest of the jury in getting them to nullify** the charge. The important thing in this instance is education, as many in our society know absolutely nothing about jury nullification, or that it even exists. This isn’t a surprise, as its usage is widely hated, and shadowed by judges. Attorneys are[ethically prohibited](http://thejointblog.com/reminder-juries-can-nullify-charges-they-find-unjust/Further,%20as%20officers%20of%20the%20court,%20attorneys%20have%20sworn%20an%20oath%20to%20uphold%20the%20law,%20and%20are%20ethically%20prohibited%20from%20directly%20advocating%20for%20jury%20nullification" \t "_blank) from directly advocating for jury nullification: When they do, a judge will almost always and instantly call a mistrial. This, along with a general public that doesn’t tend to care about the specifics of our legal system, has led to jury nullification being widely underused, despite it being a huge weapon against draconian laws. Even though it’s underused, it’s not entirely uncommon, and more Americans than ever are becoming aware of it. Laws are even beginning to change, with states like New Hampshire [passing legislative](http://www.infowars.com/new-hampshire-officially-recognizes-jury-nullification/" \t "_blank) just last year to explicitly allow defense attorneys to inform juries of their right to jury nullification, contrary to standard practice everywhere else in the nation. Just a few months after this law took effect, [a man was nullified of a cannabis cultivation charge,](http://reason.com/blog/2012/09/14/new-hampshire-jury-acquits-pot-growing-r" \t "_blank) which would of been a felony. These type of laws will need to be passed everywhere to assure protections to this much-needed safeguard. For now, we must continue to raise awareness to our ability to use jury nullification to correct what is often a broken criminal justice system.

**Part Three is Solvency:** First, The AFF functionally legalizes marijuana because it makes it so that it would be impossible to actually convict someone, so even though our cards say legalization I still solve, because nobody could ever get a conviction. Second,Jury nullification on a large scale eventually leads to a change in the law I sight a laundry list of warrants, and overwhelming historical precedent. **Parlato 12**[[4]](#footnote-2)

