

CHAPTER SIX

**ALCOHOL POLICIES IN ENGLAND, THE UNITED STATES,
SWEDEN AND FINLAND**

Richard Harvey Brown

Alcohol is a staple commodity with a long history of use in all four cases studied here. Great Britain, the United States, Sweden, and Finland have, at various times and for various reasons, defined alcohol use as a social problem and come up with a variety of regulatory efforts at solving that problem. In Great Britain, alcohol was initially problematic as much as it represented a foreign influence, that of French wines and brandies. But when that problem was solved by restrictions on those products and encouragement of English gin production, the country found itself with an epidemic of crime and drunkenness in its urban centers. The United States transitioned from a society highly tolerant of alcohol abuse to one, buoyed by fears of an emerging class of urban immigrants, that strictly prohibited the use and sale of all types of spirituous drink. However, alcohol production, distribution and consumption simply moved underground during this time period and contributed to massive organized crime rings. Sweden and Finland's alcohol policies reflected similar concerns with public welfare and the social order, but were less invested in class conflicts and less seduced by the lure of monopoly profits. Though Finland responded in some similar ways as the U.S. and Britain, thanks in part to a similar temperance movement and the influence of religious authorities, it still arrived at slightly more rational means of control, as did Sweden. This chapter further explores these cases and the ways in which various cultural and economic relations have steered the use and regulation of alcohol.

The Gin Epidemic in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century England

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries England established a parliamentary system of government and expanded its capitalist economy. Overseas discovery, colonization, and expanding international trade thrived, while the process of industrialization was effecting

changes at home. In this broad context, a number of factors shaped alcohol policies in England: a mercantilist policy of import substitution, a desire by the state to enhance its revenues, lobbying by producers and public protests by consumers, moral entrepreneurship by the middle classes, and price sensitivity of demand for licit or illicit drugs and for one form of alcohol or another. Probably no one at the time clearly understood how these various forces interacted, just as we, often willfully, remain largely ignorant of the dynamics of our own drug use and drug policies today.

Drinking increased in England after the collapse of the Puritan Commonwealth in 1660 and the restoration of the Stuarts with King Charles II. But as Stuart economic policy favored the importation of French brandy and wine, the use of gin was limited. In 1688, however, the Glorious Revolution dethroned the Stuart King James II, and Protestants William of Orange and Mary (James' daughter) begin their reign (1689-1702). William, a frequent drinker himself, understood the revenue value of gin in the Netherlands and soon encouraged its distillation and sale in England. During the greater part of the seventeenth century the new art of the distillation of spirits had been a monopoly in the hands of the Distillers' Company and other royal patentees, and trade remained small. Soon after his ascension, however, William prohibited the importation of French wine and spirits and then broke the London Distillers Monopoly. As part of the commercial warfare against the French, the import of foreign brandy was heavily taxed or entirely prohibited. In 1690, the "Act for the Encouraging of the Distillation of Brandy and Spirits from Corn" granted permission to anyone to distill and retail spirits made from English corn on payment of a duty. Between 1690 and 1701 a series of statutes provided that English distillers, if they used malted corn, should pay only a low preferential duty on their product,

whereas French and other foreign brandies should as far as possible be excluded. Duties were raised on beer and Commons introduced a tax on malt, cider and sherry (French 1884:246, Coffey 1966:673-4, Inglis 1975:62, Webb and Webb 1903:20-22).

With the protection afforded by the state's tax and mercantile policies, the domestic distillery business flourished. Soon gin was being given by masters to their workers instead of wages. In addition to distilled spirits, in 1688 over twelve and a half million barrels of ale and beer were produced, which averages out to two and a half barrels for every man, woman, and child in England (Patrick 1952:30-31). Due to the 1690 Act, the annual production of distilled liquors, mostly gin, rose to nearly a million gallons (Roueché 1966:27). In 1701, people were permitted to retail spirits without even the licenses required of ale-house keepers (Coffey 1966:674).

In the first quarter of the eighteenth century, Daniel Defoe, the novelist and ideologue for landed interests, urged that the distillery industry should be preserved and treated with care (Inglis 1975:63). The reign of Queen Anne (1702-1714) gave home-distillation a boost by raising import duties and lowering home excise. Distillers continued to be encouraged by legislatures in the reign of King George I (1714-1727), and production rose to two million gallons, double that of 1694. The Mutiny Act gave distillers and retailers added inducements (Coffey 1966:674). Distilled spirits became cheaper than beer, encouraging unrestrained indulgence. An inn advertisement of this period read "Drunk for a penny, dead drunk for two pence, clean straw for nothing" (quoted in Blum 1969:33). In 1726, a government committee reported that gin was sold in one house in ten in some London parishes, with gin consumption at 3,601,00 gallons (Coffey 1966:672). In 1720 and in 1736, the government attempted to regulate

the retailing of gin, but the measures were unpopular and largely ignored. Again in 1743 the government, needing more revenues, repealed the regulations (Coffey 1966:690-1). The consumption of gin in England rose from 527,000 gallons in 1685 to over 11,000,000 gallons in 1750, much of which was consumed by the urban poor, particularly of London (Coffey 1966:690-1).

From 1730 to 1749, a mounting crime wave among London's poor terrified the city. As with other drugs elsewhere, poverty and criminality were blamed on gin. In 1733, Parliament decided "to consider further methods for encouraging the making and exporting of home-made spirits". It repealed the 1729 Act that discouraged distilling and passed a new Act that imposed penalties on retail sales except when sold in dwelling places (George 1925:33). A "perfect pandemonium" of drunkenness resulted. Gin was given as wages, sold on every market stall, vended by peddlers. It appears that "one half of the town" was set up "to furnish poison to the other half" (Webb and Webb 1903:22). Intemperance spread as every householder seemed to be converted into a publican; production of distilled liquor rose to 11 million gallons, compared to 2 million in 1714 (Roueché 1966:28).

Throughout this period alcohol consumption also was more and more defined as a moral and social problem. At the start of the seventeenth century Parliament passed the "Act to Repress the Odious and Loathsome Sin of Drunkenness." Perhaps the first attempt to legislate moderation, it remained in effect until 1872, and reflected Parliament's view that drinking beyond a certain point becomes illegal (Baird 1944-45:143-6). What began as a mercantilist revenue policy was now officially recognized to have resulted in an odious social problem. Many terms of present day discourse on drugs use and poverty also were first used at this time. Poverty

increased rapidly during this period, and those sympathetic to the poor saw gin drinking as their escape from the horrible dreariness, hardship, and insecurity of their daily lives. By contrast, conservatives saw the gin epidemic as a reflection of the weak morals of poor people and a cause of rather than an effect of their poverty. By the early 18th century, both poverty and criminality were blamed on the enormous amounts of gin drunk by the poor (Coffey 1966:690-1).

