



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL **TEAM**

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service **officer**



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru

and a professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

SEEDS OF ACCEPTANCE: A DEMOGRAPHIC AND GEOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF USA AND UK ON PUBLIC OPINION ON MEDICAL MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION

AUTHORED BY: ADI RITHVIKA V
Christ (Deemed To Be University)

ABSTRACT:

The debate over medical marijuana legalization continues to shape public policy in both the United States and the United Kingdom. While both nations have witnessed shifts in public opinion, the extent and nature of acceptance vary significantly across demographic and geographic lines. This paper analyzes how factors such as age, education, political affiliation, and regional attitudes influence public opinion on medical marijuana legalization in the U.S. and U.K. By utilizing recent surveys, legislative histories, and case studies, this research highlights key similarities and differences in public perception and policy frameworks governing medical marijuana use.

INTRODUCTION:

The legalization of medical marijuana remains a contentious issue globally, with countries adopting divergent approaches based on legal, cultural, and political factors. While the United States has a decentralized approach where states regulate marijuana laws independently, the United Kingdom maintains a more centralized, cautious stance. This study explores the evolution of public opinion on medical marijuana in both nations by analyzing demographic trends and regional variations. The findings provide insights into how public perception influences policy-making in these two major Western democracies.

I. Identifying Lacunae in the Legal Framework:

The legal landscape surrounding medical marijuana varies significantly between the United States and the United Kingdom. While both nations have enacted laws to regulate cannabis for medical purposes, significant gaps remain in accessibility, regulatory oversight, and consistency across jurisdictions. This section identifies and examines these lacunae in the existing legal frameworks.

A. United States

1. State vs. Federal Discrepancies

The most glaring gap in the U.S. legal framework is the disconnect between state and federal laws. Although 38 states and the District of Columbia have legalized medical marijuana, it remains a Schedule I controlled substance under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA), 21 U.S.C. §801 (2018). This classification creates legal uncertainty for patients, healthcare providers, and businesses, as federal law technically prohibits all cannabis-related activities, including interstate commerce and banking transactions related to marijuana businesses.

2. Inconsistent State Regulations

Each state with legalized medical marijuana has its own regulatory system, resulting in inconsistent qualification criteria, possession limits, and permitted methods of consumption. For example, California permits a broad range of medical conditions for cannabis use (Cal. Health & Safety Code §11362.5), whereas Texas restricts it to only a few conditions under the Compassionate Use Program (Tex. Occ. Code §169.001). This patchwork approach results in disparities in patient access and enforcement.¹

3. Barriers to Research

Due to federal prohibition, obtaining cannabis for research purposes requires approval from multiple agencies, including the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), significantly hindering scientific advancements. The Medical Marijuana Research Act of 2020 attempted to address this but has not fully resolved the issue.

B. United Kingdom

1. Limited Scope of Legalization

The U.K. legalized medical cannabis in 2018 under the Misuse of Drugs Regulations 2018 (S.I. 2018/1055). However, access remains severely restricted. Only specialist doctors can prescribe cannabis-based products, and general practitioners are prohibited from doing so (Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, c. 38). Moreover, the National Health Service (NHS) rarely funds such prescriptions, making medical cannabis effectively inaccessible to most patients.

¹ Compassionate Use Act of 1996, Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11362.5 (West 2023).

2. Lack of Clear Guidelines for Practitioners

Many U.K. healthcare providers are reluctant to prescribe medical cannabis due to the absence of comprehensive clinical guidelines. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) has issued guidance recommending cannabis only for specific conditions like epilepsy and multiple sclerosis, excluding many potential beneficiaries (NICE Guideline NG144).²

3. Restrictive Licensing System

The licensing requirements for cannabis cultivation and distribution are stringent, making it difficult for domestic producers to enter the market. Most medical cannabis in the U.K. is imported, leading to high costs and supply chain inefficiencies.

