

"Republicans for Marijuana" Message Analysis

Presented by Emily Criswell, Jack McLaughlin, Jonathon White, and Michaela Brannon

Overview

Please note that the four of us do not identify as Republicans, though we all support the legalization of recreational marijuana. Our message creation should therefore be perceived as a hypothetical, "this is what a message from an organization consisting of Republicans who support the legalization of recreational marijuana would look like." In addition, Republicans for Marijuana is a fictional organization, created for the purpose of our message.

Narrative Framing: The goal of our message is to gain support for the legalization of cannabis in the commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to try and get the support of those who would normally be against it. The group that is against the legalization of marijuana for the most part is people who identify as conservatives, and as we know a lot of the people that are conservatives are registered as Republicans. We titled our ad "Republicans for Marijuana" in a hope to be identified as a part of the "in-group" which we have identified as Republicans. While we are not specifically using the idea of anger towards an out-group, we are still trying to play on the idea of an in-group versus an out-group which we see in Celeste Michelle Condit's writing in *Angry Public Rhetorics*.

In Condit's writing she talks about the idea of anger towards and out-group and how one must first identify that out-group to direct its anger towards. She talks about Aristotle's early criteria for just anger in this section when talking about orienting or directing anger towards the group in specific ways:

The theoretical basis for the assembly of that script is an expansion from Aristotle's early criteria for just anger to a fuller Burkean pentadic form, but with special attention to the constitution of the protagonists. Acting as a collectivity requires not only orienting against violators or out-groups but also orienting toward members of the collective in specifically articulated ways. (Condit 71)

In other words, this idea of just anger, to be implemented properly has some prerequisites. Some of these are an injustice happening to an in-group, identifying an out-group, and identifying why the out-group was responsible for said injustice. While we are not using this idea of anger towards an out-group specifically, we are still identifying an out-group without saying it directly. That is the reason that we used the saying "Republicans for Marijuana" because we felt that it would make the readers feel that they were a part of the in-group and the out-group was the Democrats.

We, however, have two different messages in hopes to reach two different audiences of Republicans. The first is the poster which is meant to be seen by as many Republicans as possible but more for younger conservatives. The second is the video that we created which is meant for the older generation of Republicans as it would air on a television station because we know that older people tend to watch more television than younger people. This demographic that we are trying to

reach through television may be more challenging to get our message to as older generations often times have made up their minds on decisions and rarely change their minds on specific issues.

What we are hoping that the people who do see our advertisement on television will do, or the call to action, is to check out our website to get more information about the organization, Republicans for Marijuana. The actual purpose of our poster that we created is to persuade the person reading the infographic about supporting marijuana, given the evidence regarding economic benefits, which we have provided. We anticipate that in the process of informing these voters about the potential positives to the legalization of marijuana, we will consequently gain support from Republicans in favor of legislation created for legalization.

We also tried to take into consideration the charts that we were provided from Haidt that try and explain how people from different ideologies care about different things such as care or liberty and oppression. When looking at Republicans/conservatives we see that their moral matrix is focused on the principles of authority, loyalty, and sanctity; however, we hope that we can play on how conservatives' value both liberty/oppression and fiscal responsibility, which was not on the graph.

Audience: Our target audience consists of working-class conservative voters – ideally, registered Republicans – of Pennsylvania, from age 40 and above. To elaborate on the age range, we are targeting middle age and older voters, as we have found that approximately 2/3s of Millennial Republicans support legalization. Here are the breakdowns of how many Republicans support legalization, from each proceeding generation: “Generation Xers (47%) and Baby Boomers (38%), and much higher than among GOP members of the Silent generation (17%) (Abbott). Our secondary audience will be individuals who have been left unemployed, due to losing their jobs because of COVID-19. We believe it is in our best interest to gain the support and backing of Pennsylvania's conservative voters because they are traditionally opposed to legalizing recreational cannabis. We chose to focus on the state of Pennsylvania for two reasons: one, simply because it is the state where we all attend college; but primarily, in light of Governor Wolf's declaration in August of 2020 regarding his call for legalization. In addition, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act (MORE Act) is a current topic for legislation; as of December 3, 2020, the House of Representatives voted to pass this bill.