By the mid-18th century an alcohol crisis appeared as gin drinking became the first distilled liquor to be consumed in England on a substantial scale. An "epidemic" of use had become one of the major social issues of the day. This seems to have been caused by the state's mercantilist policy of import substitution and use of gin to enhance general revenues, combined with the abysmal and uprooted condition of London's poor. As Dorothy George described it in her London Life in the Eighteenth Century, gin drinking was "essentially a disease of poverty", the grinding poverty portrayed by Hogarth, Fielding, Morris and many other artists and writers. The picture that emerges is of a squalor and degradation far worse even than in the London of the Great Plague; and it was from this that the London poor appeared to seek escape. Spirits were relentlessly pushed by the distillers whose trade, Hervey complained, became the most profitable of any in the kingdom "except that of being broker to a Prime Minister". And the distillers themselves had been given every encouragement by the Government, hungry for more revenue, and by the landowner M.P.s, hoping for higher rents (Inglis 1975:69-70). As drunkenness increased, however so did crime, and soon London's frightened middle classes saw drink as the cause of criminality. It was finally the middle- and upper-class fear of the drunken London mob that forced the government to establish more controls over production and sales.

The redefinition of gin as a social problem took place over several decades. Although Parliament was not yet concerned about the plight of the poor, in 1726 it was disturbed that gin consumption was spreading to soldiers and servants (Inglis 1975:63). In 1727, Parliament attempted to control drunkenness by the first Gin Act, which put a duty on gin of five shillings per gallon and required retailers to pay an excise tax of 20 pounds a year for a license (Webb and Webb 1903:24-25). The Gin Act also suppressed the making of good gin, and poisonous "Parliament Brandy" began to be produced. Massive protest resulted, joined by farmers and landed interests who produced the grain for distillation (Inglis 1975:64).

In the 1730's governmental and Parliamentary debates blamed the degeneration of the London poor on gin and recommended its restriction. A duty of 20 shillings per gallon on retail spirits was proposed because the low price of spirits was held to be the principal inducement to excessive use. The opponents of prohibition argued that this was unfair and unfeasible: the rich could purchase gin wholesale and still indulge, and spirits would inevitably find illegal entry channels in any case. The prohibitionists countered that retail prohibition would at least keep the spirits out of the reach of persons of inferior rank who are most likely to abuse them (Inglis 1975:65). Bowing to public demand, the government reluctantly passed a new Gin Act in 1736, which imposed an enormous duty and prohibited the sale of less than 2 gallons without paying a license of 50 pounds a year. The avowed objective of the Act was to make spirits "come so dear to the consumer that the poor will not be able to launch out into an excessive use of them" (Catlin 1931:15, Webb and Webb 1903:25-26, French 1884:286-8). The London mob protested in violent "Gin Riots" and greeted the Queen with shouts of "Gin or King" (Rude 1959:53-63). With such widespread opposition the new law was impossible to enforce even with numerous

paid informers. It became evident within a few years that Parliament had failed to suppress excessive drinking and that consumption was increasing. With the effective criminalization of the trade through highly restrictive licensing requirements, taxes and duties, respectable traffickers abandoned the now illegal business and distilling was taken over by reckless and disreputable persons who increased the clandestine sale of spirits. Beer, still cheap, increased in popularity (French 1884:289-92, Webb and Webb 1903:28, Coffey 1966:675).

The increase in duties imposed by the Gin Act of 1736 did lower reported gin consumption from 5,394,000 gallons in 1735 to 3,600,000 gallons in 1737, and in 1738 a proclamation was passed to enforce the Gin Act and protect the efforts of officers of justice. In 1742 production of spirits peaked at 20 million gallons, and gin consumption rose to 7,160,000 gallons (Coffey 1966:673, Roueche 1966:28). Parliament, needing more revenue, repealed the 1736 Act and adopted a more moderate policy that combined revenue duties with the licensing of retailers at a moderate annual fee. The new Act was drafted by one of the great distillers of the time, Lord Bathurst; it argued that since it was impossible to prevent the retailing of spirits, it was better to license it and thereby reduce usage by increasing expense and also thereby raise money for the European wars. The new law, known as the Tippling Act, increased the price of gin, granted licenses only to alehouses license holders, and forbade distillers to retail (Inglis 1975:67). Consumption appeared to be reduced (Coffey 1966:676), but in 1747 distillers petitioned and won the right to sell spirits at retail, with an ensuing increase in consumption and public drunkenness.

At about 1750, gin consumption rose to 11 million gallons (Coffey 1966:673). In a period of rising prosperity, comfort, and assertiveness of London's middle class, there were

renewed protests against debauchery, as in Hogarth's print Beer Street, Gin Lane (1751), which depicts life among the London poor. Similarly, Fielding's An Inquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers (1751) denounces the evils of gin. Whereas the working and middle classes prospered, said Fielding, the poor are "in want of every necessity of life" and display terrifying drunkenness and lawlessness (Coffey 1966:673). Gin was called "the grand destroyer" (Ingليس 1975:69).

In 1751, in response to a stream of propaganda and petitions, perhaps the most effective being Hogarth's print and the report by Henry Fielding, a new Act re-imposed the original provisions of the 1743 Act, strengthening retail controls and licensing the sale of liquor rather than prohibiting it. These measures were effective, and gradually the indiscriminate sale of liquor in London was replaced by consumption in licensed houses (Webb and Webb 1903:38-39). Gin consumption declined from an annual 11 million to less than 2 million. Although beer drinking increased for a while, coffee and tea slowly begin to take the place of alcoholic beverages (Coffey 1966:669, 673,678). The Act was said to be a turning point in the social history of London in that it considerably reduced public drunkenness. Nevertheless, the controversy over drunkenness continued into the 19th century.

To summarize, gin was introduced from Holland to England by William of Orange, whose reign (1689-1702) was marked by intermittent strife with France. In order to restrict outflows of British sterling, William placed prohibitive tariffs on French wine and brandy. He encouraged the local manufacture of cheap, easy-to-make gin. Within forty years, gin production in England rose from half a million gallons a year to twenty million. Eventually the use of gin reached "epidemic" proportions. Contemporary observers declared that the lower classes had

sunk into degradation through their addiction. London itself was known on the Continent as a city made unsafe by gin maddened addicts, much as New York in the 1970s was reputed to be unsafe because of heroin crazed muggers. Gin was blamed for crime, sloth, and disease amongst a new proletariat. Finally the Crown intervened by revoking distilling permits that the excise bureau had licensed fifty years before. The Gin Tax Acts of 1731 and 1756, backed up by extreme police measures, were used to force the nobility of relinquish their distilling privilege.

What can we make of this historic episode? What principles or lessons can be drawn? First, it appears that drug use is not inherently a social problem. It becomes one through public definition as such, and these definitions are greatly influenced by the economic interests and moral and economic entrepreneurship of different social classes. In this case the urban poor of England had been created from a peasantry impoverished and then displaced by over a century of Enclosure Acts that had been passed in support of commercial sheep raising and textile manufacture and export in the prior century. The new bourgeoisie was entrepreneurial not only commercially but also morally. They blamed the human costs of capitalist development on gin. In a further displacement, drug use was thought to be the cause of widespread crime. This shifted attention away from alternate possible explanations. For example, it could be argued (and by a small minority in England was partly argued), that both excessive drug use and crime were caused by injustice -- in this case, the injustice of poverty now seen as illegitimate in a society of growing affluence. Certainly men and women had suffered deprivation earlier in British history, perhaps even greater suffering than that which occurred during the commercial and industrial revolutions. But the new poverty was different in form and meaning: it was seen as artificial, not natural. It was morally unlike, and less acceptable than, deprivations caused by plague or famine.