Additionally, companies seeking licenses must navigate an opaque regulatory process under the Home Office's jurisdiction, further discouraging investment in the sector

II. Innovative Reassessment:

Both the U.S. and the U.K. require innovative policy reforms to enhance medical marijuana accessibility. In the U.S., potential solutions include federal rescheduling of cannabis, interstate commerce legalization, and streamlined research approvals. States could adopt uniform regulations to ensure consistency in patient access. In the U.K., expanding prescription authority beyond specialists, establishing clearer medical guidelines, and easing licensing restrictions for domestic production could improve availability. Both nations could benefit from evidence-based policy adjustments, public-private partnerships, and international models to create a more effective and equitable medical marijuana framework.

III. Constructive Suggestions:

To address the regulatory challenges surrounding medical marijuana, the U.S. should work toward federal-state harmonization by rescheduling cannabis under federal law to align with state programs and facilitate interstate commerce. Additionally, standardizing eligibility criteria, prescription guidelines, and quality control measures across states would create a more consistent framework. In the U.K., expanding prescription authority to general practitioners and broadening NICE guidelines would improve patient access. Simplifying the licensing process for domestic production could reduce reliance on costly imports and streamline supply

² Nat'l Inst. for Health & Care Excellence, Cannabis-Based Medicinal Products (NICE Guideline NG144, 2019), <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng144>.

chains. Both nations should prioritize research and development by establishing dedicated funding, removing bureaucratic barriers, and encouraging cross-border scientific collaboration. Finally, public awareness campaigns and regular policy updates based on medical advancements and global best practices would foster a more informed and adaptive approach to medical marijuana regulation.

IV. Trends in Public opinion:

Public opinion on medical marijuana legalization has shifted significantly over the past few decades, with growing acceptance driven by increased awareness, scientific research, and changing social attitudes. In the United States, national surveys indicate that over 85% of Americans support medical marijuana legalization, with bipartisan backing despite ongoing federal prohibition. Geographic trends reveal stronger support in progressive states like California and New York, while conservative states show slower acceptance. Age demographics also play a key role, with younger generations overwhelmingly in favor, while older populations are gradually becoming more accepting due to medical benefits.

In the United Kingdom, public support for medical cannabis is steadily increasing, though at a slower pace compared to the U.S. Surveys indicate that around 75% of the British public favors legal access for medical use, but skepticism remains due to restrictive NHS policies and limited public education. While younger individuals and advocacy groups push for broader legalization, older and more conservative demographics remain cautious. Overall, trends indicate a global shift toward medical marijuana acceptance, with legal frameworks struggling to keep pace with evolving public sentiment.³

V. The Burden: Ethical and Practical Concerns

The legalization of medical marijuana brings both ethical and practical challenges that policymakers must address. Ethically, concerns arise regarding patient access, equity, and medical legitimacy. In the United States, the disparity between state and federal laws creates legal uncertainty, disproportionately affecting marginalized communities that may lack the resources to navigate complex regulations. Similarly, in the United Kingdom, restrictive prescribing practices limit access to only a select few, raising ethical concerns about unequal

³ NHS England, Barriers to Accessing Cannabis-Based Products for Medicinal Use on NHS Prescription(2022), <https://www.england.nhs.uk>.

treatment and healthcare justice.

Practically, regulatory inconsistencies, supply chain limitations, and medical skepticism hinder effective implementation. In the U.S., banking restrictions force cannabis businesses to operate in cash, increasing security risks and financial instability. Meanwhile, in the U.K., reliance on imported cannabis raises costs and limits availability. Additionally, many medical professionals remain hesitant to prescribe cannabis due to insufficient research and fear of professional liability. Addressing these concerns requires a balanced approach that ensures ethical medical access while maintaining regulatory integrity and public safety.

IV. Demographic Analysis of Public Opinion on Legalizing Medical Marijuana

Public opinion on medical marijuana legalization varies across demographic groups based on factors such as age, gender, education level, political affiliation, and socioeconomic status. Both the United States and the United Kingdom exhibit distinct trends in how different populations perceive medical cannabis policies.

1. Age-Based Trends

Younger generations tend to be more supportive of medical marijuana legalization than older populations. In the U.S., surveys indicate that over 80% of adults under 35 support legalization, whereas support among those aged 65 and older is comparatively lower, at around 60%. In the U.K., younger individuals also show greater acceptance, reflecting a broader generational shift toward liberal drug policies. However, older individuals remain skeptical, often due to stigma and lack of awareness of medical benefits.

