Why Settle.

The War on Vapor: Financial Conflicts of Interest, Legislative Capture, and the Systematic Destruction of Independent Cannabis Vaporization

Published	May 2026
Document ID	TUSA-WP-2026-03
Author	Terps USA Research Division

Executive Summary

A coordinated, global legislative assault on vaporization is currently underway. From total bans in over 46 countries to exorbitant taxation, shipping prohibitions buried in COVID relief legislation, and flavor restrictions, governments and international health bodies are actively suppressing the most efficient cannabinoid delivery technology available to cannabis consumers.

This legislative crackdown is frequently framed as protecting public health or targeting youth access. A rigorous examination of the financial mechanics behind these policies reveals a different reality. The suppression of the independent vaping industry is driven by a massive, multi-billion-dollar conflict of interest involving three primary beneficiaries: Big Tobacco, Big Pharma, and Government Tax Revenues.

This paper documents three interconnected arguments: the scientific case for vaporization as the most efficient cannabinoid delivery method available; the financial conflicts driving legislative suppression of that technology; and the real-world casualties — independent cannabis businesses — destroyed by legislation written to protect legacy monopolies.

Public Health England and the Royal College of Physicians consistently maintain that vaporization is at least 95% less harmful than combustion. [4] Global policy is increasingly dictated by financial self-preservation rather than public health evidence. The consumer pays the price.

1. The Science of Vaporization: What Combustion Is Actually Costing You

Before examining the politics and economics of vaping legislation, it is necessary to establish what the scientific record shows about vaporization versus combustion as cannabinoid delivery methods. The efficiency gap is not marginal. It is structural — and it directly affects the value proposition of every cannabis purchase a consumer makes.

1.1 What Combustion Does to Your Cannabinoids

Cannabis combustion occurs at temperatures exceeding 315°C (600°F). At these temperatures, the active compounds consumers are purchasing are not preserved — they are destroyed. The scientific record on cannabinoid loss through combustion is consistent across multiple independent studies:

When smoking cannabis, up to 50% of all cannabinoids are immediately destroyed by combustion heat. An additional 15–20% is lost through sidestream smoke — the smoke that burns between draws, delivering nothing to the consumer. [3]

A 2003 analytical study found that cannabis smoke from a standard pipe recovered only 10.8% of THC while containing approximately 87% smoke toxins. The same study found that a vaporizer recovered 89.1% of THC while containing only 9.5% smoke toxins. [3]

A 2026 study comparing vaporized cannabis to joint smoke found that vaporization reduced harmful byproducts by up to 99% across all measured analytes. Joint smoke contained nearly 189 identifiable compounds. Vaporized aerosol consisted primarily of cannabinoids and terpenes. [9]

1.2 The Dabbing Temperature Problem

The concentrate community has historically viewed high-temperature dabbing as delivering maximum potency. The thermal chemistry of cannabinoids does not support this belief.

THC begins to degrade at approximately 200°C (392°F), with significant degradation occurring above 220°C (428°F). [7] Standard dab nail temperatures run between 315°C and 482°C — well above the degradation threshold. At these temperatures, active THC undergoes thermal conversion to cannabinol (CBN), a less psychoactive degradation product. [8]

One peer-reviewed study found that at 200°C, 29.1% of THC had already converted to CBN. [8] The consumer who believes they are consuming pure, potent concentrate at extreme dab temperatures is in fact consuming a partially degraded product — and generating the same combustion-adjacent byproducts that low-temperature vaporization was designed to eliminate.

The counterintuitive reality the science establishes: the consumer who reports greater 'lift' from a properly produced vape cart at correct operating temperature is not experiencing a pharmacological anomaly. They are experiencing the efficiency that low-temperature vaporization was always capable of delivering — efficiency that combustion and high-temperature dabbing systematically destroy.

