

Chapter 7

Take a Stand/Propose a Solution

If you had to choose one, would you rather have a voice like Gilbert Gottfried or have a voice like Elmo?

This silly question, which I give to my students, is the first step toward getting them to take a stand. (If your students are unfamiliar with Gottfried's voice, show them the following YouTube clip: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xSorefCdmQ0>.) After a minute or two of discussing this question, I break my students into four groups and present each group with another question to ponder (all taken from or influenced by Justin Heimberg and David Gomberg's [1997] *Would You Rather . . . ?*):

1. Would you rather be able to pause the world around you or to silence it? (38)
2. Would you rather be able to fast forward life or to rewind it? (45)
3. Would you rather live in a world without cell phones or a world without computers?

4. Would you rather spend a five-hour car ride with Bill Gates or with Taylor Lautner/Kim Kardashian? (196) (In this one, the reader fills in the blanks.)

My students were asked to write quick reflections, which generated opposing stances. Here are some excerpts from their writer's notebooks:

Would you rather be able to fast forward life or to rewind it?

I would rather rewind life because I could re-do the bad parts. I would change some things, like the first time I wet the bed. I could avoid some of the fights I got into. I would avoid getting lost. I could also go back to some of the highlights, like seeing my first crush again. If I could do it right the first time, I would not have any desire to fast forward my life. Also, if I had the ability to rewind life, I would never die. I could re-live my teenage years as often as I want.

I would rather fast forward life, because what I have already done I have already done, and these events have helped to make me what I am today. Also, I'd like to fast forward just to see where I will end up in life, how it will be different from now. I also want to see how our generation will turn out.

Would you rather spend a five-hour car ride with Bill Gates or with Taylor Lautner/Kim Kardashian?

I would rather be in a five-hour car ride with Taylor Lautner because he would have more normal things to talk about than a man who is the richest in the world. I would also have more questions to ask him than I would to Bill Gates, because most of the questions related to Gates would have to do with money. I am afraid I might ask him some rude questions about money. Besides, there is a high chance that Taylor Lautner would be a lot more fun than Bill Gates. I mean no offense to the richest guy in the world, but what exactly would we talk about that would be interesting to both of us? I guess we could talk about computers.

I would rather spend a five-hour car ride with Bill Gates. He's a smart businessman and he's the richest man in the world. Plus, the car ride might be in a stretch Hummer limo. Also, he could give me some pointers on how to make it big in this world. Who wouldn't want advice from him? If he were happy, maybe he would drop some cash on me. Taylor Lautner and Kim Kardashian are famous for being brainless.

Taking a Stand

Admittedly silly, the “Would you rather?” game is a strategy designed to get my students to think about taking a stand. After this ten-minute warm-up, I move them into deeper waters by having them recount an argument they have had with a family member or friend. To flush out all sides of the issues, students are asked to complete a Four-Square Argument Chart:

FOUR-SQUARE ARGUMENT CHART	
What are the main points of your argument?	What are the main arguments of your parents/friends?
What are the counterarguments you will hear from your parents/friends?	What are the counterarguments you would present to your family/friends?

In the upper left-hand corner of the chart, students state their sides of the issues. This, of course, is the easy part of the assignment. Students have no problem airing their grievances. The harder part of the assignment comes when I ask them to remember the immortal words of Atticus Finch, who in *To Kill a Mockingbird* said, “You never really understand a person until you consider things from his point of view . . . until you climb into his skin and walk around in it” (Lee 1960, 30). With this in mind, I have the students revisit their arguments in the lower left-hand corner of the chart, this time listing the counterarguments they would hear from the opposition (in this case, their parents or friends). From there, the students move to the upper right-hand side of the chart, where we repeat the process, this time standing in the shoes of our parents or friends and listing their central arguments. The students then complete the chart in the lower right-hand corner by listing their counterarguments (see Figure 7.1 for a student’s example).

Often, students rush to an opinion without thoroughly considering the other side of the issue. What I like about the Four-Square Argument Chart is that it requires my students to climb into someone else’s skin.

As I move my students closer to writing essays in which they take a stand, it is imperative that I design lessons that require them to see both sides of the issues they will be addressing.

Knowing Both Sides of an Issue

As I write this chapter, we are two weeks away from an election. In California, the initiative that is receiving the most attention is

Figure 7.1
Aine's Four-Square
Argument Chart

In a sentence or two, explain an argument you have had with a parent or friend:

My family doesn't approve of my friend because of his age.

