Looking upon its social acceptability, it is clear that the people of Colorado support legalization as seen with its history over the past decade where it not only instituted a legal system for pot's medical use, but also its recreational use. The past two ballot initiatives in 2012 and 2013 passed with considerable majorities. Moreover, this support has been seen not just in Colorado or Washington, but in the nation as a whole; for the first time a preference for marijuana legalization by Americans has gained considerable traction. Even those who oppose legalization agree with proponents that the federal government should not intervene in states that already have legalized pot. The fact that not just numerous celebrities, but even influential politicians have tried marijuana, shows the prevailing influence it has upon American culture. It is not the first time there has been such a wide disconnect between public opinion and the enforcement of a bad policy.

The efficiency of Colorado's measure makes admirable efforts to correct the clear failures of federal policy—the federal government has spent billions in enforcing prohibition and lost money that could have been gained by tax revenues. Likewise, Colorado has the ability to earn its own considerable tax revenues and use a system similar to its alcohol regulation to keep minors from purchasing pot on the black market. However, this does not make Colorado's policy the appropriate model to apply—at least not until it improves upon its own deficiencies. Most prominent among them are the lack of a cap on the amount of marijuana produced, which could lead to surplus pot being smuggled to other states and the cutting of corners on safety regulations, as well as the requirement of vertical integration, which may allow monopolists to artificially set the prices of industry and producers to have a potentially corruptive financial stake in the retail process.

In terms of political feasibility, it is unlikely the federal government will soon change exisiting marijuana policy, but it will probably allow Colorado a chance to implement its policy before deciding how to act next. If the state improves upon its regulations to meet federal standards, it is likely it will pass scrutiny by the

Department of Justice under its new "trust, but verify" approach; however, a comprehensive and collaborative approach must be made by all three branches of the federal government in order to change federal policy. Many federal officials are recognizing that the conversation regarding the "War on Drugs" and the traditional policies of the last 40 years are changing especially with respect to the social attitude. This has led to measures being introduced in the House to decriminalize marijuana. If the problems of tax reform can be hammered out, it is likely the state-legal marijuana industry will gain legitimacy, but it is Congress that must institute a change in policy by declassifying marijuana as Schedule I drug in order for the IRS to no longer be compelled to enforce it.

Although Colorado's policy attempts to remove the criminal element from marijuana and clearly matches current social trends, I would not recommend that Michigan adopt this policy or a modified version of it until it addresses four areas of concern. As Colorado's policy currently stands, producers and processers have the ability to have a significant financial stake with pot retailers. Furthermore, it does not set a cap on how much marijuana producers may grow (unlike its Washington counterpart). In addition, conflicts with the IRS are bound to happen with the way it is written now, a reminder that federal agencies outlive those of particular presidential administrations. Lastly, it is unlikely that the Colorado legislation will live on if a 'tough on drugs' candidate is elected President in 2016. Without taking into consideration the deficiencies in its efficiency or its long-term political feasibility from the federal context, Michigan should not adopt Colorado's policy as its own.