



JP Moczulski / Reuters

# Sub-national Units And Agricultural Workers Programs In Canada

Ernesto Sánchez Sánchez\*

## INTRODUCTION

The Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program (SAWP) has been a model of bilateral cooperation between Mexico and Canada since 1974. Its constant assessments make it possible to guarantee better working conditions for migrant workers and an orderly, legal, safe flow of temporary migration. This article contributes to the debate about this program by looking at sub-national units, local actors, and working conditions within this bilateral dynamic.<sup>1</sup>

\* Full-time professor and researcher at the School of International Studies and Public Policies, Autonomous University of Sinaloa (UAS); sansan.ernesto@gmail.com.

ORIGINS AND DYNAMICS OF THE SEASONAL  
AGRICULTURAL WORKERS PROGRAM (SAWP)

While the program attempts to take advantage of the supply and demand for immigrant labor and in specific conditions it has served as a limited incentive for rural Mexican communities due to the constant increase in remittances, workers' working conditions are increasingly deregulated. This has left them vulnerable since the enforcement of the Low Skilled Workers Program (LSWP) in 2002.

In a country like Mexico, international migration has an increasingly complex, dynamic relationship with local development processes in both places of origin and destinations. In some regions of Mexico, governmental migratory strategies, carried out in conjunction with nationals organized in associations, fraternities, or clubs, are part of geopolitical strategies. These expand bilateral relations not only due to proximity or migratory tradition, such as in the case of the U.S., but also due to programs set up by countries and regions that report benefits to municipalities or provinces, such as in the case of Mexican workers in Canada. In contrast with the United States' 1942-1964 Bracero Program, Canada's, signed in 1974 through a Memorandum of Understanding, brought Mexico into the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program (SAWP).

At the end of the 1990s, the Canadian government established a similar program to its Mexican one with Jamaica, Barbados, and Trinidad and Tobago, countries with a language affinity and whose work forces make up the majority of all Canadian temporary agricultural workers.

Since 2010, more than 10 000 Mexicans go every year to Canada under the SAWP to work on farms through bilateral agreements set up and regulated not only by the two countries' federal governments, but also by their sub-national governments. In 2015, Mexico's Ministry of Labor and Social Services' National Job Service facilitated the participation of 21 499 Mexican workers. Their main destinations were the provinces of Ontario, British Columbia, Quebec, and Alberta; they mainly came from the State of Mexico, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, and Puebla.<sup>2</sup> One outstanding sub-national agreement is the one between the state of Jalisco and the province of Alberta.

SAWP's consolidation is not only due to demand for labor, but also because of the crisis in the Mexican countryside. While the program is considered a model for successful international labor mobility that responds effectively to the demand for farm labor in Canada, I believe that it creates

In a country like Mexico,  
international migration has an increasingly complex,  
dynamic relationship with local development  
processes in both places of origin  
and destinations.

fewer conflicts in meeting Canadian employers' needs thanks to its flexibility. Some situate that flexibility in the fact that it uses rural labor and that, by gradually reducing Canadian government intervention in the process, it makes it possible for Canadian businesspersons to obtain higher profit margins.

This sub-national dynamic involves the supply and demand of labor, which can have positive results since the migrants activate their places of origin to differing degrees by sending remittances home. The 21 499 Mexican agricultural laborers placed in Canada in 2015 alone declared having sent home Can\$225 052 091 in remittances.<sup>3</sup> This seasonal program shows that interaction has generated joint policies between governments and businesses. Although Canada's programs may not be as developed and coordinated as the U.S. case with the 3 x 1 programs, they are very dynamic and are based on criteria and principles that stem from the federal, municipal, or provincial level and generate sub-national effects.

This allows us to situate sub-national units among migratory issues as decisive scenarios for migratory and labor policies, as well as other elements that indirectly influence topics such as human rights and transit policies.

One key element for the continuity and consolidation of SAWP within the framework of sub-national units is that they center on institutional agreements. Through them, they manage and administer the flows of labor mobility based on an intergovernmental model, managed government to government, involving national and sub-national authorities of both countries, as well as the coordination with Canadian employers.