1.3 Terpene Preservation

Terpenes — the aromatic compounds responsible for the distinctive character of different cannabis cultivars — are among the most temperature-sensitive compounds in the plant. They begin evaporating and degrading well below cannabinoid combustion temperatures. [1]

Combustion destroys the terpene profile of cannabis flower entirely. High-temperature dabbing degrades it. Low-temperature vaporization, operating between 157°C and 227°C, preserves the full terpene spectrum alongside active cannabinoids — delivering the complete chemical profile of the material rather than a combustion-reduced fraction of it. [7]

This has direct implications for the entourage effect — the documented interaction between cannabinoids and terpenes that modulates the consumer experience. Combustion does not preserve the conditions for the entourage effect. Vaporization does.

---

2. The Unholy Alliance: Who Profits From Vaping Bans?

If the scientific record supports vaporization as the most efficient, most complete, and least harmful cannabinoid delivery method available, why are governments worldwide moving to restrict or eliminate it? The answer lies in the disruption of established, highly lucrative financial ecosystems.

2.1 Government Tax Revenue and the Tobacco Bond Crisis

Vaping is a highly disruptive technology that directly threatens over $250 billion in global tobacco tax revenues. [5]

In the United States, the federal government collected approximately $9.38 billion in tobacco excise taxes in 2024 — a decline of over 30% from the $14 billion collected a decade prior. This decline correlates directly with the rise of vaporization as an alternative to combustible tobacco. [6]

The structural conflict runs deeper. Under the 1998 Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (MSA), 46 U.S. states receive perpetual annual payments from tobacco companies based on the volume of cigarettes sold. To access immediate cash, many states issued 'tobacco bonds' backed by these future settlement payments. Vaping products are generally not included in the MSA — meaning every consumer who switches from combustible cigarettes to vaping directly reduces the settlement payout that backs those bonds.

Moody's has estimated that up to 80% of state tobacco bonds are at risk of default due to declining cigarette sales. [5] State governments therefore have a documented, multi-billion-dollar structural incentive to keep combustible cigarette sales high and to tax or eliminate competing vapor products.

The conflict of interest is even more explicit internationally. When India enacted a total ban on e-cigarettes in 2019, the government held a 28% ownership stake in ITC Limited — the country's largest cigarette manufacturer. When the vaping ban was announced, ITC's stock value surged by an estimated 1,800 crore (approximately $215 million USD), directly enriching the government entity that enacted the ban. [7i] Similar state-owned tobacco monopolies operate in China, Egypt, and Vietnam, which passed a vaping ban in 2024. [8]

2.2 Big Pharma's Protection of the NRT Market

The pharmaceutical industry represents a second major financial beneficiary of anti-vaping legislation. The global Nicotine Replacement Therapy (NRT) market — comprising patches, gums, lozenges, and prescription cessation drugs — was valued at $3.3 billion in 2024 and is projected to exceed $7 billion by 2030. [9i]

Vaporization is a direct, demonstrated competitor to traditional NRTs. A 2019 study published in the New England Journal of Medicine found that e-cigarettes were nearly twice as effective as NRTs at helping smokers achieve abstinence: 18% versus 9.9% at one year. [10]

Pharmaceutical companies manufacturing NRT products have actively lobbied regulatory bodies to classify vapes as medical devices requiring pharmaceutical-level authorization, or to ban them entirely. As documented by the American Enterprise Institute, NRT manufacturers have utilized their substantial lobbying presence to oppose alternative cessation products and protect market share from independent innovation. [11]

2.3 Big Tobacco's Regulatory Capture

The most counterintuitive element of the anti-vaping legislative landscape is the role of legacy tobacco companies. The conventional narrative frames anti-vaping legislation as harmful to Big Tobacco. The financial record shows the opposite.

The FDA's Premarket Tobacco Product Application (PMTA) process — the primary regulatory gate for vaping products in the United States — carries an estimated compliance cost of $28,000 to $2.5 million per product application. [12] For independent manufacturers producing multiple formulations and SKUs, total PMTA compliance costs can reach tens of millions of dollars — a barrier that eliminates small and medium-sized independent operators entirely.