Here are our specific segmentations:

Demographic – A working-class conservative voter (any gender), from age 40 and above, who has either had their income negatively affected or lost their employment due to COVID-19. This individual is most likely a blue-collar worker, who was unable to conduct their work remotely.

Geographic – A resident of Pennsylvania.

Psychographic – A Republican or otherwise conservative voter who does not approve of recreational drug use or legalization.

Behavioristic – A nonuser of recreational drugs who would not vote to pass legislation on legalization.

Vehicle: For our message creation, the format for our message is an infographic that can also be broken up into slideshow images and pieced together for a short video. Thus, we are utilizing two formats: an infographic and a video advert. In order to circulate this message to our target audience, which consists of conservative voters in Pennsylvania, we will accomplish two things: for starters, we will send the infographic to conservative-watched news outlets – such as Fox News, CBS, and ABC – for distribution on their respective websites; next, we will send the video advert to the same news outlets for distribution to be aired on television.

It should be noted that both of our messages were created using Canva, a free design software with copy-right free materials for free-use. The song used in our video was free-use as well, because it was downloaded from a creative common’s platform; however, it is strictly for personal use, and in order to actually broadcast this message, we would have to purchase a commercial license for the song, and thus this is an example of a potential monetary constraint. For these reasons, we do not have the constraint of cost in creating our messages; however, we did have the constraint of being limited to only using free content to create our messages.

The broadest constraint of our vehicle is the fact that it will cost us money sell our advertisement to these news outlets; as such, this might affect whether we are able to send our message to all three outlets, depending on whatever our budget might be, and the overarching cost of advertising. Another constraint is that each news outlet has the power to refuse to broadcast our message, as the legalization of marijuana is not something that the majority of Republicans advocate for – if a news outlet does show our message, they too are taking a risk, which is that their ratings may be negatively impacted should something like a boycott result. Lastly, the length of our video advertisement is another constraint. Because we want to air it via multiple news sources, rather than our own streaming platform, we must adhere to their advertisement restrictions. We have found that the average television ad length for these outlets ranges from 15 seconds to 2 minutes. As a medium and a compromise, we have limited our video to a maximum of 1 minute; in fact, the video came out to exactly 52 seconds.

The affordance of both our advertisements is that it informs the audience, who is not traditionally in favor of legalizing marijuana, about the economic benefits of the legal cannabis industry. Furthermore, if it is legalized, we have outlined other affordances in our messages: job growth; labor income; tax revenue; better investment opportunities; and less tax-payer money spend in the court system on cannabis-related convictions.

Emotions: Our message creation for Republicans for marijuana is attempting to evoke fear, anger, and a sense of optimism. The use of pathos in our message is evident with the way some phrases are worded. For example, anger is being portrayed in the phrases “we need to face the facts”, “does this seem right to you?”, and “here’s the bottom line”. Fear inducing words are scattered throughout our infographic, like the phrase’s economic uncertainties, job loss, and money wasted.

The sense of optimism comes into play when we ask the question, “How can we rebuild our state’s economy?” Asking this question and then giving the answer “by legalizing recreational marijuana”, gives the audience that sense of optimism that legalizing recreational marijuana will help rebuild the state’s economy. What is our reasoning behind trying to evoke anger, fear, and optimism in our message?

We wanted to use some form of anger in our message to gather up people that all shared similar emotions of being angry towards how the government is handling the crashing economy. According to Condit’s readings on angry rhetoric, public anger tends to induce optimism to overcome risks. We want to evoke anger towards how the government is handling this economic crisis so more people, especially conservatives, will take initiative by supporting the legalization of recreational marijuana for economic benefits. We play on the anger people have towards the government by saying “We don’t support government regulations on economic state policies, so why should we allow the government to mandate the marijuana industry?” This specific statement is used to cause the audience to feel angry towards government regulations resulting in people supporting the marijuana industry being legalized to keep government from regulating the economy coming from the industry.