Instead, the poverty of London was starkly contrasted with still remembered country life and with new fortunes that were visibly of recent acquisition. These contrasts made the poverty of London's proletariat unjust. And this injustice required a moral explanation, one that would reassure the respectable classes of the legitimacy of their privileges, underline their inherent benevolence and concern for their inferiors, and quell rebellious acts against inequalities of wealth by defining them as crimes against property and persons.

Second, our example also shows the role of drugs as commodities. William of Orange was brought from the Netherlands to renew the British monarchy. Familiar with Dutch ginebra, he saw it as a means of mercantilist import substitution against French wine and brandy. Thus drug policy was also a subset of international, political and economic policy. Further, revenues from licenses and taxes on distilled spirits were an important source of revenue for the state. Finally, the producers of spirits played a significant role. The London Distillers Guild Monopoly, the Distillers' Company and holders of royal patents, and landowners whose grain fed the distilleries all were effected by drug policies of the period and often were major actors in forming them. Thus, in its inception and in its variations over the decades, international political, economic and domestic fiscal considerations importantly shaped policies in England regarding wine, brandy, beer, and spirits.

Third, there seems to have been an interaction between different types of drugs, in this case all of them alcoholic beverages. When (French) wine and brandy were made unavailable, people turned to newly manufactured (British) gin. When gin became prohibitively expensive, many users shifted to beer. Finally, alcoholic beverages were partly supplanted by coffee and tea.

Thus, it would seem that drugs are linked within certain families or groups, and that lowered consumption of one may well be tied to increased consumption of another.

Fourth, in the British case there was an interdependence between levels of price and consumption and between legal and illicit sectors. Excessive prohibition in the form of higher prices stimulated illegality of production and use, but it also appears to have lowered overall consumption. Conversely, excessive permission in the form of lower taxes and licensing fees stimulated competitively low prices and greater consumption. Thus the respective sizes of the legal and illegal sectors, as well as levels of demand, appear to be price sensitive. Much of English alcohol policy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries can be seen as an effort to strike a balance between extremes. But this was not easily achieved, partly due to ignorance since this was perhaps the first calculated experiment in social policy of its kind. More importantly, different class and interest groups held different criteria of policy "success". Moderate consumption was only one goal of policy. Others were maximum revenues for the state; exclusion of foreign imports; optimal profits for landowners, distillers, and publicans; stigmatization, welfare and control of the urban poor; and maximum availability at minimal cost for users. These differing objectives often were in conflict.

Alcohol Use and Policy in the United States

Alcohol in the Colonial Period. Liquor figured prominently in the trade and local economy of early New England and was consumed widely at social and religious functions (Lender 1973:357-9). By the standards of today, excessive drinking was the rule rather than the exception during the colonial period (Krout 1925). Concern over drunkenness was widespread in

the colonies, particularly after 1700 when the use of distilled liquors and the number of taverns increased dramatically. But, contrary to the stereotype, Puritans neither detested nor prohibited alcohol. Drunkenness was seen as a voluntary overindulgence; it wasted a commodity then regarded as beneficial, destroyed the earning power of the drunkard, and caused breaches of other laws and securities. It may also have been, upon occasion, a convenient scapegoat for other social ills (Baird 1945-6:380-382).

Except for the unsuccessful Oglethorpe Experiment in Georgia in 1733, there was no organized attempt to restrict the normal use of intoxicants and no widespread condemnation of spirituous liquors as such. The Puritans manufactured liquor in their homes and consumed all types of alcohol, especially beer, as a normal part of their diet. Alcohol was drunk during funerals and religious ceremonies and figured prominently in the local economy, revenue collection, and colonial trade. Even drunkards were viewed less as criminals than as sinners to be redeemed. The provisions against drunkenness, excessive drinking, and Sunday sales were moral precepts enforced by secular law. The purpose was to prevent or punish the sin of overindulgence (Baird 1946-7:287). Yet viewed as a whole, the purpose of the colonial New England alcohol law cannot be divorced from that of the other control laws.

The ideas that drunkenness was a sin, and that the business of manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors was a privilege to be granted or taken away by government were transposed directly from England, but the colonists gave them greater strength and meaning. Although they sought to save souls in the enforcement of the alcohol law, the element of police control is explicit in the records and was always present in practice. The enforcement of liquor legislation

reflected New England views of drunkenness and morality, but laws dealt mainly with revenue, commercial regulation, price and product quality control, and the India trade.

In the 169 years from the first colonization of Jamestown in 1607 to Independence in 1776, these doctrines and the cluster of definitions that surrounded them were to become firmly fixed in common belief and legal practice (Baird 1946-7:295-6, Lender 1973:361). All that could be designated as temperance reform work in this period was limited to agitation and legislation against the evil of drunkenness. Liquors and drinking in themselves were considered wholesome and necessary. When used with a relative moderation that stopped short of visible drunkenness they were considered helpful and stimulating. Only when used to excess were they condemned (Cherrington 1920:10-11). Sometime toward the end of the colonial period, however, legislators seem to have become more interested in policing the alcohol industry and in maintaining public order than in the moral duty of saving souls (Baird 1946-7:293).

The long-term constancy and development of these views are revealed in the chronology of colonial policies relating to alcohol. Virginia enacted a law in 1619 against playing dice, cards, drunkenness, idleness, and excess in apparel. In 1622, Sir Frances Wyatt, Governor of Virginia, was advised by the London Company to effect a "speedie redress" of the enormous excess of drinking, the "cry whereof cannot but have gone to Heaven, since the infamy hath spread itself to all that have heard the name Virginia" (5:3). Despite these fears, in 1629, total prohibition of the liquor traffic was thought to be undesirable, although attempts were made to restrict its sale to Indians (5:4-5; 3:16). Later, in 1632, Virginia enacted the provisions of the law of England against drunkenness.

Massachusetts Bay stipulated in 1633 that the Governor's permit was necessary to sell liquor, declaring that already many are "distempering themselves in drinke" (3:17). In 1634, a Massachusetts ordinance tried to combat the exorbitant cost of liquor, created by a high demand and low supply, by fixing the price of beer (5:15). Massachusetts enacted a law in 1635 providing for the court to issue licenses for the sale of liquor, with heavy penalties for violators (3:18). At first only a few licenses were issued in Boston (4:363).

In 1644, Massachusetts established an excise tax on all wines sold at retail by licensed vintners. In the same year New York levied excise taxes on beer, wine, and brandy. Tariffs and excise taxes also began to be used throughout the colonies to produce revenue (3:20). In 1650, a law was passed in Connecticut imposing a heavy duty on imported liquors and an excise tax on liquors manufactured in the United States. Soon such revenue-producing measures spread throughout the colonies (3:13,22).