Below is something that somehow is not taught in public schools. It is history nonetheless and easy enough for any one who is interested to verify. Jury ended power of King in 1215, when the Barons of England compelled King John to sign the Magna Carta, trial by jury was established. The King now had to seek permission through 12 citizens unanimous in their verdict before he could take anyone's freedom away. That’s why we have jury trials: To protect people from government oppression. Right of Assembly; Freedom of Religion; jury can’t be punished In 1670, Quakers William Penn and William Mead were prosecuted for preaching to an assembly. The government did not approve of the Quaker religion and made laws against public assembly. At the end of the trial, the judge instructed the jury to return a guilty verdict. Four jurors, led by Edward Bushell, refused to return the guilty verdict. The judge then ordered the jury locked up until they returned with an acceptable verdict, the one he had asked them to return. For two days the jury refused to return a guilty verdict and the judge ended the trial. As punishment, the judge ordered the jurors imprisoned until they paid a fine. Bushell refused and spent months in jail. He was eventually released after his habeas corpus petition prompted the Court of Common Pleas chief judge to rule that a jury can nullify the law and forbade judges from punishing jurors for their verdicts. Witch trials stopped **The Salem witch trials began in 1692. After** a splendid year-long government conviction rate and **the execution of 33 witches**, in May, 1693, **juries decided the court** of Oyer and Terminer had gone too far. They **nullified the witchcraft law with 52 consecutive** **hung juries and/or acquittals**. **Frustrated, prosecutors ceased bringing cases to trial**. Juries made it impossible to hang or otherwise put to death known witches in Salem. Freedom of speech won by jury In 1734, John Peter Zenger’s newspaper criticized the Royal Governor of New York. It was against the law to criticize the government in Colonial America, as it still is in many countries that do not have jury trials. The British charged Zenger with seditious libel. At his trial, Zenger’s lawyer, Andrew Hamilton, admitted Zenger broke the law but asked the jury to acquit because the law was bad and Zenger published the truth. Chief Justice James Delaney disagreed. "The truth is no defense," he ruled. Hamilton urged the jury “to make use of their own consciousness and understandings in judging of the lives, liberties or estates of their fellow subjects,” declaring jurors “have the right, beyond all dispute, to determine both the law and the fact.” Hamilton said if jurors cannot nullify laws, then "juries (are) useless, to say no worse . . . The next step would make the people slaves." The transcripts of the trial were widely published and the verdict encouraged literature critical of England by such as Franklin, Jefferson, Paine and others. If Zenger’s jurors had obeyed the judge’s directions, the people of America might still enjoy British rule.  Jury trial in the bill of rights Given the jury’s role in Zenger’s and many other Colonial trials, the framers of the Constitution envisioned that juries would continue this role when they guaranteed jury trials in the Sixth Amendment. Benjamin Franklin said that jury nullification is “better than law, it ought to be law, and will always be law wherever justice prevails.” Thomas Jefferson wrote, “Were I called upon to decide whether the people had best be omitted in the Legislative or Judiciary department, I would say it is better to leave them out of the Legislative. The execution of the laws is more important than the making [of] them.” Alexander Hamilton said of some of the framers of the constitution, “If they agree on nothing else, (they) concur at least in the value they set upon the trial by jury; or if there is any difference between them it consists of this: the former regard it as a valuable safeguard to liberty; the latter represent it as the very palladium of free government.” Capital punishment  **Juries in England and America used nullification to reject** **harsh** applications of **capital punishment forcing both countries to limit the** **death penalty** to murder and treason. Nullified fugitive slave act  **The fugitive slave law** of 1850 was enacted to mollify slave owners from the South who were threatening to secede from the Union since slaves were illegally running away and the North was not doing enough to stop it. The law **provided** for stiff **punishment for “criminals” who helped slaves escape**. In Syracuse, New York, **24** “criminals” **were indicted for helping a slave escape** from jail. A federal judge in Buffalo called the defendants "disturbers of society." **Four trials ended in three acquittals and compelled the government to drop the charges**. **In 1851, a crowd** broke into a Boston courtroom and **grabbed a slave** named Shadrach Minkins **and turned him loose**. The judge called the defendants’ actions in that case "beyond the scope of human reason." President Millard Fillmore demanded prosecution. **A grand jury indicted three people**. Daniel Webster led the prosecution. **After one acquittal and several hung juries, the government was forced to drop all charges**. **Because of juries**, a network of **criminals called abolitionists organized knowing** northern **juries would not convict.** Things got worse. The Southern States did secede. The Civil War followed and then the Emancipation Proclamation. If northern juries had simply followed the law as the judge directed, African Americans might still be human property in accordance with federal law. Set Wild Bill Hickok free Wild **Bill Hickok** and Davis Tutt **engaged in a** one-on-one **pistol**, quick draw **duel on** July 21, **1865** in Springfield, Missouri. Tutt was killed. **Hickok was charged with manslaughter.** **Mutual combat was against the law**. **Witnesses claimed** both men fired, but **Tutt was the initiator**, the first to display overt aggression. It was a question of honor. Had Hickok not fought, he would have been branded a coward. **Judge** Sempronius **Boyd** instructed the jury that a conviction was its only option under the law. Then he famously **instructed that they could nullify** by applying the unwritten law of the "fair fight" and acquit. The **jury acquitted Hickok**. Helped end prohibition **In 1920, the** US **Constitution was amended to prohibit** the sale of **alcohol** because a majority wished to impose their moral beliefs on the minority of citizens. The jury protected citizens from the tyranny of the majority. During Prohibition, **juries nullified alcohol control laws about 60 percent of the time**. **The fact that most juries would not convict** on alcohol control laws **made the use of alcohol widespread** throughout Prohibition. **Jury resistance contributed to the adoption of the Twenty-first amendment repealing Prohibition**. The jury reflecting made prohibition a toothless amendment.  Union rights In the late 19th century, **vigorous prosecution on "conspiracy" charges against** criminals known as **striking union workers was thwarted by jury acquittals** **and gave unions the right** **to** organize, assemble, and **go on strike**. \* \* \* As you can see, throughout history, government has on occasion not always been right. Some say there is plenty wrong with our present-day government. Only the people have lost sight of their duty to know their proper role: To vote in the jury box as they vote in the ballot box. It is also seen that government has no capacity to admit its laws are wrong. By its very nature, government must try enforce its laws - good or bad. It is for these two reasons that we have juries to protect our freedoms. Now you might think that since the jury brought us so many of our cherished freedoms, the government would want the true role and purpose of the jury taught to every child in every public school.  I wonder why that does not happen?