Undoubtedly, the Canadian business community has the specific weight that lends the program its operational efficacy. Canadian employers must supply housing for migrant workers in accordance with provincial standards, as well as food, air fare, and medical coverage. However, Ofelia Beceril, on the one hand, and Leigh Binford, Guillermo Carrasco, and Socorro Arana, on the other, showed that the employers recover a significant portion of that up-front payment through deductions to weekly paychecks to migrant workers.<sup>4</sup> This shows the need to create the administrative procedures as part of public policies of national and sub-national governments in

Since 2010, more than 10 000 Mexicans go every year to Canada to work on farms through bilateral agreements set up and regulated by both the two countries' federal authorities and their sub-national governments.

the face of possible violations of the work contracts of program participants.

#### A DESCRIPTION OF WORKING LIFE

Undoubtedly, in the Canadian case, workers programs must be consolidated through continual assessments, pointing out the factors that can interfere with their operation. Given the exponential hike in regulated migration and the fact that programs linking sub-national units are being formalized guaranteeing the safety of migrant workers, this is even more necessary. This is the case of Tlaxcala, where these units become important because they offer labor and, in conjunction with the government bureaucracy and business agreements, they create synergies that can become incentives for the locale, but at the cost of migrants' working conditions.

The publications of Binford, Carrasco, and Arana, and of Becerril show how Mexican workers, mainly from states in Central Mexico like Tlaxcala and Puebla, are living in what amount to precarious conditions. They are paid only a few pennies over minimum wage; they receive no overtime pay or bonuses for seniority—recent arrivals earn the same wage as those who have been there longer; and therefore, the only way workers can increase their weekly wage is to increase the number of hours worked.<sup>5</sup>

More than one-third of the workers interviewed said that they had no days off, which is a violation of the contractual regulations of the program itself. Ofelia Becerril's study observes the workers in Leamington, Ontario, known as Canada's "tomato capital," and argues that transnational agricultural work by Mexicans in Canada ratifies the restructuring of production processes and new forms of organizing the workplace. She shows how patterns in the organization of work (the assignation of posts, tasks, working hours, and opportunities) are based on a strict sexual and ethnic division of labor, which is discriminatory and creates labor segmentation and segregation.<sup>6</sup>

Despite the fact that Mexico's Ministry of Labor stipulates that migrant workers have a certain level of skill, ongoing train-

ing, and experience in crops, in some cases, such as that of strawberry workers in Quebec, Canadian employers do not recognize their skill level or pay them accordingly.

This reinforces what Jonathan Molinet has stated to the effect that in sub-national units, in this case in destinations, asymmetries exist between workers and employers, showing different levels of control or management that should be formally presented through government administrations in the place of origin.<sup>7</sup>

#### THE DEREGULATION OF MIGRANT LABOR

In the first half of 2002, the Low Skilled Workers Program (LSWP) was put in place to complement SAWP. The new program created more flexibility based on the migrant's place of origin, determining the skills the worker might have. A characteristic of this program is the absence of any direct participation by the Canadian government in the agreements between employer and worker, making the latter vulnerable in terms of working conditions. The program's main objectives are to recruit workers from any country, emphasizing underdeveloped nations, to carry out low-skilled jobs and create unmediated alternatives for hiring in different niches of agriculture.

Migrant workers hired under this program work for highly-monitored stays of one to two years. There is little supervision or regulation of their working conditions, in contrast with the SAWP, where consular structures dedicated to supervising them intervene. Employers, for their part, receive no Canadian governmental assistance in dealing with local public or private institutions in the case of labor disputes or early repatriation with the help of consulates. That is, despite shoring up the supposed dynamic of sub-national units in places of both origin and destination, no legal structure or institution exists to regulate or serve as intermediary in conflict resolution between workers and employers.<sup>8</sup>

The workers' vulnerability requires that both governments intervene together. If this worker program is to truly be considered under the law in the sub-national unit, the different levels of government must intervene to negotiate and politically administer it. And, if we really want to talk about sub-national units, they must consider public policies carried out by specific locations.