Maryland passed a law in 1662 to encourage the establishment of inns, with special licenses granting a monopoly of the sale of liquors in a district. Like many other colonies, Maryland sought to encourage inn keeping, brewing, distilling, and trade generally (5:6). In Massachusetts, in 1670, John Higginson, pastor of Salem church, admonished greater care in the regulation of the sale of liquor. Later he complained that drunkenness was increasing in Massachusetts and that the magistrates were responsible because they had licensed too many ordinaries and public drinking-houses (5:51-2).

King Philip's War broke out in 1676, caused largely by a long series of outrages seen as resulting from the sale of liquor to Indians and renegade whites in one Massachusetts tavern (3:28). Tavern licenses were being issued en masse in Boston; in 1681 alone at least 42 retail

liquor sources were approved (4:362). There was no uniform enforcement of regulations governing taverns (Lender 1973:362-4). Rum was profitably imported into New York in 1687 (3:29). The Treasurer of Massachusetts was authorized in 1688 "to rent, let or farmer the impost of wine, brandy, and rheum, and the rates upon beer, cider, ale and mum" (3:30). Cotton Mather petitioned the General Court of Massachusetts in 1694 for effective regulation of ordinaries and began a campaign claiming that the horrible religious condition of the country was due to excessive tippling and that a "flood of excessive drinking" had begun to drown Christianity (5:53). A change came over colonial drinking customs around 1700. Distilled spirits rose in popularity, particularly rum, but also whisky. Colonies also began to award liquor licenses with greater liberality. Drunkenness subsequently increased (5:31ff,45). In 1710 New York imposed an excise tax on liquors sold at retail (3:32). In 1721, rum revenues for one year were appropriated to the "use, benefit, and better support" of Yale college, an example of the typical use of liquor revenues in this period to finance a wide range of local and provincial activities (5:19). Also in 1721, the Philadelphia Friends tried to encourage a movement to stop the sale of spirits and encourage beer as a substitute. In 1726, Cotton Mather with 22 other ministers wrote Seasonable Advice Concerning the Tavern, approving the role of public houses but attacking excessive use of ardent spirits (5:54).

Extending the concern about excessive alcohol in England to America, between 1733 and 1742, the Oglethorpe Experiment took place in Georgia. Governor Oglethorpe, with the support of the English Parliament, declared the importation of "ardent spirits" to be illegal in Georgia. At first the law was rigidly enforced, but then it drifted into disrepute. Smuggling rose dramatically and the law became unenforceable because the majority of people in Georgia did not regard the

sale and use of rum as criminal and thus did not convict violators. In 1739, a riot by "drunken hoodlums" frightened Savannah magistrates to enforce the law, but in 1742 it was abandoned. The magistrates were convinced that liquor laws could not be enforced and were persuaded by British merchants that the rum trade could be highly profitable (5:52-8).

The popularity of distilled spirits with all classes was increasing (5:58), and by 1750 the county courts in all but three colonies had been given the power to grant liquor licenses or monopolies. As trade became more profitable, the idea of raising license costs to raise money began. The use of malt liquors over distilled ones was encouraged by lower fees (5:9). On the eve of the American Revolution, spirituous liquors had become one of the greatest movers of colonial commerce (5:50).

Alcohol from Independence through the Civil War.

With the Declaration of Independence, the first serious and effective efforts against use of distilled liquors began, particularly in response to abuse within the army. Following the War, controls on drunkenness weakened and consumption increased along with tolerance of drinking. Fear grew among moral leaders that the American appetite for strong drink might well endanger the future of the country (Bynum 1968:160). A shift that took place only later, from a theological model of sin to a medical model of disease, was adumbrated in Benjamin Rush's Inquiry into the Effects of Ardent Spirits on the Human Body and Mind, in which he called the intemperate use of distilled spirits a "disease" (Cassedy 1976:407). In 1787, Alexander Hamilton urged Congress to place a tax on "ardent spirits", arguing that Federal regulation of distilled liquors could furnish considerable revenue (Cherrington 1920:57). Congress passed Alexander Hamilton's program

into law with the Revenue Act of 1791, which included a tax on distilled spirits; it was amended in 1792 to increase fees on distilleries and foreign materials imported for distillation.

The periods of 1800 to 1875 witnessed the heaviest drinking in American history, as well as the rise of organized temperance movements (Winteler 1968:418, Carson 1963:67,406). Following the revolutionary war, the old restraints on liquor lost their hold, a process that was intensified by the westward migration, the decline of the old New England and Federalist elites, the rise of Jeffersonian and especially Jacksonian democracy, and the growing influx of immigrants. In response, the movement for alcohol control also changed profoundly between Independence and the Civil War, expanding in scope and appeal and moving from the call for moderation to the demand for prohibition.

The Jeffersonian, and later Jacksonian political victories marked the rise of the influence of small farmers and artisans. A drop in religious devotion occurred and the old norms of moderation became less effective as the Calvinist clergy lost its political and social position as an elite. Seaports and other cities reported increases in transience, crime, poverty, and drinking. The migration westward also intensified social dislocations. The use of liquors spread westward with mostly male pioneers, creating a frontier with few barriers to intemperance (Wjnkler 1968:416) much as the mostly male early Chinese immigrants were more inclined toward drug use. The Federalist-Calvinist elite of New England began to worry about the spread of religious irreverence and the advance of democracy -- the specter of the Godless drunken voter (Krout 1925:83, Bailyn 1992).

Thus the period from 1810 through 1826 was a time of quickening religious revivalism and temperance activities as well as, by contemporary standards, extraordinarily heavy drinking.

An organized attack on the use of liquor began with backing from the Protestant religious establishment and "respectable" laity. The church not only urged members to avoid distilled liquor, it also sought to influence public opinion outside the church communion on behalf of temperance. For example, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church focused attention on the liquor traffic. Similarly, Lyman Beecher, a Calvinist clergyman and pupil of Anthony Benezet, established a temperance movement in Litchfield Connecticut that sought to reduce liquor consumption through voluntary associations (Cherrington 1920:67-69, Cassedy 1976:406, Winkler 1972:939-957).

Growing intemperance brought the medical profession and religious reformers together. As this collaboration vitalized the movement (Cassedy 1976:406), a more direct attack was launched calling for abstinence, not just temperance (Winkler 1972:945, 951-3). In 1826, the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance ("the Crystallization of sober sentiment"), was founded in New England (Winkler 1968:417). Through this society, the northeastern elite tried to preserve the old order and reestablish their control over the increasingly powerful middle classes (Gusfield 1963:36).

The New England Federalist aristocracy was alarmed by the political defeats of the early 19th century and by the decreased deference shown to their clergy. Rural farmers, evangelical Protestants, and the uneducated middle class were rising social groups that rejected the social status and political power of Federalist leadership. As the economic and electoral power of the old elites diminished, their politics shifted to status preservation through moral hegemony (Gusfield 1963:3-11, Krout 1925:297-304). The men who founded the temperance movement

sought to make Americans into a clean, decorous, godly and sober people whose aspirations and style of living would reflect the moral leadership of New England Federalism.