Angry rhetoric leads to a sense of optimistic bias. Condit explains that overoptimism orientation that comes from anger tends to have the brain shut down the search for more information and to favor a more hands-on approach. In the case of message, we want the angry audience to feel optimistic that supporting the legalization of marijuana means supporting the rebuilding of our economy. We want our audience to feel optimistic that the legalization of marijuana will help rebuild the economy.

Fear was a heavy emotion we played on in our message creation. We start inducing fear by stating statistics about the impacts Covid-19 has had on Pennsylvania’s economy right away. The statistic that heavily conveyed fear was that because of the pandemic 453,000 jobs are predicted to be lost and Pennsylvania is only bringing back about 309,700 of those jobs back. We want to cause fear to push for the audience to take action. Fear is also shown at the end of our infographic to show the consequences of not supporting the legalization of recreational marijuana. We want the audience to fear that if we do not legalize marijuana than we will face jobs continuing to be lost, money continuing to be wasted, and the risk of another economic recession.

Aesthetics

Before we move to discuss the specific aesthetics of our messages, it is important to conceptualize the idea of constitutive rhetoric in relation to our advertisements. Constitutive rhetoric is defined as a technique that:

“positions the reader towards political, social, and economic action in the material world and it is in this positioning that its ideological character becomes significant . . .
Constitutive rhetorics are ideological not merely because they provide individuals with

narratives to inhabit as subjects and motives to experience, but because they insert ‘narrativized’ subjects as agents into the world . . . In particular, . . . the constitution in action of a motivated subject that orients those addressed towards particular future acts.” (Stein 173-174)

In other words, constitutive rhetoric maintains the premise wherein an individual is faced with motive that is of political, social, and economic action. Based on the individual’s experiences, they will whether the matter is important to them, or likewise if it is something that they can resonate identify with. Or, perhaps it is the idea that the message is asking the audience member to identify themselves positively with whatever is being conveyed. In our messages, we actively sought to convince our target audience – working-class, blue-collar conservatives and Republican voters of the age 40 and above – to support the legalization of recreational cannabis in Pennsylvania. By demonstrating constitutive rhetoric, we are asking our audience to see themselves as those who have been economically disenfranchised by COVID-19 – the majority of who have.

Color: For our infographic, we predominately used the colors green and brown. The use of green is meant to represent the color of a marijuana leaf; this is an element that many marijuana infographics use. We used brown as a complementary color, which is also intended to represent the color of a marijuana blunt, as these are typically depicted in media as being wrapped in brown cigar paper. Another way we used color was to play on emotion as our message transitions into the quote from Warren Harding. What we designed was the use of darker colors. This was intended to represent the darker mood we conveyed in which we insist to our audience that without the legalization of recreational marijuana, the economy will continue to get worse; more specifically, “jobs will continue to be lost, money will continue to be wasted, and Pennsylvania’s economy will be at risk of another recession.” However, the colors switch at the end of the graphic, when we see white smoke clouds in the background, with the words, “we support the legalization of recreational cannabis in Pennsylvania – do you?” The intention of this design choice was to convey a sense of optimism, as opposed to the darker colors directly above the conclusion. In other words, we have a moment of relief, when the audience can take a step back and breathe, realizing that though we face troubling times, there is a promising solution to our tribulation.

Next, for our video, we kept the design relatively simple. We used the color white as the primary background color to represent uncertainty, or a blank future. We realize that this is in direct contrast to the use of white in our infographic, but this merely attests to the subjectivity of color theory. Before the slide, “By legalizing recreational marijuana” (00:00:28), our text is grey, for the reason that this color represents bleakness, and a sense of dreariness is evoked. Once we reach “By legalizing recreation marijuana,” the background turns green; this resembles the color of a marijuana leaf (for the same reasons expressed above), and this sudden change of color is meant to catch the audiences’ attention. From here, the white background comes back and remains for the rest of the video. We brought back the use of white because our video still leaves questions that

need to be answered. Therefore, we concluded the video by encouraging our curious audience to visit our hypothetical website (00:00:47).