2. Gender Differences

Men generally express stronger support for medical marijuana legalization than women. In the U.S., surveys reveal that approximately 70% of men favor legal medical cannabis, compared to around 60% of women. In the U.K., similar trends exist, though gender disparities are less pronounced. Women's concerns often center around potential health risks, addiction, and regulatory oversight, contributing to their relatively cautious stance.

3. Political Affiliation

Political ideology significantly influences attitudes toward medical marijuana. In the

U.S., Democrats and Independents overwhelmingly support legalization, with approval rates exceeding 75%, while Republican support remains lower, typically around 55-60%. However, bipartisan acceptance is growing, especially for medical use. In the U.K., support is more widespread across political affiliations, though traditionally conservative groups exhibit more reluctance toward policy changes.⁴

4. Education and Socioeconomic Status

Higher levels of education correlate with greater support for medical marijuana legalization. University graduates in both the U.S. and U.K. tend to favor evidence-based policy changes, recognizing the medical benefits of cannabis. Conversely, lower-income and less-educated populations may show mixed opinions, influenced by social stigma and misinformation. However, in lower-income communities where access to alternative healthcare is limited, support for medical marijuana as a cost-effective treatment is increasing.

5. Racial and Ethnic Perspectives

In the U.S., racial disparities in drug enforcement shape public opinion on medical marijuana. African American and Latino communities often express cautious support due to historical criminalization and disproportionate arrests for cannabis-related offenses. However, these communities also advocate for policy reforms that promote equity and social justice. In the U.K., ethnic minority perspectives vary, with religious and cultural influences playing a role in shaping attitudes toward cannabis use.

VI. Geographic Analysis of Public Opinion on Legalizing Medical Marijuana

Public opinion on medical marijuana legalization varies significantly across geographic regions in both the United States and the United Kingdom. Factors such as urbanization, regional political leanings, and historical drug policies influence acceptance levels.

1. United States: Regional Variations

The U.S. exhibits stark geographic differences in attitudes toward medical marijuana, largely influenced by state laws and political culture:

West Coast & Northeast: States like California, Oregon, Washington, and

⁴ Pew Rsch. Ctr., Americans Overwhelmingly Say Marijuana Should Be Legal for Medical or Recreational Use (Nov. 22, 2022), <https://www.pewresearch.org>.

Massachusetts show the highest levels of support. These regions legalized medical marijuana early, fostering public acceptance. Urban centers such as Los Angeles, New York City, and Seattle have strong pro-legalization movements.

Midwest & South: While states like Illinois and Michigan have embraced medical marijuana, more conservative states such as Alabama, South Carolina, and Tennessee show lower approval rates due to cultural and political opposition. However, support is gradually increasing.

Rural vs. Urban Divide: Urban areas show significantly higher approval rates than rural regions, where skepticism about cannabis remains more pronounced.

2. United Kingdom: Regional Attitudes

Support for medical marijuana in the U.K. also varies by location, influenced by accessibility, government policies, and public perception:

England: London and other metropolitan areas exhibit greater support due to progressive attitudes and exposure to international drug policy trends. However, smaller towns tend to be more conservative.

Scotland & Wales: Public support is relatively strong, with calls for more autonomous drug policies. Scotland, in particular, has shown interest in exploring cannabis-based medical treatments.

Northern Ireland: As the most conservative region, Northern Ireland has lower support for legalization, partly due to stronger social and religious influences.

Conclusion:

The legalization of medical marijuana has been a subject of extensive debate, shaped by legal, ethical, demographic, and geographic factors. A comparative analysis of the United States and the United Kingdom reveals both progress and persistent challenges in integrating cannabis into healthcare systems. While medical marijuana is legal in various forms in both nations, barriers related to accessibility, regulatory inconsistencies, and public perception continue to affect its widespread acceptance.

