I negate and value morality.All moral obligations must derive from practical reason. Because we can always question, why I should follow other sources of morality, but if I ask why I should act for reasons I demand a reason to act for reasons, which concedes the authority of acting for reasons. And Practical reason requires universally valid moral norms, because given that everyone shares the same capacity to choose their ends, and when I take an action that aims at my end, it’s good to me by virtue of the fact that I have chosen it, considering this consistency would require that I recognize that others regard their ends as valuable as well. Further, arbitrariness is non-universizeable because it creates a situation where moral rules become random and can therefore be applied differently in the same circumstance, which would be contradictory and therefore can’t be universalized. Therefore the standard is rejecting arbitrariness. I contend that, a moral obligation for juries to nullify in the face of perceived injustice would lead to arbitrariness. First, jurors are presented information from lawyers, who have all of the relevant information but may choose to withhold it, this means that they are not educated enough to make a decision and will therefore be arbitrary. Second, Jurors do not know a defendants past actions and might arbitrarily acquit someone, who seems like a nice guy but has actually killed ten people. Third, Jurors aren’t told of evidence that wasn’t admissible, but that could still influence their decisions making them arbitrary. Fourth, juries are chosen from a pool of random people who happened to be selected on a given day, these people may have vastly different conceptions of justice making rulings inconsistent based on whomever happened to get called in. Fifth, we don’t explain to juries why certain punishments are deserved for certain crimes which makes nullification arbitrary because the decision is not based upon a complete understanding of the facts and is instead motivated by a persons past experience. Sixth, politicians have already passed laws outlining punishment for certain conduct and because convictions are ultimately subject to review by voters in general the law is built on a far better grounded conception of justice then that of only twelve people. Seventh, people’s opinions on cases may vary with their mood, and they may feel arbitrarily merciful on a given day and choose to acquit.