Though the background turns back to white, our text transitions from grey to green. Like before, our use of green is symbolic of a marijuana leaf. However, we used green text in our video to convey two ideas: one, that this is like a green-light on a traffic-light, inferring that legalizing recreational marijuana is the way to “go” or to “start” rebuilding the economy after COVID-19; and secondly, because the green is a nice contrast from the previously grey text – we have eliminated the dreariness by instead inspiring a sense of optimism that says, “This is how we heal.”

Wording:

Our choice in wording had a significant impact in the creation of our messages. Overall, for both our video and our infographic, we wanted to maintain a conversative tone with our audience. For example, we used trigger words such as “we” and “our” to declare that we were either addressing ourselves as an organization in solidarity with our audience, or “you” to directly address the recipient of the message. Ultimately, we stopped and posed the question that many Republicans have been asking ever since the economic downslide – in Pennsylvania, especially. This question asks, which we directly quote from our infographic, “How can we rebuild our state’s economy?” And, we give them the answer: “By legalizing recreational marijuana.” This was another moment in our message where we wanted to create a connection between us and our audience, by saying “our state” rather than “the state”; this gives us credibility with our audience – and consequently ethos – by demonstrating that we have the authority to speak on this matter, because our organization is focused in Pennsylvania.

What follows is our section wherein we give our reasons for supporting legalization. Rather than simply listing off our reasons – such as tax revenue, job growth, labor income, investment opportunities, and less taxpayer money invested in the court system for cannabis-related convictions – we utilized logos by going into depth about each benefit, by giving our audience members hard facts and proof that legalization works. For example, under “Labor Income,” we said the following:

A Nevada study conducted by a *RCB Economics and Marijuana Policy Group* found that legalizing marijuana in the state [of Nevada] could create and support over 41,000 jobs while generating over \$1.7 billion in labor income – while California has an estimation of 81,000 jobs and a labor income of \$3.5 billion.

This demonstrates to our audience that we have an informed argument that is backed by research that is specialized on the legalization of marijuana.

Succeeding our section on the benefits, we inserted a quote from Warren Harding: “Less government in business and more business in government.” We included this because it is relevant to the conservative ideal on less government intervention and mandates on business (or really, anything economic for that matter); this is something that we found to be a contingent for

hypocrisy in the Republican opposition to prohibiting recreational marijuana, because this – according to their values – should not be any business of the federal government, and yet it is (and they see no issue with this). In addition, Harding was the 29th President of the United States, and a Republican. He is a man who many conservatives resonate with, regarding shared political beliefs; via ethos, this may incite patriotism amongst members of our audience.

In the section, “Here’s the Bottom Line,” we opted again to utilize the word “we”: “We don’t support government regulations on economic state policies”; “So why should we allow the government to mandate the marijuana industry?”; and “With the bleak times and economic uncertainties we continue to face in the exigence of the pandemic, we must now consider the legalization of cannabis in the state of Pennsylvania as a viable option for rescuing our economy.” Our other option would have been to substitute “we” with “our organization.” However, it was important to stick with “we,” otherwise the use of “our organization” would have created a separation between us – Republicans for Marijuana – and our audience. In this case, solidarity is crucial, and it allows for constitutive rhetoric by essentially provoking our audience members to visualize themselves in our viewpoint: How can I as an individual be a Republican and support the legalization of marijuana?

Finally, we conclude our infographic by instilling a little separation, in which we declare our support for legalization, and we ask our audience if they do too. This is a moment that almost seems to ask our audience if they are with us, or if they are against us. The fear of an economic recession is intended to be the consequence of not supporting the movement.

At very bottom of our infographic, we included the list of the three sources that we used to compile the factual information that we broadcast. By listing our sources, we demonstrate the ethos and credibility behind our message, as it was founded on pre-existing research regarding the economic affects of the pandemic in Pennsylvania and the economic benefits of legalization in states such as Nevada, Colorado, and California. The implementation of our sources at the end proves to our audience that we are not fabricating the information projected. In addition, it allows for our audience to explore the original sources for further personal research.