Legal and Regulatory Challenges

The legal frameworks governing medical marijuana in the U.S. and U.K. demonstrate contrasting yet equally complex structures. The United States grapples with a significant state-federal conflict, where marijuana remains illegal at the federal level under the Controlled

Substances Act, despite its legalization in 38 states for medical use. This discrepancy creates complications for patients, healthcare providers, and businesses, especially in banking and interstate commerce. Furthermore, each state has different qualifying conditions, prescription methods, and distribution channels, leading to a fragmented regulatory landscape.

In contrast, the United Kingdom maintains a highly restrictive approach to medical marijuana. Despite its legalization in 2018, the prescription process remains heavily controlled, with only specialist doctors allowed to prescribe cannabis-based medicines under limited conditions. The National Health Service (NHS) rarely provides funding, pushing patients towards expensive private clinics or illegal markets. The U.K.'s restrictive licensing process further limits domestic cultivation, increasing dependency on imports and raising costs for patients.

Demographic and Geographic Influences

Public opinion on medical marijuana is shaped by various demographic factors, including age, education level, and political affiliation. In the United States, younger generations, particularly Millennials and Generation Z, show overwhelming support for medical cannabis, while older populations remain divided. Political affiliation also plays a key role, with liberal and independent voters generally favoring legalization, whereas conservative voters are more skeptical. Racial and socio-economic factors further impact access and support, with historically marginalized communities often facing disproportionate legal enforcement despite growing advocacy for cannabis reform.

Geographically, the U.S. exhibits strong regional variations. The West Coast and Northeast, which pioneered medical marijuana legalization, continue to show the highest support, while the South and Midwest remain relatively conservative but are gradually shifting. Urban centers tend to be more accepting than rural areas, where cultural and political resistance persists.

Similarly, in the United Kingdom, public opinion varies by region. London and major cities show strong support for medical cannabis, influenced by international trends and progressive policy discussions. Scotland and Wales demonstrate increasing interest in cannabis-based treatments, while Northern Ireland remains the most conservative due to social and religious influences. The lack of public awareness campaigns and clear guidelines for healthcare providers further contributes to skepticism in rural areas.

Ethical and Practical Considerations

The ethical debate surrounding medical marijuana primarily revolves around patient rights, healthcare equity, and scientific legitimacy. Proponents argue that denying access to cannabis-based treatments violates a patient's right to healthcare, especially when traditional pharmaceuticals fail. The increasing body of scientific research supporting cannabis for conditions such as chronic pain, epilepsy, and multiple sclerosis strengthens this argument.

However, opponents highlight concerns regarding safety, regulation, and long-term effects. The absence of standardized dosing and comprehensive clinical trials in many cases raises questions about medical marijuana's efficacy and potential risks. Additionally, regulatory agencies struggle to balance patient needs with concerns about abuse and commercialization.

Future Prospects and Policy Recommendations

To address these issues, both the U.S. and U.K. must consider legal reforms and policy adjustments that enhance accessibility, ensure regulatory clarity, and support scientific research. In the United States, federal legalization or reclassification of marijuana under the Controlled Substances Act would resolve many of the legal conflicts between state and federal law. Additionally, streamlining research approvals and promoting medical cannabis education among healthcare providers would help bridge the knowledge gap.

In the United Kingdom, expanding the list of qualifying conditions, simplifying prescription procedures, and increasing NHS funding for medical marijuana treatments would make cannabis-based medicines more accessible. Developing a transparent and efficient licensing system for domestic cultivation would also help reduce costs and ensure consistent supply.

Final Thoughts

The path to fully integrating medical marijuana into mainstream healthcare requires a balanced approach that considers legal, scientific, ethical, and public perspectives. While significant progress has been made in both the U.S. and U.K., lingering barriers continue to limit access and acceptance. A data-driven, patient-centric approach, combined with legal harmonization and public education, is crucial for ensuring that medical marijuana can serve its intended purpose—providing relief to patients in need.

As public opinion evolves and more research emerges, the future of medical marijuana

legalization will likely see further advancements. However, achieving a fair and effective regulatory system will depend on policymakers' ability to address legal inconsistencies, facilitate medical research, and promote evidence-based education. By doing so, both nations can move towards a healthcare framework that prioritizes patient well-being while ensuring responsible use and regulation of medical cannabis.