The LSWP does not necessarily include day-workers. We see here that labor relations are individualized between companies and their workers, leaving to one side any space for

The Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program sub-national dynamic involves the supply and demand of labor, which can be positive since the migrants activate their places of origin by sending remittances home.

negotiation and agreements among workers. Companies can decide what their needs are in terms of forms of work; this has important effects on relations between skilled and non-skilled labor, in which, for example, the unequal wages are made more unequal, with the disadvantage for workers without certified skills.<sup>9</sup>

What we see here is a lack of job security that, given their lack of union representation, undoubtedly minimizes workers' participation not only within the system of production, mainly in the distribution of work, but also in terms of their wage demands.

Strategies of labor flexibility come together in this form of regulating migration through practices akin to sub-contracting, and, as is already the case in some cases of U.S. H2B visas, inter-entrepreneurial relations are created in which workers join production with only minimal conditions of labor co-responsibility. That is, a triangular relationship is created that exempts companies from all legal responsibility *vis-à-vis* the migrant worker. This has sparked a huge number of advisories of violations of working conditions. Therefore, it twists the strategies of the programs and leads to the need to demand public policies managed internationally by sub-national governmental actors that would institutionalize them and at the same time provide social, economic, and political synergy. The idea, then, is to try to take advantage of opportunities abroad and that labor markets in Canada be instruments for local development.<sup>10</sup>

That is, we can see an injustice being committed with regard to workers' insertion into the labor market in Canada since a discrepancy exists between the policy and the practice of workers' labor rights. This is due to the restrictive character of work permits since the demands for getting a job and hiring practices can limit labor rights as protectionist measures. And, in this relationship of sub-national units, the bio-politics of destinations take advantage of the labor, but leave to one side the other dimensions of migrant workers' lives.<sup>11</sup> Despite the fact that in its 2007 Statement of Objectives, the Labour Mobility Working Group stipulated it would improve temporary workers programs and guarantee the pro-

tection of labor rights, it has not emphasized these issues and has only reinforced the schemes for new job opportunities.<sup>12</sup>

## IN CONCLUSION

Temporary migrant worker programs must go beyond the training of human capital and the creation of conditions to guarantee migrants' decent working conditions. They must produce an effect that makes both the places of origin and destination more dynamic. Therefore, it is necessary to ensure their operation from the point of view of the sub-national units where the coordinated regulation of the different levels of government makes possible the operation in a location and guarantees labor risks are minimized. Factors such as migratory patterns, forms of insertion, and the spatial distribution of the population are being restructured given that the central governments and sub-national units gradually stop regulating these labor relations. It is necessary to generate sustainable ways of living and working with working and hiring conditions that strengthen migrants and their communities of origin, establishing a synergy in regional development and ensuring that the benefits are reciprocal. ■■

---

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> I will use the term "sub-national units" to mean instrumental units based on the decentralization of governments that leads to processes of social and political integration in sub-national entities that implement bilateral practices. See Jacqueline Behrend, "Política subnacional y democracia," *Revista SAAP* vol. 5, no. 2, 2011.

<sup>2</sup> See [http://www.canadainternational.gc.ca/mexico-mexique/eyes\\_abroad\\_coupdoeil/MXICO2015SAWP.aspx?lang=eng](http://www.canadainternational.gc.ca/mexico-mexique/eyes_abroad_coupdoeil/MXICO2015SAWP.aspx?lang=eng), accessed October 10, 2016; and "Programa de Trabajadores Agrícolas México-Canadá 2016 rebasa su objetivo: STPS," <http://www.noticiasmvs.com/#!/noticias/programa-de-trabajadores-agricolas-mexico-canada-2016-rebasa-su-objetivo-stps-855>, accessed October 10, 2016.

<sup>3</sup> See <https://www.gob.mx/stps/prensa/inicia-stps-envio-de-trabajadores-agricolas-a-canada>, accessed January 10, 2017. For more statistical data about workers in Canada, see *The Mapping Migration from the Americas Project*, <http://www.mappingmigration.com/homeenglish.html>.