As for our video, we already discussed how we kept the wording casual, as if we were having a conversation with our audience. By doing this, it creates the sense as though we are listening to whoever is watching the video, and we do not try to talk over them. We pose the question, “Does this seem right to you?” only to pause for a moment of audience reflection, and then we give our answer that should resonate with exactly how the audience feels, which is that it is not right: “We don’t think so, either.” Of course, the insistence here is that we are trying to help convey the message that this is how the audience should be feeling; ultimately, it is okay to think like us, because we are Republicans, just like them.

As in our infographic, we tried to avoid the use of “you” as much as possible. In the end, we wanted to illustrate the idea that we are all in this situation together – the pandemic and its economic hinderances – and thus we should work together to find the solution – legalizing

recreational marijuana. This also demonstrates ethos yet again, as we as an organization have the credibility to speak on this matter, because we are Republicans who are affected by the pandemic, who also advocate for legalization. Lastly, when designing the name of our website, we wanted to make it something that is easy to remember. Thus, we went with the name of our organization, Republicans for Marijuana, and simply spaced out each word with a dash, which makes our website title easier on the eyes, and also better to remember, because the words are broken up. We made sure to use .org rather than .com, because presenting ourselves as .org makes us look more credible as a legitimate organization who can be trusted, rather than a website that has motivations for profit.

Textual Focus Points:

Not to be confused with our word choice, this section refers to the stylistic decisions of our word placement. To begin, we will discuss the textual focus points of our infographic. The heading declaring the name of our organization – and consequence, who is presenting the infographic – is placed at the very top with the largest text out of any other section. It simply says, “Republicans for Marijuana.” And yet, this is enough for audience to deduce what the message is about, and who is conveying it.

Throughout the entire message, we emphasized the section headings with larger font that was typically capitalized; this was done so that the section headings would not be lost amongst the graphic, and this also creates clarity for the reader. For example, a reader could see the section title “Tax Revenue” and would know immediately that the information directly under it is commentary on the economic benefit of tax revenue.

Our text is predominantly white, simply for the reason that is easy to read against the darker colors of the background. That, and it is the color of smoke, which matches the smoke clouds on the graphic. However, when we reach the section beneath “Here’s the Bottom Line” – or as we like to call it, the *fear section* – we emphasized key words with orange font. For example, we colored these phrases orange: “economic uncertainties”, “legalization of marijuana”, and “viable option for rescuing our economy.” These phrases came from the following statement:

With the bleak times and economic uncertainties we continue to face in the exigence of the pandemic, we must now consider the legalization of cannabis in the state of Pennsylvania as a viable option for rescuing our economy.

The choice of emphasizing these phrases meant that the summation of our assertion in the statement is easy to discern in the block of information – that amidst our economic uncertainties, the legalization of marijuana is a viable option for rescuing our economy. The reader would not need to read the entire statement to understand our point; instead, only the words emphasized in orange font.

We then transition into the section beneath “Otherwise.” We emphasized the words “Jobs” and “Money” with bigger font to catch the reader’s attention by flashing their primary concerns that

have been created by the pandemic: job loss, and money. Furthermore, we capitalized and colored the words “lost” and wasted.” This was done for the purpose of reaffirming the audience’s fears.

Lastly, we conclude our infographic by declaring that “we support the legalization of recreational cannabis in Pennsylvania.” We then ask our audience the question, “Do you?” in all caps. Again, this was done to catch the reader’s attention, but for the intention that they will feel as if they are being directly approached by our organization, as we seek out their answer to our question. In turn, this will beckon the reader to reflect on how they feel about the viability of the legalization of marijuana after being presented our information.

The textual focal points in our video were rather consistent and simple. The placement of our words was always front and center. Thus, the text flowed from each slide to the next, and it did not require the audience member to look elsewhere on the screen for the succeeding bit of information. On the final slide, in which we post the URL to our website, we included the outline of a marijuana leaf at the center of our text. This is because a marijuana leaf would be the colophon of our organization.