Also all the instances above were just instances of partial nullification, whereas the AFF ensures that every single marijuana trial is nullified, so my internal link is much stronger then the examples in the card, which makes solvency even more probable. And, Marijuana legalization has the potential to **end the broader drug war** by creating **regulatory experimentation** and **momentum against prohibition. Berman 14[[5]](#footnote-3),**

Why State Marijuana Legalization Could Dramatically Transform Drug War Battles and Forces As reflected in the primary materials reprinted in this Issue, alongside the current debate over modest modifications to federal drug sentencing schemes, federal officials have been forced to confront and respond to much more dramatic drug law reforms taking place in the states. In 2012, voters in Colorado and Washington legalized recreational use and sales of marijuana. These reforms came on the heels of these states and more than a dozen others enacting laws permitting persons to legally obtain mari- juana for medicinal purposes under various regulatory schemes. These state-level marijuana law reforms, particularly in the two states in which voter approval of recreational marijuana use required state officials to create and monitor regulatory regimes for marijuana distribution and use, forced the Department of Justice to review and articulate whether and how federal officials would continue to enforce existing federal prohibitions on all marijuana use and distribution in states that had legalized such activity. Reprinted in this Issue are two documents that reflect the results of the Justice Department’s latest efforts to provide guidance to states that have legalized marijuana use and to actors with those states involved with marijuana-related businesses: (1) an August 2013 memorandum signed by Deputy Attorney General James Cole providing guidance, through the articulation of eight national priorities, for on-going federal marijuana enforcement, and (2) a February 2014 memorandum from the U.S. Department of the Treasury setting out expectations for any financial institutions involved in providing services to marijuana-related businesses. Much might be said concerning the substance and style of these federal policy memos, and it will likely be years before it is clear what concrete impact these statements of federal policies and practices will have on the day-to-day activities of persons working in and around state marijuana industries. But, regardless of exactly how federal policies and practices impact state marijuana regulations and businesses, the new reality that public officials and private actors in a number of states are now working within and around a new legalized marijuana regime could have an extraordinary, transformative potential with respect to the broader drug war. Unlike sentencing reform, the creation of new state regulatory regimes necessarily and dramatically alters the basic drug war landscape and the basic work of those on the battlefield. As suggested above, even significant drug sentencing reforms do not change the essential terms on which the drug war is fought, nor are they likely to reorient the perspectives and commitments of the traditional combatants in this war. In sharp contrast, new laws legalizing and regulating recreational use of marijuana demand that governmental moneys and energies—which were previously devoted to drug supply reduction strategies, interdictions, and incarceration—are now directed toward new programming and invest- ments intended to ensure safe and limited access to certain drugs along with revised strategies for reducing drug abuse and related harms. Voters in Colorado and Washington have now essentially demanded their governments experiment with new models of legal regulation for marijuana focused primarily on safeguarding the health and security of those citizens who want to use drugs responsibly and those who wish to avoid drug use. With government priorities reoriented in this way, some addi- tional space has been cleared for legitimate and responsible businesses and other private-sector actors to invest in and contribute to creating a legal, regulatory, and social environment in which some respon- sible drug use is encouraged, and drug abuse is discouraged and treated as a public health problem rather than as a criminal justice concern. With legal recreational marijuana regulations and realities just starting to emerge in Colorado and Washington, and in light of the varied experiences in states with varied medical marijuana regulatory structures, it is far too early to predict just how and how quickly state-level marijuana reforms can and will transform national policies and perspectives on the drug war more generally. But it is clear that these reforms have already ensured that a new set of policy makers and institutional players are thinking about regulation of drug distribution and use in radical new ways. And once it becomes easier to understand and experience a serious, reasonable alternative to a criminal justice response to at least some drugs, the prospect of a full withdrawal from the drug war, rather than just a limited retrenchment in that war, becomes much more realistic.

Legalizing marijuana will not end systemic racism, but it is a step in the right direction that has **tangible positive effects** and can **build momentum** for broader movements. **Franklin and Title 14[[6]](#footnote-4)**