<sup>4</sup> Ofelia Beceril Quintana, "Relación de género, trabajo transnacional y migración temporal: trabajadores y trabajadoras agrícolas mexicanos en Canadá," paper presented at the first international colloquium "Migración y desarrollo. Transnacionalismo y nuevas perspectivas de integración," in Mexico in 2003, [http://meme.phpwebhosting.com/~migracion/ponencias/20\\_3.pdf](http://meme.phpwebhosting.com/~migracion/ponencias/20_3.pdf), accessed October 4, 2016; and Leigh Binford, Guillermo Carrasco Rivas, and Socorro Arana Hernández, *Rumbo a Canadá: la migración canadiense de trabajadores agrícolas tlaxcaltecos* (Mexico City: Taller abierto, 2004).

<sup>5</sup> Binford, Carrasco, and Arana, op. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Becerril, op. cit.

<sup>7</sup> Jonathan Molinet, "Las unidades subnacionales y las políticas conjuntas en la agenda bilateral migración, medio ambiente, burocracia," <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/LASA98/Molinet.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> Luis M. Muñoz Carrillo, "Programa de Trabajadores Agrícolas Temporales México-Canadá: costos y beneficios," George Washington University, 2011, [http://www.gwu.edu/~ibi/minerva/Spring2011/Luis\\_Munoz\\_Spanish\\_version.pdf](http://www.gwu.edu/~ibi/minerva/Spring2011/Luis_Munoz_Spanish_version.pdf).

<sup>9</sup> Francisco Zapata, "El trabajo en la vieja y en la nueva economía," in Enrique de la Garza Toledo, Jean-Marie Harribey, and Julio César Neffa, comps., *El futuro del trabajo. El trabajo del futuro* (Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2001).

<sup>10</sup> Mariana Calvento, "La inserción Internacional de los actores subnacionales: análisis de un proceso contemporáneo," *Interações* vol. 15, no. 2 (July-December 2014).

<sup>11</sup> Camelia Tigau, "Migrantes buenos y malos; biopolíticas de selección de trabajadores extranjeros en América del Norte," in Bernardo Bolaños Guerra, *Biopolítica y migración. El eslabón perdido de la globalización* (Mexico City: UAM, 2015).

<sup>12</sup> This group is coordinated by Mexico and Canada's federal governments. The participants are Mexico's Ministry of Labor and the Foreign Relations Ministry; and Canada's Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration and Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. Its function is to encourage the flow of temporary workers in an orderly, legal, safe manner.

## Understanding Drug Policy in the United States: Sub-national Trends

Jonathan D. Rosen\*



Jerry Lampen/Reuters

In November 2012, two states in the United States, Washington and Colorado, legalized marijuana for recreational purposes. On November 8, 2016, voters in four states, Massachusetts, Maine, Nevada, and California, decided to follow suit. Moreover, 28 out of the 50 states in the United States have legalized medical marijuana. This is despite the fact that marijuana usage is illegal at the federal level. This article examines the recent trends in marijuana

legalization in the U.S., highlighting the complex relationship between the states and the federal government in the U.S. For a variety of reasons, states have decided to legalize marijuana, albeit in various forms. Many advocates of legalizing marijuana in the U.S. argue that this would help reduce drug trafficking and drug-related violence in producing and transit countries. The article begins with a discussion of the U.S. drug war and the consequences of such policies. It then discusses the increasing number of people incarcerated in the U.S. as a result of the drug laws, followed by a discussion about the legalization debate and another on the power of

\* Research scientist at Florida International University (FIU); [jonathanrosenrosen@gmail.com](mailto:jonathanrosenrosen@gmail.com).

the states and states' rights issues. Before a brief conclusion, I discuss the role of states as a model for public policy.