Video Music:

The music choice in our video was a decision that required careful deliberation and selection. It needed to be a song that matched the mood of the video, and by consequence, an extension of pathos – or, emotion. In the beginning, the song starts of sounding somber and a bit ominous, in reflection of the mood of the pandemic; especially considering that the country as a whole feels rather discontent and pessimistic about the future, or ever returning to normal. The steady beats of the song come in at “7.3% Unemployment Rate” (00:00:11). This is meant to capture the audience’s attention; while the comment on the fiscal shortfall is important, we do not believe that our audience would necessarily resonate with this fact as much as they would the unemployment rate – thus, we waited to have the beat come in at the point that is more relatable.

The music remains consistent, and the beating is monotonous. It is not until the slide, “By Legalizing Recreational Marijuana” (00:00:28) that the pitch finally changes and gets higher, or prettier. This chord progression was intentionally placed at this moment in the video, because it lines up with the slide that proposes the solution to saving Pennsylvania’s economy. It is a moment of optimism for our audience, and perhaps even curiosity. The chords continue to add to the body of the song, far more than in the first half of the video. This represents the expansion of our solution, and the pitches do not return to the somber mood for the remainder of the video. In the end, the audio fades as the message fades too. There is no significance to this decision, other than that it was simply made so as to avoid an abrasive and unattractive ending to the video. However, it could be symbolic of the fact that as the call-to-action for our audience “To find out more, visit us at republicans-for-marijuana.org” (00:00:46) fades from the screen, as does the music; it is the sense that without support for our organization, we will only face more uncertainties (and this “uncertainty” is emulated by the second of silence).

Message Reflection

We definitely made a few significant changes from our initial message draft to our finalized version; in fact, we had not actually decided for sure that we wanted to create both an infographic *and* a video until we began our research over Thanksgiving break. Originally, our intention was to only create the video. Once we better understood the constraints of the video – in that we had too much information to say in under a minute – we decided a supplementary infographic was necessary. Though this meant more work for us, it also guaranteed that we would be able to convey everything we needed to in our message creation.

An additional change in our message was that we originally wanted to frame our narrative from a left-leaning view, with the intention of essentially scaring conservatives into supporting the legalization of cannabis (sort of a, “the government is going to destroy your life as you know it if you don’t support us” kind of idea). This idea was easier said than done, and we realized quickly in our drafting that we had a better chance of just angering the opposition, rather than achieving what we wanted. Relying on scare-tactics would have required us to use the foundation of fairness – in that the government is cheating the American people for their own benefits – which is not an idea that would resonate well with conservatives; this is because the principle of fairness favors liberals over conservatives. So, instead of bullying our target audience into submission, we instead opted to play into mutual fears that our organization *Republicans for Marijuana* has, consisting of factors such as job loss, income loss, etc. It should be noted that our organization is purely fictional and was created for the purpose of this advertisement. However, if this was a real message to be broadcasted, it would need to be backed up by an organization such as this.

Another point that is worth discussing is the fact that there are a few less-effective aspects of our messages. Overall, our messages do not seem to match up with our target age; by this, we just mean that our messages are rather neutral to age and could be received by anyone. If we had more time, we could have done additional research on the War on Drugs and how to implement ideas from that into our message, to demonstrate that we are targeting an older audience. Our video is very basic, and both of our messages were created using free computer software. Aside from the constraints already discussed, we had design constraints as well, regarding simple things such as controlling how fast the text in our video faded in and out; while this is not a major issue, it caused frustration. With greater graphic design skills and money to spend on better software, we would have been able to add more visuals to our video.

With more technology skills and time, we would like to organize and send out a survey to registered Republican voters in Pennsylvania; in this survey, we would give them the opportunity and space to discuss their main concerns about legalizing marijuana – or even aspects that they do support – so that we could then address these elements in our messages, to sympathize with their concerns from one Republican to another, and by demonstrating why their fears are not as reasonable as they may believe. It was important for us to emphasize fears in our message creation because this is a characteristic emotion of authority.