Andrew Jackson's presidency (1828-36) marked a further defeat of the old elites in the face of the rising American "common man". Little by little, however, the temperance movement itself began to change. It made more use of the methods of revivalism, its organizations and doctrines attracted new adherents from among ordinary people and, as aristocratic leadership of the movement declined, total abstinence rather than temperate drinking became its primary doctrine, and more attention was given to coercion rather than assimilation through reform (Gusfield 1963:46-51, 62-85). The membership of American Society for the Promotion of Temperance rose to about 500,000 in the mid-1830s (Krout 1925:128-129). Middle class Protestants were particularly attracted to the revivalist methods of this temperance movement that was increasingly transforming a prohibition movement. Prohibition campaigns were set up in practically every state. Many also joined in alliance with the anti-alien Know-Nothing movement (Gusfield 1963:36,49,55, Sinclair 1962:91-93). At about the same time, D. Humphrey Sorer discovered that drinking had been increasing during the previous 20 years, at the very height of the temperance movement's early efforts (Cassedy 1976:407). With this and other evidence, by 1840 the voluntary associations were convinced that the lure of profits to be gained from the liquor traffic was nullifying their efforts.

In the 1840s the focus of the Temperance movement shifted from aristocratic defense against the emerging middle class to the defense by that middle class against the hordes of new immigrants then arriving to America's shores. The movement attracted urban, nativist, Protestant Americans seeking to consolidate their middle-class respectability through a sharpened

distinction between their beliefs and habits and those of immigrants and marginal laborers.

Temperance legislation that curtailed alcohol sales was seen as one means of impressing the central power and dominance of American Protestant morality. Thus the movement reflected the fears of an older, established social group at the sight of rising industrialism and the growth of an urban, largely non-Protestant immigrant proletariat (Gusfield 1963:3-11).

In 1852, Susan B. Anthony established the Woman's State Temperance Society of New York, the first such society formed for and by women. Many early feminists were prohibitionists (Sinclair 1962:92). At about the same time, to help fund the Civil War, an Internal Revenue Act imposed a license fee of \$20 on retail liquor dealers, of \$1 per barrel on beer, and of \$.20 per gallon on spirits. As a result, a financially and politically powerful liquor interest developed within government that continued after the Civil War (Cherrington 1920:139, Sinclair 1962:92).

Alcohol from the Civil War through Prohibition.

Although prohibition organizations had existed before the Civil War, these early groups were generally too loosely organized to be very effective. Moreover, between 1870 and 1915 liquor taxes provided from one-third to one-half of the total internal tax revenue of the country, amounting to about \$200 million annually after the turn of the century, and thus creating a strong fiscal interest against prohibition (Szasz 1974:196). Moreover, strong drink and wine were still sold by private dealers, and local authorities were becoming financially dependent on revenues generated by expanded sales and profits of liquor. As in the colonial period and early republic, liquor was still an important source of state revenue. Although the first wave of prohibition described above was undercut by the effects of partisan politics, the Civil War, and the Internal

Revenue Act (Cherrington 1920:139-140), consumption of distilled liquor declined from 3.25 gallons per capita in 1860 to 2.35 in 1870. During the same period, however, beer consumption increased. It is estimated that there was one saloon for every 200 Americans in the decade after the Civil War (Sinclair 1962:93). Thus the early years of the temperance movement were characterized by a rise in prohibition groups, but little actual legislative success. This was to change with the rise of the Anti-Saloon League (ASL) and the Progressive movement.

In 1874 the Women's Christian Temperance Union was founded in Cleveland, Ohio, in the assimilationist tradition, it emphasized education (Sinclair 1962:46). In the 1880s and 1890s, discontent grew among rural, middle-class native Americans over rapid urban, industrial growth and increased immigration. American farmers felt a loss of status, power, and income, and Populism emerged partly as an attempt to preserve the old order of rural dominance. Increasingly, prohibitionists allied themselves with such anti-foreign sentiments (Sinclair 1962:46).

Without the Anti-Saloon League, prohibition would have remained an ideological term with little political consequence (Odergard 1975:100-105). Instead, the League combined political sophistication with popular sentiment to help elect "dry" representatives to the legislatures throughout the country. The League's highly organized efforts finally bore fruit in 1913 with the passage of the Webb-Keynon Act forbidding the transport of liquor into "dry" states. By 1916 the ASL had achieved victories in the national elections.

At about the turn of the twentieth century, although temperance was not the single major goal of the Methodist Church, the church became an arm of the temperance movement and the movement became a rallying point among church members (Hougland et al. 1974:409). The

movement also provided a justification of heavy taxation on alcohol as an effective way to combat it in the name of sobriety and protection of health, morals, and the stability of family and society. In 1909, temperance societies organized a national plebiscite and recorded 1,900,000 votes for and only 17,000 votes against prohibition.

By the twentieth century, abstinence had become symbolic of a style of American life -- rural, Protestant, middle-class, and nativist. It was no coincidence that the triumph of Prohibition occurred as rural America made its last desperate attempts to preserve its vision of life in the face of the defeat of the Populist movement, increasing industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. While the status levels associated with alcohol use had changed since the days of Lyman Beecher, the use of alcohol as a means of identifying social class membership and defining an entire world-view persisted.

In the first quarter of the twentieth century, the Progressive movement endeavored to come to grips with the mounting discontent of the lower classes, especially among urban industrial workers. It sought to democratize the machinery of government and to use government to control big business and improve the lot of ordinary people. Although today often regarded as a conservative measure, prohibition was actually written into the Constitution as a progressive reform. As an integral part of the Progressive Movement, Prohibition drew on the same moral idealism and sought to deal with the same basic problems (Timberlake 1966:1-3). This is perhaps ironic because, as Gabriel Kolko (19xx) has shown, much "Progressive" anti-capitalist regulation actually served to increase economic concentration and was even supported by many of the big capitalists.

With the onset of World War I, the Progressive movement garnered the final support necessary for Prohibition. The War centralized authority in Washington, allowing the government to do things that it had never done when the nation was at peace. The War also made it necessary to save foods that otherwise were put to brewing and distilling. And finally, the War legitimated the repression of all things seen as German, including the brewer's trade (Merz [1930] 1969:25-27).

Prohibition did not command universal support, for its appeal lay largely with the old-stock, middle-class section of the American community. Other progressives, especially those identified with the urban-labor-immigrant elements, disliked the reform and fought it. Although the two groups often cooperated on other measures, they disagreed on the question of prohibition. But because older middle class constituted the backbone of the Progressive movement and wielded disproportionate political power, it was able to overcome the opposition of spokespersons for the urban masses and to impose its own standard of sobriety on the nation by law (Timberlake 1966:1-3).

The politically articulate middle class set out to use the government at every level to change or neutralize the habits of the lower classes. Good government, well-written legislation, and honest enforcement were their bywords (Hougland et al. 1974:6, Musto 1970:66). These efforts to "take politics out of government" also coincided with the rise of ethnic political machines that had taken control of many city halls. Prohibition platforms expressed the sentiments of farmers who saw themselves oppressed by urban financial institutions, manufacturing interests, and the political machines (Gusfield 1963:94-96). Within the context of Populist antipathy to urban and Catholic communities, the saloon appeared as the symbol of a

culture that was alien to the recently discovered ascetic character of American values (Gusfield 1963:100-102, Sinclair 1962:46).