As the president acknowledged, marijuana prohibition targets black and brown people (even though marijuana users are equally or more likely to be white). Ending prohibition through passing legalization laws, as Colorado and Washington have, will reduce this racial disparity. The war on drugs, as we all know, has led to mass criminalization and incarceration for people of color. The legalization of marijuana, which took effect for the first time in the country in Colorado on January 1, is one step toward ending that war. While the new law won't eradicate systemic racism in our criminal justice system completely, it is one of the most effective things we can do to address it. Here are three concrete ways that Colorado's law is good for people of color. 1. The new law means there will be no more arrests for marijuana possession in Colorado. Under Colorado's new law, residents 21 or older can produce, possess, use and sell up to an ounce of marijuana at a time. This change will have a real and measurable impact on people of color in Colorado, where the racial disparities in marijuana possession arrests have been reprehensible. In the last ten years, Colorado police arrested blacks for marijuana possession at more than three times the rate they arrested whites, even though whites used marijuana at higher rates. As noted by the NAACP in its endorsement of the legalization law, it's particularly bad in Denver, where almost one-third of the people arrested for private adult possession marijuana are black, though they make up only 11% of the population. These arrests can have devastating and long-lasting consequences. An arrest record can affect the ability to get a job, housing, student loans and public benefits. As law professor Michelle Alexander describes, people (largely black and brown) who acquire a criminal record simply for being caught with marijuana are relegated to a permanent second-class status. When we make marijuana legal, we stop those arrests from happening. 2. Unlike under decriminalization, the new law means there will be no more arrests for mere marijuana possession in Colorado, period. In the Jan. 6 article "#Breaking Black: Why Colorado's weed laws may backfire for black Americans," Goldie Taylor mistakenly suggests that Colorado's new legalization law may "further tip the scales in favor of a privileged class already largely safe from criminalization." Much of the stubborn "this-changes-nothing" belief about the new law stems from confusion between decriminalization and legalization. There is a profound difference between the hodgepodge of laws known collectively as "decriminalization" passed in several states over the past 30 years, and Colorado's unprecedented legalization law. Decriminalization usually refers to a change in the law which removes criminal but not civil penalties for marijuana possession, allowing police to issue civil fines (similar to speeding tickets), or require drug education or expensive treatment programs in lieu of being arrested. Because of the ambiguity in some states with decriminalization, cops still arrest users with small amounts of marijuana due to technicalities, such as having illegal paraphernalia, or for having marijuana in "public view" after asking them to empty their pockets. One only need look as far as the infamous stop-and-frisk law in New York, where marijuana is decriminalized, to see how these ambiguities might be abused to the detriment of people of color. In Colorado, however, the marijuana industry is now legal and above-ground. People therefore have a right to possess and use marijuana products, although as with alcohol, there are restrictions relating to things like age, driving, and public use. Police won't be able to racially profile by claiming they smelled marijuana or saw it in plain view. 3. We will reduce real problems associated with the illicit market. As marijuana users shift to making purchases at regulated stores, we'll start to see improvement in problems that were blamed on marijuana but are in fact consequences of its prohibition. The violence related to the street-corner drug trade will begin to fall as the illicit market is slowly replaced by well-guarded stores with cameras and security systems. And consumers will now know what they're getting; instead of buying whatever's in a baggie, they have the benefit of choosing from a wide variety of marijuana products at the price level and potency they desire.

And, Independently advocating for marijuana legalization serves as a training ground for larger movements **challenging mass incarceration** and **facilitates coalition-building**, which also means my discourse has spillover affects to solve the war on drugs. **Tate 14[[7]](#footnote-5)**