Lastly, we established several differences between our infographic and the infographic we audited from *Ben & Jerry's*, “Let’s Be Blunt About Cannabis Justice.” The design of their infographic harbored a little bit of influence over ours – specifically, our structure and the use of smoke clouds. Like “Let’s Be Blunt About Cannabis Justice,” we stated our organization name. This is a great way to catch someone’s attention, as it demonstrates ethos from the beginning: for the audited infographic, it pulls on the credibility, because *Ben & Jerry's* is a popular ice cream brand with an established social media presence, brand loyalists, and the money to sustain their image. For our message, we tell our audience right from the beginning that we are just like them: Republicans, because like-minded people of a worldview gravitate to each other, “calling on particular shared values respected figures of authority, or one’s own character as a method for appealing to an audience” (Jones 167).

However, we believe our message is more affective in that we are targeting people who do not traditionally support the legalization of marijuana. Thus, we are trying to win over more supporters, who will in turn seek out more information on the subject; this, of course, could have led them to “Let’s Be Blunt About Cannabis Justice,” and as a result, they may have followed the brand’s call-to-action of signing their petition regarding the MORE Act to Congress. On the other hand, the *Ben & Jerry's* advert is only targeting pre-existing supporters of legalization.

To us, it was clear that “Let’s Be Blunt About Cannabis Justice” was not intended for a conservative audience, due to the fact that the message appeals to liberal foundations of morality. The clearest one was the principle of fairness from Haidt’s five foundations of morality. According to his graph, *The Conservative Advantage*, conservatives do not typically endorse care of fairness. Here we see fairness, which is defined as to “reap benefits of two-way partnerships” (Haidt, Figure 6.2). In the *Ben & Jerry's* infographic, it is demonstrated that white individuals who distribute and/or possess marijuana do indeed reap the benefits of the systematic injustice within the industry, as black individuals are arrested more frequently for cannabis-related convictions, despite the fact that the narcotic is used at similar rates among races. This also demonstrates the relevant virtue justice.

Because this is still an important issue that needs to be addressed in the marijuana industry – and one that we wished to convey in our message – we simply decided to frame it in a way that Republicans could sympathize it. Rather than calling out the injustices of the industry, we said that legalization will mean less convictions, but ultimately *less taxpayer money spent in the court system*. This, we believe, is certainly a value our target audience can get behind. It was also important to avoid mentioning the racial disparities in the industry, because this plays on the conservative principle of authority, which believes in “[forging] beneficial relationships within hierarchies” (Haidt, Figure 6.2). Therefore, it is likely that many conservatives might not see an issue with the disparities of the industry. In the end, this was simply an impasse that we worked hard to overcome.

Works Cited

- Abbott, Graham. "63% Of Young Republicans Support Marijuana Law Reform." *Ganjapreneur*, Ganjapreneur.com, 3 Mar. 2020, www.ganjapreneur.com/63-young-republicans-support-marijuana-law-reform/.
- Khrisna, Mrinalini. "The Economic Benefits of Legalizing Weed." *Investopedia*, Dotdash, 12 Nov. 2020, www.investopedia.com/articles/insights/110916/economic-benefits-legalizing-weed.asp.
- Levy, Marc. "Pennsylvania Sees Another Big Monthly Drop in Jobless Rate." *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, PG Publishing Co., 17 Oct. 2020, www.post-gazette.com/business/career-workplace/2020/10/17/Pennsylvania-sees-another-big-monthly-drop-in-jobless-rate/stories/202010170028.
- Mahon, Ed. "By-the-Numbers: COVID-19's Big Hit to Pa.'s Economy." *WITF*, WITF Inc., 9 July 2020, www.witf.org/2020/07/09/by-the-numbers-covid-19s-big-hit-to-pa-s-economy/.

Class Readings Referenced

- Celeste Michelle Condit, "Angry Public Rhetorics"
- Jonathan Haidt, "The Conservative Advantage", "The Moral Foundations of Politics", & "The Foundations of Morality [Chart]"
- Rebecca Jones, "Finding the Good Argument"
- Sarah R. Stein, "The '1984' Macintosh Ad: Cinematic Icons and Constitutive Rhetoric in the Launch of a New Machine"