Eight months after the United States' entrance into World War I, the 18th Amendment passed the Congress. Less than thirteen months later the amendment was ratified by the necessary 36 states. The Amendment called for prohibition of manufacture, sale, transportation, or importation of intoxicating liquors -- but did not forbid their purchase or use. No penalties for violators were specified; Congress was simply empowered to enforce the article by appropriate legislation. In October, 1919, one month before the end of the war in Europe, the Volstead Act was passed by the Congress over a presidential veto. This was the last major victory of the Prohibition movement, won with the support mainly of dry, rural, Protestant constituencies. The Act, which implemented the 18th Amendment, prolonged wartime prohibition and set penalties for violations. The purchase of liquor, however, did not make the purchaser liable for prosecution under the law of conspiracy. Only doctors could legally issue their patients whiskey, brandy, and other strong drinks. The aim of the Volstead Act was to secure as much enforcement as the country would endure, not total enforcement (Sinclair 1962:169).

In 1921 and through 1922, consumption of alcohol and problems related to its use were lower than for any period for which data are available (Warburton 1932:26-72, 172-92). By 1920, older supplies of existing, legal liquor dried up and the flow of illicit liquor increased. "Rum-runners", often sailing under foreign flags, brought liquor into the country from Canada, Europe, and the Caribbean where it still was quite legal. In 1923, there were 134 seizures of such vessels, in 1924, 236 seizures. As of 1924, \$40 million of liquor was entering the U.S. annually (NCMDA 1972:506). The illegal liquor trade became well established. Speakeasies and other

clandestine outlets made their appearance and illegal consumption increased substantially (Warburton 1932:27-73). A total of 95,533 illicit distilleries, stills, still worms, and fermenters were seized in 1921; this total rose to 172,527 by 1925, and to 282,122 by 1930 (National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse 1972:505). From 1927 through 1930 consumption of beverage alcohol equaled two-thirds that of 1911 and 1914; however, the amount of money spent on bootleg liquor was exactly the same as for legal alcohol of the earlier period (Warburton 1932:108). Convictions for liquor offenses rose from 35,000 in 1923 to 61,383 in 1932. Jail sentences rose from 11,818 in 1927 to 44,678 in 1932 (Sinclair 1962:190). As with the War on Drugs today, the increased level of captured illegal substance correlated closely with the increased volume of the trade rather than an increase in its interdiction.

The situation was anything but static, however, and as more and more people began to use illegal spirits, resistance to enforcement grew even among officials, and it became harder to get convictions for violations (McCarthy and Douglass 1959:378). Moreover, there was practically no precedent in America on which the government could base a comprehensive program of enforcement of the Volstead Act, and at no time during Prohibition was there adequate personnel for enforcement of the law. In the 1930s enforcement efforts and penalties increased, but still with little effect.

The Volstead Act came under repeated attack during this time for a number of reasons: inefficient enforcement, loss of government revenue, increases in illegal trade and related criminality, deaths attributable to the use of illegal and impure liquor, and the Great Depression. In 1932, the National Security League announced its solid opposition to Prohibition. A Congressional investigation of the League found members of the DuPont, Morgan, and

Rockefeller families its the chief financial backers. Stanley Menken, the founder of the League, was explicit in its purpose: "...to see the income tax lessened at the upper end and enlarged at the lower." (Gordon 1943:99). The Wall Street anti-prohibitionists constituted a formidable challenge to the 18th Amendment and their action helped revive the old liquor political machine that had been devastated during the 1920s. The desertion of the "drys" by such noted families as the Rockefellers and the Kresges virtually destroyed the political clout of the movement and in 1932 both the Democratic and Republican Parties decided to oppose Prohibition.

Another key factor in the anti-prohibition movement was the role of the press. A great majority of the newspapers, especially in the cities, were opposed to Prohibition and were considered by their "dry" opponents to be very influential. Gordon (1943) maintains that the great metropolitan newspapers were purchased by the Wall Street power groups, but it is more plausible that the metropolitan press simply catered to the known prejudices of its urban clientele by publishing news that would degrade laws prohibiting drink (Merz [1931] 1969). Newspapers merely shared the opinion of many people in their communities that Prohibition had been a failure in the cities, however successful it may have been in the rural areas.

Finally, evidence of political misdeeds related to alcohol, even in the executive office, also undercut support for Prohibition. For example, a political intimate of President Roosevelt, Joseph P. Kennedy Jr., was given permits to import large amounts of scotch whisky before repeal. Brought in under medical permits, Kennedy was able to flood the market with large amounts of alcohol when the United States officially turned "wet". Similarly, the young Representative Wright Patman, from a dry bible belt district in Texas, initiated impeachment against Andrew Mellon, who at the time was Secretary of the Treasury and in charge of all drug

law enforcement. Among other charges was Patman's documentation of Mellon's continuing interest in Old Overholt Distilleries, which remained operational during Prohibition under a government monopoly for production of licit (industrial, military, and medicinal) alcohol.

The Great Depression also helped kill support for the 18th Amendment. Democrats argued that prohibition was hurting the economy by increasing unemployment and depriving the government of tax revenue (Gusfield 1963:127). In 1931, the Wickersham Commission (National Commission on Enforcement of the Prohibition Laws) noted that the passage of the 18th Amendment was attributable to public hostility toward excessive consumption, political corruption, and licensed saloons, and not to use of intoxicating beverages as such. This implied that a policy short of total Prohibition would have been more reasonable and more responsive to popular sentiment.

In 1932 the election of the Democratic candidate for President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, marked the rise and establishment of a new, urban, middle-class professional elite not committed to the values of rural and small town Protestants. Roosevelt's election was a catalyst for all the other contributing factors, for the repeal of Prohibition by passage of the 21st Amendment in 1933. Federal deregulation of alcohol was sudden and comprehensive. The lack of a more selective decriminalization, instead of complete legalization, was partly due to the weakness of the dries after 1932 and to the strength of the wets, but it was also attributable to the indifference of an American public, weary of the endless debates about the evils and virtues of drink, by powerful commercial interests in the liquor trade, and by a preoccupied federal government and inadequate local administrations (Sinclair 1962:398-399). In this situation there

developed haphazardly the generally permissive, crazy quilt of regulations for alcohol that continues in America today.

To summarize, the history of American alcohol use and alcohol policy can be divided into a number of different stages. First, during the colonial period, alcohol was not considered a social problem at all even though levels of consumption were quite high, and only drunkenness, not high consumption itself, was censured, mainly through religious and moral suasion. During the nineteenth century, however, there appeared an anti-alcohol movement, at first to encourage temperance in drinking and later to prohibit it altogether. This movement was a moral, religious, and legal crusade first led by the old Federalist families as a status defense against the new middle class. However, it shifted its focus and soon was led and supported mainly by white, Protestant, American-born rural and small town people and members of the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie -- shop keepers, school teachers, merchants, and the like. Their efforts were crowned in 1919 by the ratification of the 18th Amendment and the passage of the Volstead Act that prohibited all forms of production of and traffic in alcohol, except for medicinal and industrial uses. Despite a drop in consumption, by perhaps one third, law enforcement was ineffective due mainly to lack of public and even official support. Moreover, an extensive criminal business network had sprung up to supply alcohol illegally. As public hostility to prohibition increased, along with the scope and power of criminal business monopolies, and as the U.S. government and people became more preoccupied with the Panic and ensuing Depression, support for Prohibition declined and it eventually was repealed with the 21st Amendment in 1933.

