State officials can respond effectively to burdensome or constraining federal directives using tactics that go beyond *lobbying* and *lawsuits* and yet fall short of *nullification*.

**Decriminalization.** When state and federal governments both possess regulatory authority, states can enact measures decriminalizing certain practices, hoping federal executive officials will not enforce federal statutes in states with contrary policies.

**Nonparticipation.** States can decline to participate in federal programs and accept the designated penalties, hoping Congress will revise statutes or executive officials will issue rules or waivers that moderate the programs.

**Judicial Reconsideration.** When federal judicial doctrine is uncertain or in flux, states can enact measures inconsistent with Supreme Court precedents, hoping the Court will reconsider and relax judicially imposed constraints on state policy discretion.

**Judicial Veto.** When federal judicial doctrine is uncertain or in flux, states can enact measures inconsistent with federal statutes, hoping the Supreme Court will invalidate or limit the application of federal statutes.