#### THE U.S.-LED DRUG WAR

The U.S. has seen an evolution in the number of laws designed to combat drug consumption, production, and trafficking. For instance, in 1937, the U.S. Congress passed the Marijuana Tax Act, which, as the name implies, made marijuana illegal at the federal level through taxes. The 1952 Boggs Acts and the 1956 Narcotics Control Act created mandatory sentences for individuals violating drug laws. In fact, people found guilty of violating the marijuana laws for the first time faced between two and ten years in prison.<sup>1</sup>

Former U.S. President Richard Nixon launched the "war on drugs" in 1971. While Nixon maintained the need to combat the supply of drugs, he also understood the necessity of investing resources to reduce the demand for them. The argument is that drug traffickers will continue to traffic drugs and other illicit commodities as long as the demand for such products exists. However, other scholars contend that the U.S.-led drug war really began over 100 years ago with the passage of the Harrison Act of 1914, which taxes individuals who import, produce, manufacture, or traffic coca and opium.<sup>2</sup>

The U.S. has spent billions of dollars on counter-narcotics initiatives with the goal of combatting the supply of drugs. For example, Washington allocated US\$10 billion to Plan Colombia from 2000 to 2015, with the initial goal of reducing drug cultivation, production, and trafficking by 50 percent. In addition, the U.S. has spent US\$2.5 billion on the Mérida Initiative to combat drug trafficking and organized crime in Mexico. Critics of such supply-side strategies have contended that countries in Latin America would not have problems with drug trafficking if such high levels of demand did not exist in the U.S., the number-one drug-consuming country in the world. Thus, the argument is that drug trafficking should not only be viewed as a security issue, but rather a public health problem.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, critics of the drug war and supply-side strategies have maintained that such policies have resulted in high levels of violence.<sup>4</sup> Mexico, for example, witnessed extreme levels of drug-related violence during the Felipe Calderón administration (2006-2012), as more than 100 000 people died during this period. Drug traffickers fight among each other for control of routes and territory. In addition, the Mex-

Many advocates of legalizing marijuana in the U.S. argue that this would help reduce drug trafficking and drug-related violence in producing and transit countries.

ican governments' campaign to combat drug traffickers resulted in a war between the states and these illicit actors, which led to high levels of violence and bloodshed.

The U.S. government has sought to combat drug usage by incarcerating drug users. As a result, the prison population has multiplied over time. For instance, the number of individuals incarcerated for non-violent drug offenses spiked to 400 000 in 1997 from 50 000 in 1980.<sup>5</sup> The prison population has increased by more than 500 percent over the past 40 years. Today, 2.2 million people are in jails or prisons in the U.S., which means that the U.S. incarcerates more people than any other country in the world.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, over half the people in federal prisons are there for drug-related crimes. In 2015, law enforcement officials arrested 643 121 people for breaking marijuana laws.<sup>7</sup>

#### THE LEGALIZATION DEBATE

The legalization of drugs has been a matter for intense debate. While there are those in favor of the complete legalization of all drugs, the legalization of harder drugs such as heroin and cocaine has been a more difficult sell and a controversial issue, as they are very dangerous and viewed as suicidal drugs. However, the U.S. has seen public opinion change over time with regard to the legalization of marijuana. In 1969, for example, 12 percent of the population favored marijuana legalization, compared to 36 percent in 2005. By 2009, 44 percent favored legalization. As of October 2015, 58 percent of the U.S. public believed that this substance should be legal. A Pew Research poll found that 57 percent of people favored the legalization of marijuana in the U.S. in 2016, compared to the 37 percent of individuals who did not approve.<sup>8</sup>

Several arguments are made for legalization for recreational usage, while other individuals contend that marijuana should only be legal for medical purposes. Marijuana has some positive medical benefits. For instance, it is often given to individuals with glaucoma to reduce ocular pressure, and it is

known to reduce pain levels in people with cancer. Furthermore, some argue that more people die from other legal substances, such as alcohol, yet marijuana remains illegal. Thus, some contend that it is hypocritical for marijuana to be illegal while cigarettes and alcohol are legal. Other people argue that the legalization of marijuana would lead to lower profits for criminal organizations, such as the Mexican drug cartels, who traffic this substance. In addition, some people, particularly Libertarians, believe that everyone should have the individual liberty to consume whatever they want. Libertarians contend that the government should play a limited role in individuals' decisions. Others, however, believe that the government should regulate and tax the distribution of marijuana. Currently, eight states tax and regulate marijuana in the U.S.: Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Massachusetts, Maine, Colorado, California, and Alaska.<sup>9</sup>

However, opponents of marijuana legalization argue that it could result in individuals using other harder substances (i.e., marijuana is a gateway drug). Critics also contend that marijuana can have negative health repercussions, such as memory loss, and, therefore, could impact the performance of students. Moreover, some individuals argue that marijuana could result in increased criminal activity as well as accidents (i.e., driving while intoxicated).