My side of the argument:	My parent's side (or friend's side)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am trustworthy • We're just friends • Just because we hold hands doesn't make us boyfriend/girlfriend. • age doesn't matter • why should you care? • how does it affect you • it's my life you'd think I'd have control over it since it's mine. • I deserve the right to pick who I hang out with it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • friends don't hold hands that way • there's more to it than "friends" • friends don't walk you home • they think he's too old • he could be playing with you • you could get pregnant and forget about school. • you may be trustworthy but what tells us that couldn't change.
My parent's response would be...	My response would be...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doesn't look like your other friends • friends don't walk you home • friends don't take you to dances • age does matter he's a legal adult! • you not old enough to control your life • you could get hurt • why would I hide anything 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • just because your friends with a guy or going out with one doesn't mean you're automatically stupid enough to get pregnant. • we're both teenagers • if he was he would have left along time ago • friends could walk you home there's nothing wrong with it. • you'd hide it so you wouldn't get in trouble.

Proposition 19. If passed, this proposition will legalize marijuana. When I brought up the issue of Proposition 19 in class one day, the conversation went something like this:

Mr. Gallagher: As you know, Proposition 19, if passed, will legalize marijuana. How many of you support the passage of this initiative? (A number of students raise their hands.)

Mr. Gallagher: How many of you oppose this initiative?

Chapter 7: Take a Stand/Propose a Solution

(A number of students raise their hands.)

Mr. Gallagher: You are all wrong. Both sides are wrong.

Marko: How can both sides be wrong?

Mr. Gallagher: Do you know all of the arguments on both sides of the issue? Do you know all the counterarguments on both sides of the issue?

Elleni: I know the main argument for passing it.

Mr. Gallagher: That is not what I asked. Do you know *all* of the arguments and *all* of the counterarguments? Does anyone in this classroom know *all* of the arguments and *all* of the counterarguments?

(Cue crickets chirping.)

Mr. Gallagher: Well, then how can you be sure you are right when you don't thoroughly understand both sides of the issue?

(Crickets get louder.)

Mr. Gallagher: Let this be the first lesson in taking a stand. Everyone is quick to throw out an opinion, but you should never take a stand until you have thoroughly familiarized yourself with both sides of the issue.

To help my students familiarize themselves with both sides of Proposition 19, I presented them with the arguments, pro and con, found in the Official Voter Information Guide (2010). In Figure 7.2, you will see the arguments in favor of passing the initiative, followed at the bottom of the page with rebuttals to these arguments. In Figure 7.3, you will find arguments against Proposition 19, again followed at the bottom of the page with rebuttal arguments. (Both sets of arguments can be found in Appendix 8.)

Notice that if you were to place the documents in Figures 7.2 and 7.3 side by side, they would form a version of the Four-Square Argument Chart I mentioned earlier in this chapter. With the four squares in front of them, I had students take yellow highlighters and mark all the arguments in favor of the proposition. When this was completed, I had the students take a second lap, this time using pink highlighters to mark all the arguments opposing the initiative. Once they knew all of the arguments on both sides of the argument, they were ready to begin thinking about writing.

Drafting the Paper

When it was time to start drafting, I wrote first, reminding my students that an effective introduction should have two elements: a hook and a

Introduction 2

Over 16,000 teachers in California were laid off last year and more than 26,000 pink slips were issued because of our state's budget mess. Why? Because there was no state budget in place, and when there is no state budget in place, schools have no way of accurately budgeting for the upcoming school year. Because California requires a two-thirds vote to pass a budget, the simple truth is that it has become far too difficult to get anything done. This destructive cycle has to stop, and Proposition 25, which will replace the two-thirds vote with a simple majority, is an important step in the right direction. If we want to end this damaging budget cycle, we must vote yes on 25.

I shared both of my introductions with my students, pointing out that each of them begins with a hook and ends with a thesis statement. We discussed the strengths and weaknesses of each draft, and then my students wrote two different introductions to their Proposition 19 essays. Upon completion of their two introductions, I had students share their drafts with one another, garnering feedback as to which of their introductions was most effective.

When it was time to begin drafting the body of the essay, I suggested a couple of different paragraph templates.