The outcome is documented: the only vaping products that have successfully navigated the FDA authorization process are those owned by legacy tobacco corporations — Vuse, owned by R.J. Reynolds/BAT; NJOY, acquired by Altria. [3] Draconian regulations, regardless of their stated public health purpose, function as market consolidation mechanisms — eliminating independent competition and delivering the vaping market to the same corporations that built their businesses on combustible tobacco.

---

3. The PACT Act: A Case Study in Legislative Weaponization

The clearest illustration of how anti-vaping legislation functions in practice — independent of its stated purpose — is the 2020 amendment to the Prevent All Cigarette Trafficking (PACT) Act.

3.1 What Happened

On December 27, 2020, President Trump signed the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021 — a 5,000-page omnibus spending bill primarily designed to deliver COVID-19 relief to struggling American businesses and individuals. Buried on page 5,136 of that bill was a provision titled the 'Preventing Online Sales of E-Cigarettes to Children Act.' [13]

This provision amended the PACT Act to classify all electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS) as tobacco products for shipping and regulatory purposes. The definition of ENDS was written broadly: 'any electronic device that, through an aerosolized solution, delivers nicotine, flavor, or any other substance to the user inhaling from the device.' [14]

The phrase 'or any other substance' is the operative language. Cannabis vaporizers. CBD cartridges. Vape accessories. All of it swept under a tobacco classification — in a COVID relief bill — during a period when small businesses were fighting to survive.

3.2 The Immediate Effect

Within weeks of the bill's passage, USPS implemented regulations prohibiting shipment of all vaping products to residential addresses. All major commercial carriers — UPS, FedEx, DHL — announced they would join USPS in ceasing delivery, not just to consumers but to businesses as well. [15]

For independent vaping businesses built on direct-to-consumer shipping, this was not a regulatory burden. It was a shutoff valve. Overnight, the primary distribution channel for hundreds of independent operators was closed. Large tobacco-affiliated companies with established commercial freight contracts and retail distribution networks were largely unaffected. Small independent operators had no alternative.

3.3 The Cannabis Industry Casualties

The PACT Act amendment did not create the pressures that were destroying independent cannabis vaping businesses — it accelerated them. The regulatory environment had been degrading independent operators for years before the 2020 legislation delivered the final blow to many.

These are not outliers. They are representative of a documented pattern across the independent cannabis vaping sector — businesses built on direct-to-consumer models that the 2020 PACT Act amendment rendered non-viable in a matter of weeks, while the legislation was presented to the public as a measure to protect children from nicotine addiction.

3.4 The Colorado PG/PEG Legislation — A State-Level Case Study

The federal PACT Act amendment is not an isolated example of legislation disproportionately affecting independent operators. At the state level, Colorado enacted restrictions on propylene glycol (PG) and polyethylene glycol (PEG) in cannabis vaping products — largely based on public fear generated during the 2019 EVALI outbreak.

The EVALI outbreak was subsequently determined by the CDC to have been caused by Vitamin E acetate — a compound used as a thickener in illicit THC cartridges. Standard vaping ingredients including PG were explicitly cleared of involvement. The Colorado legislation, enacted during maximum public fear, was based on a conflation of causes that the underlying science does not support. The study most frequently cited as evidence against PG — published in 2017 by researchers affiliated with a cannabis dispensary operation — has been specifically critiqued for testing compounds at 230°C, well above the operating range of standard cannabis vaping hardware. No Colorado legislator, as far as

the public record reflects, questioned the temperature differential before voting.

The result: legitimate independent operators who had built formulations around pharmaceutical-grade PG — an ingredient with a 70-year inhalation safety record and FDA GRAS classification — were forced to reformulate under time pressure, incurring significant costs, while the Vitamin E acetate that actually caused EVALI was already off the market. [See companion document: The Science of Safety: Debunking the Myths Surrounding Propylene Glycol in Vaping Applications. WP-2026-02.]