For increasing numbers of Americans, legalization of personal- use marijuana is the only alternative to draconian laws drawn up in the "war on drugs" regime of the past three decades. It is well established that concern and paranoia over petty "crack" cocaine arrests for sales, possession, and use drove the mass warehousing of California's prisons and jail populations to become the largest in the United States (Lusane 1991: Provine 2007: Reinerman and Levine 1997: Weatherspoon 1998: Weaver 2007). Miller (2008) contends that the U.S. federal system of crime control has left minority citizens less able to challenge unfair sentencing laws. Noting that marijuana possession constituted nearly 8 of 10 drug- related arrests in the 1990s. Michelle Alexander (2010) insists that this period of "unprecedented punitiveness" resulted "in prison sentences (rather than dismissal, community service, or probation)" to the degree that "in two short decades, between 1980 and 2000 the number of people incarcerated in our nation's prisons and jails soared from roughly 300.000 to more than 2 million. By the end of 2007, more than 7 million Americans—or one in every 31 adults— were behind bars, on probation, or parole" (Alexander 2010. 59). Pushed by drug prosecutions, the rising rate of incarceration reached unprecedented levels in the 1990s. Today's movement toward more prisons, mandatory minimums and reinstatement of the death penalty logically followed the racially exploitative "law and order" campaigns of the 1960s and 1970s (Murakawa 2008). Conservative American politicians use the mythical Black or Hispanic male drug dealer, like the Black female welfare queen, to drum up votes. A widespread consensus in reported government statistics, advocacy studies, and policy think tanks suggests that African Americans bear the brunt of law-and-order management of U.S. marijuana laws because of how marijuana use is racialized. Political scientist Doris Provine contends that the U.S. government increased its punitive response toward drug use as a response to racial fears and stereotypes. She writes: "[d]rugs remain, symbolically, a menace to white, middle-class values" (2007. 89). Both politicians and media have used this issue to construct a crisis and sustain punitive state drug laws. The war on drugs, she concludes, has greatly harmed minority citizens through their imprisonment, contributing to deep inequalities in education, housing, health care, and equal opportunities to advance economically. The facts of use. sales, and possession, confirmed by academic and critical legal studies literature, are strikingly different from how the national and local media choose to present them. One study focusing on marijuana initiate found "among Blacks, the annual incidence rate (per 1.000 potential new users) increased from 8.0 in 1966 to 16.7 in 1968. reached a peak at about the same time as "Whites" (19.4 in 1976). then remained high throughout the late 1970s. Following the low rates in the 1980s, rates among Blacks rose again in the early 1990s, reached a peak in 1997 and 1998 (19.2 and 19.1. respectively), then dropped to 14.0 in 1999. Similar to the general pattern for Whites and Blacks. Hispanics' annual incidence rate rose during late 1970s and 1990s, with a peak in 1998 (17.8)" (National Survey on Drug Use 1999). Individuals and groups in civil society, advocacy communities, and state legislatures must put forth a serious struggle among activists and potential coalition partners who can understand the need for reform as a matter of civil rights and justice, and not the morality of marijuana consumption. Supporting decriminalization potentially can be the training ground for a new generation of leadership in addressing the larger problem of mass incarceration and social and political isolation associated with it. For Black people and their allies who long for the days— against all odds—of political education, voter mobilization, legal reform, group solidarity, challenge to the political parties, and political empowerment, expressed in the modern civil rights movement, the matter of decriminalization is ripe for galvanizing a collaboration at the grassroots. Too many Blacks have assumed that the "War on Drugs" ended with the dissipation of the "crack" emergency, when, in sum, marijuana's criminalization—rather than incarceration—of Black people has been more perennial. If Michelle Alexander (2010) is correct in arguing that mass incarceration has effectively reasserted Jim Crow second-class citizenship (or no citizenship) rights on African American people, then they must get off the sidelines of the legalization of cannabis or decriminalization struggle and stop allowing others to fight what is essentially their battle. This has long been the case in the challenge to the crushing "prison industrial complex." Whites and others, for the most part, have been the leaders in reform efforts concerning such things as mandatory minimums, the old 100:1 gram of cocaine-to-crack formula, and health care for geriatric or HIV AIDS patients in prisons, while we have seen Calvin "Snoop- Dogg"' Broadus become more influential than the congressional Black Caucus to our young. When ordinary people change their thinking and consciousness and begin to demystify small, personal- use marijuana, then the leaders will eventually come around without reticence or fear. The marijuana debate needs to be reframed to remove all penalties against its use (Scherlen 2012). This is our exit strategy: decriminalization reform is the only path to reversing the dismal trends minorities face in America.

And reject pessimism, policy can be used effectively to begin to **dismantle institutional racism. Bouie 13[[8]](#footnote-6)**