What can we learn from this record of events in American history. One thing we notice is that revenue to the state has almost always been a factor in alcohol policy formation. In the colonial period alcohol was a major commodity taxed and traded like any other. States depended on revenues from tariffs, licensing, and excise taxes from alcohol and were loathe to give them up. Second, prohibition, in America as in England, was criminogenic. That is, whereas prohibition suppressed demand somewhat among "respectable" people, it offered conditions for criminal enterprises that supplied alcohol to those still willing to use it. This occurred at least twice in the history of American alcohol policy -- the Oglethorpe Experiment of 1733-1742 and the Prohibition Era from 1919 to 1933, in both cases with similar results. Third, we also note that even under Prohibition some production of the substance remained legal, in this case for medicinal or industrial purposes, and that this sector was let as a government authorized monopoly to privileged traders.

Fourth, we also find an international dimension to alcohol policy formation. French wines and brandies competed with American corn whiskey and ciders in the colonial period and were thus opposed. Imported rum was restricted in early New England until American merchants became able to participate in the trade of rum, sugar, slaves, and manufactured goods between America and the Caribbean, Africa and England. Later during Prohibition, spirits were imported from Canada and the Caribbean, much as illegal substances are imported today from Mexico and Colombia.

Fifth, drug policies reflected racial, class and ethnic conflicts at crucial phases of American history. Alcohol use was prohibited to Indians during the colonial and frontier periods, and it was claimed that alcohol caused Indians to be both lazy and violent. In the early part of the

nineteenth century Federalists and Whigs supported temperance and argued that alcohol use caused disorder and degeneration among the Western agrarian and popular classes that had been politicized by the Jacksonian Revolution. Later, especially after the Civil War, industrialism brought massive immigration from Ireland and southern and eastern Europe -- peoples who were Catholic or Orthodox or Jewish, who were darker of complexion, who were of semi-feudal peasant cultures. The older white Protestant groups, now middle class, responded to this demographic, cultural and, later, political onslaught by criminalizing an activity that had come to be associated with Irish, Italians, south Germans, Polish, and other newly arrived peoples. Thus in addition to its fiscal, international, and criminal aspects, American alcohol policy has from early on been driven by "status politics," that is, efforts by upper groups to stigmatize and dominate their subordinates through moral labeling and legal coercion.

Finally, we see in the American case a shift in both discourses and institutions of control relating to alcohol. In the earliest period alcohol use was not a topic of public concern, except as a source of revenue. Thus an economic, fiscal, and political vocabulary obtained. Later, as moral entrepreneurs encouraged temperance, and then abstinence, religious vocabularies and movements were dominant. Alcohol and its abuse was a sin, and the churches (along with the state) had hegemonic control. During Prohibition however, a legal and criminal discourse became dominant and the policies, courts, and prisons were the prime institutions of social control. After Prohibition was repealed, public interest in alcohol policy flagged dramatically for several decades, to be revived in the 1960s until today. Now, however, the dominant discourse is that of medical science; excessive alcohol use is seen as a disease, and hospitals, rehabilitation centers, psychotherapists, ethnologists, and other health care professionals are the new agents and

agencies of social control. Thus, particular social groups, knowledge discourses, institutions of social control, and orientations toward drug policies seem to have certain elective affinities. Concerning alcohol in the United States, these have moved from fiscal, to religious, to criminal, to medical discourses, with their corresponding constituencies, political alliances, economic and status interests, public policies, and mechanisms of social control.

Alcohol Policy in Sweden

All Scandinavian countries have traditionally strived to eliminate the consumption of alcohol, or at least to bring about a drastic reduction of consumption (Ahlstrom-Laakso 1976:132). This can be seen in the history of efforts at alcohol regulation in Sweden. From 1775 to 1788 the distillation of spirits was a monopoly of the Swedish crown. This was resented by agriculturists as an interference with the favorable cultivation of their land, and by people generally because it made their favorite beverage excessively dear. Thus Gustavus III (1771-1792) consented to a series of changes that liberalized trade in Swedish brandy (bravin), and that attached the right to distil spirits to ownership and cultivation of land. Every farmer, and every peasant who had the assent of the owner of the estate on which he lived, was permitted to manufacture brandy for a small license fee and sell it in quantities of not less than two pints. Brandy became so cheap, so abundant, so readily procurable, that an "epidemic of intoxication" swept over the country. Responses to this epidemic included penalties for drunkenness, limitations on domestic manufacture, and voluntary associations for abstinence. In 1829, even after every suggestion had been adopted for curtailing the free-trade privilege short of its absolute withdrawal, 173,124 stills continued to operate in the country (Goadby 1895:10-14).

In 1850 physicians reported that alcohol abuse was a major social problem causing great misery, especially among the working class (Thompson 1935:10-11). Local communities began to regulate the sale and consumption of spirits. Special companies, organized without private financial interest, were granted the exclusive rights of sale in a district (Marcus 1959:347-8, Thompson 1935:11-13). In 1855 the Swedish Parliament (Riksdag) enacted the first general measure regulating liquor traffic: the right to manufacture and sell spirits was made dependent on permission granted by local authorities (Johnson 1893:14), and small distilleries soon disappeared (Marcus 1959:347). This policy formed the basis for all subsequent restrictive systems.

In 1865 the city of Gothenberg organized a Licensing Company to take over and exercise rights of operating public houses in the city. Its aims were to eliminate private financial interests that encouraged alcohol use and to devote profits to public purposes (Johnson 1893:31). The Gothenberg system spread for fifty years by local initiative, without any national legislation, until it was made mandatory by the state in 1905 and then abandoned in 1917. Between 1865 and 1875, police apprehensions for drunkenness increased in Stockholm by 60% and in Christiania by 122%, but decreased in Gothenburg by 21% (Johnson 1893:23). In a legal authorization of the Gothenburg system, a national regulation divided surplus earnings equitably between community, county, and agricultural interests (Thompson 1935:15). To further curtail the incidence of drunkenness, Gothenburg brought the retail spirit traffic under control of the Company (Johnson 1893:31-33). In 1877 Stockholm incorporated the Gothenburg system (Johnson 1893:37). A national statute declared that the purpose of the Gothenburg system was to be the guardianship of the retail and bar trade of bravin within the city "in the interest of

morality" (Thompson 1935:14). The Gothenburg system It established in Sweden a pattern on monopoly regulatory systems whose focus was on philanthropy rather than on prohibition.

Public spirited citizens organized to take over and exercise the rights of operating public houses in their city in the interests of temperance and general public welfare. The motive of personal profit was eliminated as much as possible by making the income of the directors, shareholders, management and staff, in no way influenced by the amount of sales. Instead, the shareholders in the company or, as it became known, the "system", received a fixed dividend on their actually invested capital.