The Hamburger

In this approach, the writer takes a stand, recognizes the opposition, and then counters the opposition. Again, I went first by drafting an example (the counterarguments are in bold):

Proposition 25 is simple reform that will break the gridlock and ensure that budgets will be passed on time. This is important because when last year's budget ran late, the state issued 450,000 IOUs to small businesses, state workers, and other who do business with the state. This ended up costing taxpayers over \$8 million in interest payments alone. Passing Proposition 25 will discourage this from happening again, as it holds legislators accountable when they don't do their jobs (actually docking their salaries every day the budget is late). **Opponents of this proposition scream that this is misleading because politicians would never support an initiative that would cost them money from their own wallets.** They are wrong. The language of the

budget clearly states they will have their pay reduced, and what's more, they cannot legally recover any of this lost money after a budget is finally passed. Because of this possible loss of personal income, Proposition 25 will motivate lawmakers to agree on a timely budget.

I then had the students practice the hamburger paragraph. Here is an example from Eric (counterarguments are in bold):

Proposition 19 undermines the safety regulations of the road. It fails to include a standard for what constitutes "driving under the influence." Under Prop 19, a driver can legally be on the road even if a blood test has shown that he is being affected by marijuana.

Supporters of the legislation says that Prop 19 was carefully written to ensure safety, but how "carefully" written can it be if drivers can still drive with marijuana in their systems? Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) strongly opposes Prop 19 because it won't allow law enforcement to take action against stoned drivers. It is scary to consider how many drunk drivers there are on the road; it is even scarier to think that we will now have a bunch of stoned drivers. Because the proposition fails to keep our streets safe, it is opposed by the California Police Chiefs Association.

Set Them Up; Knock Them Down

In this approach, the writer begins with a counterargument and then spends the rest of the paragraph knocking it down. Again, I modeled this by drafting an example for my students (counterarguments are in bold):

Opponents of Proposition 25 scream that the initiative is misleading because politicians would never support a law that would cost them money from their own wallets. They are wrong. The language of the budget clearly states they will have their pay reduced, and what's more, they cannot legally recover any of this lost money after a budget is finally passed. Because of this possible loss of personal income, Proposition 25 will motivate lawmakers to agree on a timely budget. Proposition 25 is simple reform that will break the gridlock, ensuring that budgets will be passed on time. This is important because when last year's budget ran late, the state issued 450,000 IOUs to small businesses, state workers, and other who do business with the state. This ended up costing

taxpayers over \$8 million in interest payments alone. Passing Proposition 25 will discourage this from happening again, as it holds legislators accountable when they don't do their jobs (actually docking their salaries every day the budget is late). Opponents of this proposition scream that this is misleading because politicians would never support an initiative that would personally cost them. This argument is a red herring. We don't need politicians to support it; we need the voters of California to make it law. Then the politicians will have to abide by it.

Students were then asked to emulate the set them up; knock them down approach. Here is an example from Elleni (counterarguments are in bold):

Supporters of Proposition 19 always point out that our current laws have failed. They say that rather than accepting things the way they are, that the state should legalize and control the distribution of marijuana. They are wrong. Prop 19 proponents "forget" to include a standard for what constitutes as "driving under the influence," which means that when the police stop someone who is very drugged, they won't have any legal standard to hold the driver accountable. This is "controlling" marijuana use? Also, the drug would still not be "controlled" because underage kids will still have easy access to pot. Proponents of Prop 19 also claim that legalizing it will eliminate the drug cartels, but there is always going to be an illegal market (underage kids) that will enable the cartels to continue.

To avoid stilted, repetitive essays, I asked students to mix their approaches to their body paragraphs. In other words, I did not want four consecutive hamburger paragraphs. A student, for example, might start with a hamburger paragraph, move to a set them up; knock them down paragraph, and then return to another hamburger paragraph. As always, I modeled first. In Figure 7.4, you will see how I mixed the approaches to the body paragraphs of my essay.

Writing the Conclusion

Before writing our conclusions, I shared the dos and don'ts found in Figure 7.5. I reviewed each of them and then drafted a conclusion in front of my students:

Proposition 25 is simple reform that will break the gridlock and ensure that budgets will be passed on time. This is important because when last year's budget ran late, the state issued 450,000 IOUs to small businesses, state workers, and other who do business with the state. This ended up costing taxpayers over \$8 million in interest payments alone. Passing Proposition 25 will discourage this from happening again, as it holds legislators accountable when they don't do their jobs (actually docking their salaries every day the budget is late). **Opponents of this proposition scream that this is misleading because politicians would never support an initiative that would cost them money from their own wallets.** They are wrong. The language of the budget clearly states they will have their pay reduced, and what's more, they cannot legally recover any of this lost money after a budget is finally passed. Because of this possible loss of personal income, Proposition 25 will motivate lawmakers to agree on a timely budget.