Over at The Atlantic, Ta-Nehisi Coates has been exploring the intersection of race and public policy, with a focus on white supremacy as a driving force in political decisions at all levels of government. This has led him to two conclusions: First, that anti-black racism as we understand it is a creation of explicit policy choices**—**the decision to exclude, marginalize, and stigmatize Africans and their descendants has as much to do with racial prejudice as does any intrinsic tribalism. And second, that it's possible to dismantle this prejudice using 6 policy. Here is Coates in his own words: Last night I had the luxury of sitting and talking with the brilliant historian Barbara Fields. One point she makes that very few Americans understand is that racism is a creation. You read Edmund Morgan’s work and actually see racism being inscribed in the law and the country changing as a result. If we accept that racism is a creation, then we must then accept that it can be destroyed. And if we accept that it can be destroyed, we must then accept that it can be destroyed by us and that it likely must be destroyed by methods kin to creation. Racism was created by policy. It will likely only be ultimately destroyed by policy. Over at his blog, Andrew Sullivan offers a reply: I don’t believe the law created racism any more than it can create lust or greed or envy or hatred. It can encourage or mitigate these profound aspects of human psychology – it can create racist structures as in the Jim Crow South or Greater Israel. But it can no more end these things that it can create them. A complementary strategy is finding ways for the targets of such hatred to become inured to them, to let the slurs sting less until they sting not at all. Not easy. But a more manageable goal than TNC’s utopianism. I can appreciate the point Sullivan is making, but I'm not sure it's relevant to Coates' argument. It is absolutely true that "Group loyalty is deep in our DNA," as Sullivan writes. And if you define racism as an overly aggressive form of group loyalty—basically just prejudice—then Sullivan is right to throw water on the idea that the law can "create racism any more than it can create lust or greed or envy or hatred."  But Coates is making a more precise claim: That there's nothing natural about the black/white divide that has defined American history. White Europeans had contact with black Africans well before the trans-Atlantic slave trade without the emergence of an anti-black racism. It took particular choices made by particular people—in this case, plantation owners in colonial Virginia—to make black skin a stigma, to make the "one drop rule" a defining feature of American life for more than a hundred years. By enslaving African indentured servants and allowing their white counterparts a chance for upward mobility, colonial landowners began the process that would make white supremacy the ideology of America. The position of slavery generated a stigma that then justified continued enslavement—blacks are lowly, therefore we must keep them as slaves. Slavery (and later, Jim Crow) wasn't built to reflect racism as much as it was built in tandem with it. And later policy, in the late 19th and 20th centuries, further entrenched white supremacist attitudes. Block black people from owning homes, and they're forced to reside in crowded slums. Onlookers then use the reality of slums to deny homeownership to blacks, under the view that they're unfit for suburbs. In other words, create a prohibition preventing a marginalized group from engaging in socially sanctioned behavior—owning a home, getting married—and then blame them for the adverse consequences. Indeed, in arguing for gay marriage and responding to conservative critics, Sullivan has taken note of this exact dynamic. Here he is twelve years ago, in a column for The New Republic that builds on earlier ideas: Gay men--not because they're gay but because they are men in an all-male subculture--are almost certainly more sexually active with more partners than most straight men. (Straight men would be far more promiscuous, I think, if they could get away with it the way gay guys can.) Many gay men value this sexual freedom more than the stresses and strains of monogamous marriage (and I don't blame them). But this is not true of all gay men. Many actually yearn for social stability, for anchors for their relationships, for the family support and financial security that come with marriage. To deny this is surely to engage in the "soft bigotry of low expectations." They may be a minority at the moment. But with legal marriage, their numbers would surely grow. And they would function as emblems in gay culture of a sexual life linked to stability and love. [Emphasis added] What else is this but a variation on Coates' core argument, that society can create stigmas by using law to force particular kinds of behavior? Insofar as gay men were viewed as unusually promiscuous, it almost certainly had something to do with the fact that society refused to recognize their humanity and sanction their relationships. The absence of any institution to mediate love and desire encouraged behavior that led this same culture to say "these people are too degenerate to participate in this institution." If the prohibition against gay marriage helped create an anti-gay stigma, then lifting it—as we've seen over the last decade—has helped destroy it. There's no reason racism can't work the same way.

**Part four is Framework:** Ethics has been employed to mask the reality of white supremacy and anti-Blackness. The only possibility to have any true ethic is to be anti-ethical. Thus, the role of the judge is to be an anti-ethical decision maker in the context of the resolution. **Curry 13[[9]](#footnote-7)**

**Traditionally** **we have taken ethics to be**, as Henry Sedgwick claims, "**a**ny rational **procedure by which we determine what** individual human beings **'ought'**—or what **is** right for them—or to seek to realize by voluntary action” (1981:1).  **This** rational procedure **is** however **at odds with** the empirical **reality** the ethical deliberation must concern itself with. **To argue**, as is often done, **that the government [or]**, **its citizens**, or white people **should act justly**, **assumes** that the possibility of **how they could act defines their** moral **disposition.  If a white person could** possibly **not be racist, it does not mean that** the **possibility** of not being racist, **can** be taken to **mean that they are not racist. In** ethical deliberations **dealing with** the problem of **racism, it is common** practice **to attribute to historically racist** **institutions, and individuals** universal **moral qualities that have yet to be demonstrated.  This abstraction** from reality **is what frames our** ethical **norms and allows us to maintain**, despite history or evidence, **that** racist **entities will act justly given the choice**.  Under such complexities, the only ethical deliberation concerning racism must be anti-ethical, or a judgment refusing to write morality onto immoral entities.

Therefore, The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best opposes oppression. Debate should deal with questions of real-world consequences—ideal theories ignore the concrete nature of the world and legitimize oppression. **Curry 14[[10]](#footnote-8)**