#### THE FEDERAL SYSTEM AND STATES' RIGHTS

The U.S. is a federal system comprised of states that have their own constitutions, laws, and governments. The states in the U.S. have tremendous power compared to the federal government. In other countries with federal political systems, such as Mexico, power is concentrated in the federal government. Moreover, the 50 states in the U.S. are quite different: New York and California, for example, are more liberal than Texas and Nebraska. Individuals and leaders in these states often fight for states' rights issues. The legalization of marijuana in some states has created various challenges since it violates federal laws outlawing marijuana. Furthermore, this

*Critics of the drug war and supply-side strategies maintained that such policies resulted in high levels of violence, for example, in Mexico.*

is complicated by the fact that the U.S. pushed hard for and signed various international treaties that prohibit drug legalization (for example, the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961).

Some individuals, such as Ethan Nadelmann of the Drug Policy Alliance, have argued that the movement to legalize marijuana has similarities to the legalization of gay marriage. In June 2015, the United States Supreme Court ruled gay marriage to be legal at the federal level. Thus, states refusing to recognize gay marriage were in violation of the law. This Supreme Court ruling did not happen overnight, but resulted rather from grassroots social movements and years of litigation. In 2003, Massachusetts began to allow gay couples to marry, followed by Connecticut in 2008 and Iowa in 2009. Thus, the decisions of the states to legalize same-sex marriage led to lawsuits that eventually changed the federal law after a ruling by the highest court. Similar to the gay rights movement, more states will likely continue to legalize marijuana, which could eventually result in a Supreme Court case.

As of January 2017, marijuana remains illegal at the federal level, which presents various challenges for states that have legalized it. For example, an individual can enter a medical marijuana dispensary in Colorado and purchase various forms of marijuana from liquids and edible snacks to cannabis that can be smoked. However, businesses cannot deposit their cash earnings in banks because they are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), and banks cannot accept cash from clients who earn money from illicit endeavors. This creates various problems for businesses since they could be more likely to be robbed for having such large amounts of cash on hand.

#### STATES AS EXPERIMENTS

A unique thing about the federal system in the U.S. is that states can function as experiments. In other words, a state can implement a certain policy and the results can be studied to determine its consequences. New policies in certain states can serve as a trial. Such incremental changes have several advantages, since designing a policy based on theory could present various challenges. Often, policies that are intended to be carried out in a particular manner face obstacles during implementation. A gradual approach allows practitioners to make changes to enhance the policy's efficiency. Thus, les-

sons can be learned about what elements of a particular law, policy, or activity work efficiently and what aspects could be improved. Thorough analysis of the results allows practitioners to apply the lessons learned in other states. Moreover, the implementation of a policy in one state will not have major consequences if it is not effective. Occasionally, some initiatives that look great on paper end up failing. However, a failure in several states will have less of an impact than if a particular initiative was implemented in all 50 states.

The big fear for opponents of the legalization of marijuana is that crime and accidents could increase. Furthermore, some worry that substance abuse will spike. The legalization of marijuana for recreational use is a relatively recent phenomenon, which means that in-depth studies over significant periods of time are not yet possible. More research must be conducted in the future to determine the impact of legalization on crime, accidents, and addiction in the states where marijuana is legal. However, a study by the CATO Institute found that the legalization of marijuana in Colorado has not led to large increases in marijuana usage.<sup>10</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The U.S. has seen a breakdown—or at least a “partial breakdown”—of the prohibition regime over the past few years. The recent trends in the U.S. with regard to the legalization of marijuana show that public opinion about marijuana laws has shifted over time. The changes in drug laws are in part due to grassroots movements in the U.S. that have pushed for their modification for a variety of reasons. Thus, neither the states nor the U.S. government promoted changes to these laws, but, rather, people mobilized and placed these issues on the agenda at the ballot box. Advocacy organizations, NGOs, and other leaders have been instrumental in helping shape the legalization discourse. Some academics and researchers have played important roles in studying drug policies and advocating for alternatives based on sound scientific research and policy analysis.