Those who oppose Prop 25 claim that passing it will give lawmakers more of an opportunity to raise our taxes. Without a required two-thirds majority, they argue, we will be much more endangered by higher taxes. This argument, however, does not hold water. If you read the initiative closely, you will notice that the two-thirds requirement to raise taxes is actually still in place. That will not change. What does change is that lawmakers will be able to pass budgets without having to get a two-thirds majority. This is needed under the current system because no one is held accountable when a budget the gridlocked. Schools suffer. Businesses suffer. But lawmakers continue getting paid. Prop 25 will change this by hitting lawmakers where it hurts—their wallets. The people who oppose this initiative are using the prospect of higher taxes as a scare tactic. "Higher taxes" is a red herring designed to get people to take their eyes off the real issues.

Another benefit to passing Prop 25 is that it removes power from the small number of legislators who hold the budget for "ransom" every year. Because two-thirds vote is needed, some lawmakers hold out for special perks for themselves, often spending our money on their pet projects, or by giving billions in tax breaks to narrow corporate interests. **Opponents argue that passing Prop 25 will not eliminate this problem, that there will still be lawmakers who will attempt to hold the budget ransom.** Changing the law to a simple majority law will not change this, they argue. Though there is some truth to this argument, common sense says this problem will be lessened when budgets are easier to pass. There may be some situations where this remains a problem, but, clearly, passing Prop 25 will make it far less likely this "hostage taking" will occur.

According to the voting guide, "Late budgets waste tax money and inflate the costs of building schools and roads." Last year, for example "when the budget was late, road projects were shut down then restarted days later, costing taxpayers millions of dollars and further damaging California's credit rating." **Some might argue this is the price we have to pay to ensure that a reasonable budget gets passed,** but I disagree. As the voter's guide states, "Real people suffer when legislators play games with the budget." Taxpayers are punished, funding for schools is delayed, public safety is underfunded, and health care and services for seniors are used as bargaining chips. Prop 25 won't make all of these issues disappear, but it will certainly encourage lawmakers to address them in a more timely manner.

Figure 7.4 My Model Essay for Taking a Stand (Counterarguments in Bold)

Are we really going to go down this same, tired road again?
 Another hopelessly deadlocked budget? Lawmakers who can't agree? Taxpayers penalized by this legislative paralysis? If we do not rally and pass Proposition 25, we will end up exactly where we started—budget hell. Fortunately, it doesn't have to end this way. Proposition 25 offers hope to all Californians who are sick of the yearly budget paralysis. The system is clearly broken, Proposition 25 is the remedy, and the time to pass it is now.

Do	Don't
Ask a provocative question	Simply restate your thesis statement
Leave with an interesting quotation	Introduce a brand new idea
Call for action	Focus on a minor point of the essay
Loop back to the anecdote in the introduction	Use the following phrases: "In conclusion," "In summary," or "In closing"
End with a warning	Add extra information that should have been in the body of the essay
Paint a strong image	
Express your hopes	
Answer the "So what?" question	
Point to broader implications	

Sources: University of Richmond Writing Center 2010
Maple Woods Community College Writing Center 2011
The Writing Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 2011

Figure 7.5 Writing a Conclusion: Dos and Don'ts

When I finished this draft, I asked students to look at the "Do" column in Figure 7.5 and then identify which of the strategies I employed. They noticed that rather than simply sticking to a single strategy, I used three of them: I asked provocative questions, I issued a warning, and I offered hope.

Students then drafted their own conclusions. Luis, for example, used questions and intentional repetition in his conclusion:

Isn't it time to put an end to all this crime? Isn't it time to end all the madness surrounding marijuana use? Isn't it time to control this drug? Outlawing marijuana has not stopped millions of people from using it; therefore, it is time to try a new approach. Proposition 19 is a new approach worth trying. It is time to vote yes on Proposition 19.

Proposing Solutions

Educator Edward Tufte once said, "The point of the essay is to change things." With this in mind, I want to bring my students beyond simply

Appendix

Appendix 8: Proposition 19 Pro/Con Arguments
Pro:

19 PROP LEGALIZES MARIJUANA UNDER CALIFORNIA BUT NOT FEDERAL LAW.
PERMITS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO REGULATE AND TAX COMMERCIAL
PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND SALE OF MARIJUANA. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

* ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 19 *

PROPOSITION 19: COMMON SENSE CONTROL OF MARIJUANA

Today, hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars are spent enforcing the failed prohibition of marijuana (also known as "cannabis").