**Despite the pronouncement of debate as an** activity and **intellectual exercise pointing to the real world consequences of dialogue, thinking, and** (personal) **politics when addressing** issues of **racism, sexism**, economic disparity, global **conflicts, and death**, **many of the discussions** concerning these ongoing challenges to humanity **are fixed to a paradigm which sees the adjudication of material disparities and sociological realities as the conquest of one ideal theory over the other**. In “Ideal Theory as Ideology,” Charles **Mills outlines the problem** contemporary theoretical-performance styles in policy debate and **value-weighing in Lincoln-Douglass are confronted with in their attempts to get at the** concrete **problems in** our **societie**s. At the outset, Mills concedes that “ideal theory applies to moral theory as a whole (at least to normative ethics as against metaethics); **[s]ince ethics deals** by definition **with normative**/prescriptive/evaluative **issues, [it is set] against factual**/descriptive **issues**.” At the most general level, **the** conceptual **chasm between** what emerges as ***actual* problems** in the world (**e.g.: racism, sexism**, poverty, disease, **etc.) and how we frame such problems *theoretically***—**the assumptions and shared ideologies we depend upon for our problems to be heard** and accepted **as a** worthy “**problem” by an audience—[this] is the most obvious call for an anti-ethical paradigm**, **since such** a paradigm **insists on the actual as the basis of what can be considered normatively**. Mills, however, describes this chasm as a problem of an ideal-as-descriptive model which argues that for any actual-empirical-observable social phenomenon (P), an ideal of (P) is necessarily a representation of that phenomenon. In the idealization of a social phenomenon (P), one “necessarily has to abstract away from certain features” of (P) that is observed before abstraction occurs. **This gap between what is *actual* (in the world), and what is represented by theories and politics of debaters proposed in rounds threatens any real discussions about the concrete nature of oppression and** the **racist** economic **structures which necessitate** **tangible policies** and reorienting changes in our value orientations. As Mills states: “What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual,” so what we are seeking to resolve on the basis of “thought” is in fact incomplete, incorrect, or ultimately irrelevant to the actual problems which our “theories” seek to address. **Our attempts to situate social disparity cannot** simply **appeal to the ontologization of social phenomenon**—**meaning we cannot suggest that** the various **complexities of social problems** (which are constantly emerging and undisclosed beyond the effects we observe) **are totalizable by any one** set of **theories within an ideological frame be it** our most cherished notions of **Afro-pessimism, feminism,** Marxism, **or the like**. At best, **theoretical endorsements make us aware of sets of actions to address** ever developing **problems in our** empirical **world**, **but** even **this awareness does not command us to *only* do X,** **but rather do X and the other ideas which compliment the material conditions addressed by the action X**. **As a whole, debate** (policy and LD) **neglects the need to do X** in order **to remedy our cast-away-ness among** **our ideological tendencies** and politics. How then do we pull ourselves from this seeming ir-recoverability of thought in general and in our endorsement of socially actualizable values like that of the living wage? It is my position that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s thinking about the need for a living wage was a unique, and remains an underappreciated, resource in our attempts to impose value reorientation (be it through critique or normative gestures) upon the actual world. In other words, King aims to reformulate the values which deny the legitimacy of the living wage, and those values predicated on the flawed views of the worker, Blacks, and the colonized (dignity, justice, fairness, rights, etc.) used to currently justify the living wages in under our contemporary moral parameters.

#### And, as a judge, you are an educator and have an obligation to evaluate oppression first in order to preserve the value of debate as a whole. Smith ’13[[11]](#footnote-9)

“It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of **social control**, the reality of racism **in debate is constituted by** the singular **choices that** institutions, **coaches**, and students **make** on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to **abstractions** to **distance the conversation from the** material **reality** that black **debaters** are forced to **deal with every day.** One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. **Community norms** would **have competitors** do intellectual gymnastics or **make up rules to accuse** black **debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations** but as someone who understands that experience, **the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed**, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, **and** then find strategies to **deal with the issues at hand.** It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. **A student should not**, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, **have to justify why oppression is bad. Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential.** Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape. Current **coaches** and competitors alike **dismiss concerns of** racism and **exclusion, won’t teach other students anything** about identity in debate **other than** how **to shut down** competitors who engage in **alternative** styles and **discourses**, and refuse to engage in those discussions even outside of a tournament setting. A conversation on privilege and identity was held at a debate institute I worked at this summer and just as any theorist of privilege would predict it was the heterosexual, white, male staff members that either failed to make an appearance or stay for the entire discussion. No matter how talented they are, we have to remember that the students we work with are still just high school aged children. **If those who are responsible for participants and** the creation of accessible **norms won't risk a better future** for our community, **it becomes harder to explain to students who look up to them why risking such an endeavor is necessary.”**

#### And our action outside the state is uniquely good in all likelihood none of us will ever be policymakers however we will all be called for jury duty at some point and it may very well be on a marijuana trial. Voting AFF endorses us taking that opportunity to nullify. However, focus on governmental action undermines the importance of individual responsibility Kappeler 95[[12]](#footnote-10)