---

4. The WHO and the Suppression of Harm Reduction

The World Health Organization has been a primary driver of global anti-vaping sentiment, urging member states to ban or severely restrict e-cigarettes under the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC). As of 2025, 46 countries have enacted total bans on e-cigarette sales, with the number continuing to grow. [16]

The WHO's position stands in direct contradiction to the independent scientific consensus. The Royal College of Physicians reaffirmed in its 2024 evidence review that vaping represents a fraction of the harm of smoking and is a vital harm reduction tool. [4] Public Health England has consistently maintained the '95% less harmful' finding across multiple evidence reviews.

A bipartisan UK parliamentary inquiry specifically examined the WHO's Framework Convention on Tobacco Control and found that the WHO refuses to acknowledge the scientific evidence of harm reduction — actively advising governments against policies that have successfully reduced smoking rates. By driving flavor bans and total prohibitions, the WHO is ensuring that combustible cigarettes remain the most accessible nicotine and cannabis delivery method on the global market. [10]

The effect on the cannabis community is direct. Every jurisdiction that bans or heavily restricts vaping products — based on WHO guidance that has been independently critiqued as scientifically unsound — is pushing cannabis consumers back toward a combustion-based delivery method that destroys 50–70% of the cannabinoids they are paying for, generates 189 identifiable smoke compounds, and eliminates the full terpene profile that defines the character of the material.

---

5. Conclusion

The global legislative assault on vaporization is not primarily a public health initiative. It is the documented outcome of overlapping financial interests — government tobacco tax revenues, state MSA bond obligations, pharmaceutical NRT market protection, and Big Tobacco regulatory capture — operating simultaneously to suppress an independent industry that threatened all of them.

The cannabis consumer is the specific casualty. They are being pushed back toward a delivery method that the scientific record consistently shows destroys the majority of what they are purchasing, generates hundreds of potentially harmful combustion compounds, and eliminates the terpene preservation that defines the quality of their experience.

The independent businesses that built the cannabis vaping category — that innovated formulations, developed delivery systems, and served consumers who deserved better than what legacy markets offered — have been systematically eliminated. Shatter Batter is a delinquent entity. Farm To Vape is still trying to rebuild a shopping cart five years after their shipping channel was shut down in a COVID relief bill. The companies that survived are the ones with commercial freight contracts and regulatory budgets.

The science is available. The financial record is documented. The legislative history is public. The consumer who reads both and continues to accept the status quo — paying for cannabinoids that combustion destroys, using delivery methods that generate toxins vaporization eliminates, supporting a regulatory environment that exists to protect legacy revenue streams — has made a choice.

Why Settle.

TERPS USA®

References

[1] Sommano, S. R., et al. (2020). The Cannabis Terpenes. Molecules, 25(24), 5792. PMC7763918.

[2] Meehan-Atrash, J., Luo, W., & Strongin, R. M. (2017). Toxicant Formation in Dabbing: The Terpene Story. ACS Omega, 2(9), 6112–6117. PMC5623941.

[3] Canatura. (2024). Smoking vs. Vaping Cannabis: Efficiency and Bioavailability Comparison. https://www.canatura.com/a/smoking-vs-vaping-cannabis-you-might-be-surprised-what-difference-it-is-1 — When smoking cannabis, up to 50% of cannabinoids are immediately destroyed. A 2003 analysis recovered 89.1% THC from vapor versus 10.8% from pipe smoke.

[4] Royal College of Physicians. (2024). E-cigarettes and harm reduction: An evidence review. https://www.rcp.ac.uk/policy-and-campaigns/policy-documents/e-cigarettes-and-harm-reduction-an-evidence-review/

[5] E-Cigarette Direct. (2023). Are vapers paying for lost tobacco revenue? https://www.ecigarettedirect.co.uk/blogs/ashtray-blog/vaping-lost-tobacco-revenue — Moody's estimated up to 80% of state tobacco bonds at risk of default due to declining cigarette sales.