Currently, marijuana is easier for kids to get than alcohol, because dealers don't require ID.

Prohibition has created a violent criminal market run by international drug cartels.

Police waste millions of taxpayer dollars targeting non-violent marijuana consumers, while thousands of violent crimes go unsolved.

And there is \$14 billion in marijuana sales every year in California, but our debt-ridden state gets nothing from it.

Marijuana prohibition has failed.

WE NEED A COMMON SENSE APPROACH TO CONTROL AND TAX MARIJUANA LIKE ALCOHOL.

Proposition 19 was carefully written to get marijuana under control.

Under Proposition 19, only adults 21 and over can possess up to one ounce of marijuana, to be consumed at home or licensed establishments. Medical marijuana patients' rights are preserved.

If we can control and tax alcohol, we can control and tax marijuana.

PUT STRICT SAFETY CONTROLS ON MARIJUANA

Proposition 19 maintains strict criminal penalties for driving under the influence, increases penalties for providing marijuana to minors, and bans smoking it in public, on school grounds, and around minors.

Proposition 19 keeps workplaces safe, by preserving the right of employers to maintain a drug-free workplace.

PUT POLICE PRIORITIES WHERE THEY BELONG

According to the FBI, in 2008 over 61,000 Californians were arrested for misdemeanor marijuana possession, while 60,000 violent crimes went unsolved. By ending arrests of non-violent marijuana consumers, police will save hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars a year, and be able to focus on the real threat: violent crime.

Police, Sheriffs, and Judges support Proposition 19.
HELP FIGHT THE DRUG CARTELS

Marijuana prohibition has created vicious drug cartels across our border. In 2008 alone, cartels murdered 6,290 civilians in Mexico—more than all U.S. troops killed in Iraq and Afghanistan combined.

60 percent of drug cartel revenue comes from the illegal U.S. marijuana market.

By controlling marijuana, Proposition 19 will help cut off funding to the cartels.

GENERATE BILLIONS IN REVENUE TO FUND WHAT MATTERS

California faces historic deficits, which, if state government doesn't balance the budget, could lead to higher taxes and fees for the public, and more cuts to vital services. Meanwhile, there is \$14 billion in marijuana transactions every year in California, but we see none of the revenue that would come from taxing it.

Proposition 19 enables state and local governments to tax marijuana, so we can preserve vital services.

The State's tax collector, the Board of Equalization, says taxing marijuana would generate \$1.4 billion in annual revenue, which could fund jobs, healthcare, public safety, parks, roads, transportation, and more.

LET'S REFORM CALIFORNIA'S MARIJUANA LAWS

Oudawing marijuana hasn't stopped 100 million Americans from trying it. But we can control it, make it harder for kids to get, weaken the cartels, focus police resources on violent crime, and generate billions in revenue and savings.

We need a common sense approach to control marijuana.

YES ON 19.

www.taxcannabis.org

JOSEPH D. McNAMARA, San Jose Police Chief (Ret.)

JAMES P. GRAY, Orange County Superior Court Judge (Ret.)

STEPHEN DOWNING, Deputy Chief (Ret.)
Los Angeles Police Department

* REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 19 *

As California public safety leaders, we agree that Proposition 19 is flawed public policy and would compromise the safety of our roadways, workplaces, and communities. Before voting on this proposition, please take a few minutes to read it.

Proponents claim, "Proposition 19 maintains strict criminal penalties for driving under the influence." That statement is false. In fact, Proposition 19 gives drivers the "right" to use marijuana right up to the point when they climb behind the wheel, but unlike as with drunk driving, Proposition 19 fails to provide the Highway Patrol with any tests or objective standards for determining what constitutes "driving under the influence." That's why Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) strongly opposes Proposition 19.

Proponents claim Proposition 19 is "preserving the right of employers to maintain a drug-free workplace." This is also false. According to the California Chamber of Commerce, the facts are that Proposition 19 creates special rights for employees to possess marijuana on the job, and that means no company in

California can meet federal drug-free workplace standards, or qualify for federal contracts. The California State Firefighters Association warns this one drafting mistake alone could cost thousands of Californians to lose their jobs.

Again, contrary to what proponents say, the statewide organizations representing police, sheriffs and drug court judges are all urging you to vote "No" on Proposition 19. Passage of Proposition 19 seriously compromises the safety of our communities, roadways, and workplaces.