Yet **our insight that** indeed **we are not responsible for** the **decisions** of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to **mislead us** in**to think**ing that therefore **we have no responsibility** at all, not even for forming our own judgment, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, **it** seems to **absolve us from** having to try to see any **relation between our own actions and those** events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls 'organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, **institutionally, nationally**, and also individually organized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major power mongers, For **we** tend to **think** that **we cannot 'do' anything**, say, about a war, **because** we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation because **we are not where the major decisions are made.** Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of 'what would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defense?' Since we seem to regard their meta spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, **any question of what I would** do if I were indeed myself **tends to peter out** in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as 'virtually no possibilities': what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN - finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like 'I want to stop this war', 'I want military intervention', 'I want to stop this backlash', or 'I want a moral revolution. 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in co-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our non-comprehension, our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, **preferring innocently to drift along** the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we 'are' the war in our 'unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the 'fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't'- our readiness, in other words, to build identities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the 'others.' **We share in the responsibility for this war and** its violence in **the way** we let them grow inside us, that is, & the way **we shape our feelings**, our **relationships**, our **values' according: to the** structures and the values of **war** and violence.

Part five is theory spikes: First, the negative may not read a counter plan that alters current marijuana laws. It would make affirming impossible. **Tomasi 11/5**[[13]](#footnote-11)

**A counterplan** that **I've heard** people suggest is one **that** simply **changes the laws the aff claims juries should nullify**. For example, if the aff said that juries should nullify in favor of civil disobedients protesting what they see as unjust laws, the counterplan would say "The United States should repeal [the laws people are protesting]." That seems like a pretty devastating counterplan, and that is the problem. I'm a Policy debater. I have nothing wrong with advantage counterplans. For example, if the aff reads a warming advantage, the neg should get to present a non- topical policy alternative that's a solution to warming. Doing this is important for testing whether the aff is the best possible policy option; the very point of giving the neg counterplan ground to begin with is to test that. Advantage counterplans aren't too threatening to the aff when the aff has another advantage they can extend (one that the CP doesn't solve) or if they have excellent evidence proving the CP doesn't solve (advantage CPs for warming are predictable, so the aff probably had something to say). That said, **the repeal CP** for the jury nullification topic is an advantage counterplan gone too far. It **renders the entire topic a moot point**. Yes, if a law is unjust, obviously it'd make sense to just repeal it. But **every shred of aff offense is predicated on what** individual **jurors have a moral obligation to do in the face of an unjust law.** **The aff has no** separate **advantage to extend that the CP can't solve**, and there really is no answer to this position. **So, were I to see a theory debate in which the aff contested** the neg's ability to read **a counterplan of this sort, I would heavily lean** towards the **Aff**. **Not only is this** counterplan significantly **unfair**, but **it's also in no way important to** **neg**ative **ground**. The negative has the prosecutorial discretion CP. Read that instead--it's a defensible argument. That counterplan is also much fairer because there's a lot of literature supporting jury null over prosecutorial discretion, and vice versa. If you're making this a theory argument, you absolutely need to clarify the counterplan ground the neg still gets under your interpretation, just as for Topicality you have to explain what a topical aff \*does\* look like, and what ground the aff gets under that. In lieu of a theory argument, the aff could claim a permutation like, “encourage jurors to nullify for defendants currently on trial because of [law], and repeal the law following these trials”. That, however, strikes me as convoluted, so theory might be a better route. **Take it from someone who hates frivolous theory** in LD; **this counterplan** is theoretically objectionable. It **would ruin the topic**.

Second, If the full text of the AFF is disclosed an hour before the round, don’t let the negative read a theory interp unless full text of the shell was disclosed on their wiki page at least an hour before the round. A) Solves and deters abuse because I might change my AFF strategy in order to meet your interps, also this spills over to other round because other people you debate against might do the same. This solves abuse, and lets us talk about the topic instead of talking about esoteric theory norms, that are useless outside of debate. B) Checks back against theory prolif. They have bidirectional interps, and a nearly infinite number of ways to argue that the AFF is unfair, that I could predict. Disclosure solves because it gives me a finite list of arguments you may run, that I can prepare for which checks back against bad interps that only win because they’re surprising. C) Encourages deeper theory debates, if they need to happen. If I wasn’t going to adjust my strategy then giving me an our to prep a counter interp, ensures that we actually have a well prepped argument, which is key to helping us decide as a community whether or not we think something like Nebel T is a good idea. Also an hour is key because I need a while to change the AFF strategy and potentially meet their interps, and this only applies to the negative because I don’t know what they’ll do in the 1NC so I would have to disclose an interp to check back against every conceivable abusive thing they could do, whereas the AFF was disclosed.
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