Many proponents of the legalization of marijuana believe that the benefits outweigh the costs. Some highlight the large number of people who are arrested and incarcerated for violating drug laws. Others contend that the legalization of marijuana in the U.S. will reduce the profits of organized crime groups operating in places like Mexico, which could help decrease levels of drug-related violence.

The legalization of marijuana in the U.S. also demonstrates the role and power of the states. The lesson of marijuana legalization for medical and recreational purposes is that many states do not agree with current U.S. federal drug laws. Thus, people in a variety of cases have acted in an effort to voice their dissatisfaction. As previously mentioned, many states are currently in violation of U.S. federal laws. If more states continue to legalize marijuana, it is likely that the Supreme Court will receive cases about this issue. However, it is not possible to determine how the court will rule. **MM**

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to Marten Brienen for his helpful comments. For more see Angela Dills, Sietse Goffard, and Jeffrey Miron, “Dose of Reality: The Effect of State Marijuana Legalizations,” *Policy Analysis* no. 799, CATO Institute, September 16, 2016.

<sup>2</sup> Bruce Michael Bagley, “The New Hundred Years War? US National Security and the War on Drugs in Latin America,” *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* vol. 30, no. 1 (1988), pp. 161-182; Ted Galen Carpenter, *Bad Neighbor Policy: Washington’s Futile War on Drugs in Latin America* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

<sup>3</sup> Connie Veillette, *Plan Colombia: A Progress Report* (Washington, D. C.: Congressional Research Service, 2005); Ted Galen Carpenter, *The Fire Next Door: Mexico’s Drug Violence and the Danger to America* (Washington, D. C.: Cato Institute, 2012); Bruce Bagley, *Drug Trafficking and Organized Crime in the Americas: Major Trends in the Twenty-First Century* (Washington, D. C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2012).

<sup>4</sup> Ted Galen Carpenter, “Drug Prohibition Is a Global Folly,” *CNN*, October 4, 2013.

<sup>5</sup> “A Brief History of the Drug War,” *Drug Policy Alliance*, <http://www.drugpolicy.org/facts/new-solutions-drug-policy/brief-history-drug-war-0>, accessed December 28, 2016.

<sup>6</sup> “Incarceration,” The Sentencing Project, <http://www.sentencingproject.org/issues/incarceration/>, accessed December 28, 2016.

<sup>7</sup> “Drug War Statistics,” *Drug Policy Alliance*, <http://www.drugpolicy.org/drug-war-statistics>, accessed December 28, 2016.

<sup>8</sup> Jeffrey M. Jones, “In U.S., 58% Back Legal Marijuana Use,” *Gallup*, October 21, 2015, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/186260/back-legal-marijuana.aspx>, accessed December 28, 2016; Abigail Geiger, “Support for Marijuana Legalization Continues to Rise,” *Pew Research Center*, October 12, 2016, <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/10/12/support-for-marijuana-legalization-continues-to-rise/>, accessed December 28, 2016.

<sup>9</sup> For more on the legalization debate, see Jonathan P. Caulkins, Angela Hawken, Beau Kilmer, and Mark A.R. Kleiman, *Marijuana Legalization: What Everyone Needs to Know* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Alain Joffe and W. Samuel Yancy, “Legalization of Marijuana: Potential Impact on Youth,” *Pediatrics* vol. 113, no. 6 (2004): e632-e638; Andrew A. Monte, Richard D. Zane, and Kennon J. Heard, “The Implications of Marijuana Legalization in Colorado,” *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* vol. 313, no. 3 (2015), pp. 241-242.

<sup>10</sup> Angela Dills, Sietse Goffard, and Jeffrey Miron, “Dose of Reality: The Effect of State Marijuana Legalizations,” CATO Institute, September 16, 2016, <https://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/dose-reality-effect-state-marijuana-legalizations>.