STEVE COOLEY, District Attorney
Los Angeles County

KAMALA HARRIS, District Attorney
San Francisco County

KEVIN NIDA, President
California State Firefighters Association

Appendix 8: (continued)

Con:

PROPOSITION 19 LEGALIZES MARIJUANA UNDER CALIFORNIA BUT NOT FEDERAL LAW.
PERMITS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO REGULATE AND TAX COMMERCIAL
PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND SALE OF MARIJUANA. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

* ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 19 *

Even if you support legalization of recreational marijuana, you should vote "No" on Proposition 19.

Why? Because the authors made several huge mistakes in writing this initiative which will have severe, unintended consequences.

For example, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) strongly opposes Proposition 19 because it will prevent bus and trucking companies from requiring their drivers to be drug-free. Companies won't be able to take action against a "stoned" driver until after he or she has a wreck, not before.

School districts may currently require school bus drivers to be drug-free, but if Proposition 19 passes, their hands will be tied until after tragedy strikes. A school bus driver would be forbidden to smoke marijuana on school grounds or while actually behind the wheel, but could arrive for work with marijuana in his or her system.

Public school superintendent John Snaveley, Ed.D. warns that Proposition 19 could cost our K-12 schools as much as \$9.4 billion in lost federal funding. Another error could potentially cost schools hundreds of millions of dollars in federal grants for our colleges and universities. Our schools have already experienced severe budget cuts due to the state budget crisis.

The California Chamber of Commerce found that "if passed, this initiative could result in employers losing public contracts and grants because they could no longer effectively enforce the drug-free workplace requirements outlined by the federal government."

Employers who permit employees to sell cosmetics or school candy bars to co-workers in the office, may now also be required to allow any employee with a "license" to sell marijuana in the office.

Under current law, if a worker shows up smelling of alcohol or marijuana, an employer may remove the employee from a dangerous or sensitive job, such as running medical lab tests in a hospital, or operating heavy equipment. But if Proposition 19 passes, the worker with marijuana in his or her system may not be removed from the job until after an accident occurs.

The California Police Chiefs Association opposes Proposition 19 because proponents "forgot" to include a standard for what constitutes "driving under the influence." Under Proposition 19, a driver may legally drive even if a blood test shows they have marijuana in their system.

Gubernatorial candidates Republican Meg Whitman and Democrat Jerry Brown have both studied Proposition 19 and are urging all Californians to vote "No," as are Democratic and Republican candidates for Attorney General, Kamala Harris and Steve Cooley.

Don't be fooled. The proponents are hoping you will think Proposition 19 is about "medical" marijuana. It is not. Proposition 19 makes no changes either way in the medical marijuana laws.

Proposition 19 is simply a jumbled legal nightmare that will make our highways, our workplaces and our communities less safe. We strongly urge you to vote "No" on Prop. 19.

DIANNE FEINSTEIN, United States Senator
LAURA DEAN-MOONEY, National President
Mothers Against Drunk Driving

* REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 19 *

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR: REAL CONTROL OF MARIJUANA, OR MORE OF THE SAME

Let's be honest. Our marijuana laws have failed. Rather than accepting things as they are, we can control marijuana.

Like the prohibition of alcohol in the past, outlawing marijuana hasn't worked. It's created a criminal market run by violent drug cartels, wasted police resources, and drained our state and local budgets. Proposition 19 is a more honest policy, and a common sense solution to these problems. Proposition 19 will control marijuana like alcohol, making it available *only* to adults, enforce strong driving and workplace safety laws, put police priorities where they belong, and generate billions in needed revenue.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR: REAL CONTROL OF MARIJUANA, OR MORE OF THE SAME

We can make it harder for kids to get marijuana, or we can accept the status quo, where marijuana is easier for kids to get than alcohol.

We can let police prevent violent crime, or we can accept

the status quo, and keep wasting resources sending tens of thousands of non-violent marijuana consumers—a disproportionate number who are minorities—to jail.

We can control marijuana to weaken the drug cartels, or we can accept the status quo, and continue to fund violent gangs with illegal marijuana sales in California.

We can tax marijuana to generate billions for vital services, or we can accept the status quo, and turn our backs on this needed revenue.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR
Vote Yes on 19.

JOYCELYN ELDERS, United States Surgeon General (Ret.)
ALICE A. HUFFMAN, President
California NAACP
DAVID DODDRIDGE, Narcotics Detective (Ret.)
Los Angeles Police Department