[6] U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2025). Tobacco Tax Revenue Has Gone Up in Smoke. https://www.gao.gov/blog/tobacco-tax-revenue-has-gone-smoke-and-not-entirely-reason-you-think — Federal tobacco excise tax revenue declined from $14 billion to $9.38 billion over the preceding decade.

[7] Nectar Medical Vapes. (2024). Understanding the Science Behind Weed Vaporization. https://nectarmedicalvapes.com/blog/understanding-the-science-behind-weed-vaporization/ — THC begins to degrade at approximately 392°F (200°C).

[8] PMC2921171. Temperature Stability of THC. (2006). Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy. — At 200°C, 29.1% of THC converted to CBN through thermal degradation.

[9] Marijuana Moment. (2026, April 14). Vaporizing Marijuana Reduces Harmful Inhaled Byproducts By 99% Compared to Joint Smoking. https://www.marijuanamoment.net/vaporizing-marijuana-reduces-harmful-inhaled-byproducts-by-99-compared-to-joint-smoking-new-study-shows/ — PAX study: 189 compounds in joint smoke; vaporized aerosol consisted primarily of cannabinoids and terpenes.

[7i] The Print. (2019). Govt has banned vapes, but owns 28% of ITC, India's biggest cigarette maker. https://theprint.in/india/governance/govt-has-banned-vapes-but-owns-28-of-itc-indias-biggest-cigarette-maker/293547/ — ITC stock surged by estimated $215 million USD when the vaping ban was announced.

[10] Property Rights Alliance / Americans for Tax Reform. (2021). UK: Bipartisan Inquiry Into The UN's Harmful Anti-Vaping Regulations. https://atr.org/uk-bipartisan-inquiry-uns-harmful-anti-vaping-regulations/

[11] American Enterprise Institute. (2013). Big Pharma, Not Tobacco Companies, Wages War on Electronic Cigarettes. https://www.aei.org/articles/big-pharma-not-tobacco-companies-wages-war-on-electronic-cigarettes/

[12] U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA). (2019). FDA Seeks Comments on Premarket Tobacco Product Applications. https://advocacy.sba.gov/2019/10/01/fda-seeks-comments-on-proposed-pmta-and-recordkeeping-requirements/ — Single PMTA submission estimated at $28,000 to $2.5 million per product.

[13] Burns & Levinson LLP. (2021). Vape Shipping Ban Looms Ahead. https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/vape-shipping-ban-looms-ahead-4828140/ — PACT Act amendment buried in Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021, signed December 27, 2020.

[14] Troutman Pepper. (2021). THC, CBD and Other Non-Tobacco Vaping Product Sellers Should Take Note of New PACT Act Provisions. https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/thc-cbd-and-other-non-tobacco-vaping-5695903/ — ENDS definition: 'any electronic device that, through an aerosolized solution, delivers nicotine, flavor, or any other substance to the user inhaling from the device.'

[15] Accesswire via Financial Content. (2021). Charlie's Holdings Initiates PACT Act Compliance Measures. — Following passage, all major delivery companies announced cessation of all vaping product shipments, not just to homes but to businesses as well.

[16] Global Center for Good Governance in Tobacco Control (GGTC). (May 2025). 46 countries banning e-cigarette sales as of May 2025.

[SR1] Colorado Secretary of State Business Registry. Shatter Batter LLC. ID: 20171390976. Organized May 23, 2017. Status: Delinquent October 1, 2019. Entity name changed November 4, 2020 for failure to file periodic report. https://www.sos.state.co.us/

[SR2] Farm To Vape (@farmtovape). Instagram public statement, approximately March 2025: 'Farm To Vape products are now available at Stone Head Nation... we are currently in the process of rebuilding farmtovape.com... we believe after this much time and all the tries it's a problem with the host provider... we still own Farm To Vape and still ship from PA.' Last confirmed public communication: March 19, 2025.