Management and staff worked on fixed salaries, regardless of turnover. All surplus profits were turned over to the public. Personally disinterested management serving public welfare was the central idea of the Gothenburg System, and is still the dominating principle of Swedish liquor control today (Thompson 1935:13-14).

Much has been written for and against the Gothenburg System. Its guiding principle was the control of the liquor trade in the interests of temperance and public welfare. Although it is impossible to evaluate accurately its effectiveness in fulfilling this purpose, tested by the increasing number of arrests for drunkenness, the record looks bad. Judged by the slightly decreasing per capita consumption of spirits, it appears a bit better. Such indicators may be misleading, however, because many other factors, from levels of urban unemployment to context of consumption, also influence the level of alcoholism. Similarly, some advantages of the system may not be directly visible. For example, companies in the Gothenberg System concentrated on the service trade and converted the old, disorderly public houses into neat and inviting cafes where wholesome and palatable food was served to working people at prices they could afford

(Thompson 1935:20-22). The results soon showed in the decrease in crimes and misdemeanors traceable to drink and the use of accruing profits for public purposes (McCarthy 1959:348).

A cardinal weakness of the system companies was their lack of a complete monopoly and their failure to effectively use the monopoly that they did possess. Too many gates were left open for unregulated sales. The companies frequently were limited to the control of potato spirit in its various forms, while wines and imported liquors were handled by agencies outside of their jurisdiction. As a rule, they did not concern themselves with the wine and beer trade at all (Thompson 1935:20-22). As demand grew in Sweden for such strong drinks as cognac, whisky, and for all kinds of wine, the role of private dealers was enhanced (McCarthy 1959:348). Rights to serve liquor were also let out to privately owned and operated restaurants, often by a concession from the local authorities in which the Company had no voice (Thompson 1935:20-22). Moreover, as most of the surplus profits on the operation of the Company were to fall to the local authorities, they later became so dependent financially on these profits that their zeal in keeping the sales within reasonable limits were relaxed (McCarthy 1959:348). Under such conditions, it was impossible to conduct the liquor trade in the interests of public welfare. Denied satisfaction in the system cafe, the customer could go to the inn, the private restaurant, the retailer, or the wholesaler (Thompson 1935:20-22).

In 1917 the Gothenburg system was replaced by the Bratt system which, with modifications, remained the principal Swedish mechanism for the control and regulation of alcohol consumption until it was abolished in 1955 and replaced with a far less restrictive form of monopoly control. In 1923, the general law of 1917 was amended to include wholesale trade, the government monopoly for which was secured by Sprit-centralen and its subsidiary companies

(Marcus 1959:354). The monopoly system strove to eliminate social evils of abuse and not to cut down on total consumption (Marcus 1959:353, Thompson 1935:188). Thus in 1939 the government imposed a limit on the allowance of spirits at restaurants, and service was made contingent upon purchase of hot food. Since restaurants had to buy their liquor from the district company, the system became the sole source of supply for both individuals and the trade. The company system exercised constant and strict supervision of the purchases of their customers, and revoked the permits of those who abused them. Although the system never pleased ardent prohibitionists, with its adoption Sweden managed to control the pressures that led her neighbor Finland into adopting total prohibition during the same period.

Under the Bratt system the private retailing of wines and spirits was forbidden and the whole retail trade became the monopoly of the system companies. Mr. Bratt formed his own corporation, Vin-Spiritcentralen, to assume control of the wholesale trade. As the system went into operation, it acquired all private firms in addition to its wholesale monopoly, with profits going to the state (Thompson 1935:29). Nonetheless the system often met considerable opposition from drinkers. A rationing system was introduced that gave all adults the right to buy a rather liberal amount of spirits monthly (Kjolstad 1970:44), but it was not difficult to get more wine and spirits illegally (Elmer 1957:56). The system also was criticized for the large amount of labor and expense entailed in its management (Thompson 1935:121, Marcus 1959:354).

In 1955, the Swedish parliament modified the system so substantially that it was effectively abolished. The liquor trade remained a state monopoly, but emphasis was now placed on preventive measures, greater freedom for individuals, and less state control (Skutin 1959:355). The wine monopolies engaged in very active advertising and price campaigns to

move consumption away from brandy and over to wine and beer (Christie 1965:111). In 1956, the price of potato spirits, the most commonly used distilled drink, was raised 20% by taxation to diminish consumption (Skutin 1959:356, Elmer 1957:57). Demand for spirits declined and consumption of wine increased. In 1958, apparent consumption dropped below the 1954 level, possibly due to tax increases (Popham and Schmidt 1976:508).

The Swedish experience has a number of parallels and some differences with the cases of England and the United States. First, we find similar interactions between legal and illegal sectors, smuggling from abroad, and shifts of consumption from one type of alcohol to another in response to changes in prices. In the Swedish case, however, we find that the profit incentive is relatively weaker, that alcohol policy is less driven by racial, class, or ethnic conflicts, and that, instead, more balanced, disinterested, and more effective policies were enacted and largely supported by the general public as well as by elites.

Perhaps these differences can be explained by a factor we might call "cultural character". Unlike Britain or the United States, Sweden has been and remains a highly homogeneous society with relatively low degrees of class, race, or ethnic conflict and with a strong communitarian, even socialist, ethos. In this context, drug policies were less freighted with profit incentives and group conflicts. Thus in Sweden it has been easier to define the problem less moralistically and more precisely and to invent more moderate collectivist solutions.

It may be that when a state monopoly, such as the one in Sweden, is rather comprehensive, and a primary objective is prevention, drug problems are less prevalent than they otherwise would be. Moreover, in addition to possibly lower levels of consumption, ancillary benefits such as the reduction of criminality by illicit purveyors (under total prohibition) or

inebriated users (under total permission) may also be achieved. By contrast, when the control of alcohol problems becomes secondary to the objectives of production and marketing for profit, a state authorized monopoly system may function, in effect, as a particularly powerful ally of the alcoholic beverage industry (Elmer 1976:507-508).

Alcohol Policy in Finland

The history of alcohol use and policy in Finland is an interesting contrast to those of neighboring Sweden. In Finland, a law of 1800 granted the right of manufacture and sale of alcohol to all burghers and landowners and imposed a tax. However, perhaps because no limit was placed on home manufacture of intoxicants, drunkenness increased (Wuorinen 1931:26-27). In the 1830s, influenced by the temperance movement in the United States, earliest signs of a Finnish temperance movement appear. In a compromise aimed at decreasing the production of alcohol, the liquor tax was repealed upon surrender of the right to home manufacture, although with disappointing results. Soon modern distilleries took over the right and produced more than the farmers had done (Wuorinen 1931:29). An enactment limiting the period for which distilleries may run was passed and led to a drop in levels of production. However, the central problem of reforming the liquor laws -- the revision of the law of 1800 -- remained.

The Liquor Law of 1865, effective in 1866, prohibited all home manufacture of spirits, shifted production to an industrial basis, prohibited rural sales and limited urban sales through the grant of two year licenses (Sariola 1959:356-357, Wuorinen 1931:30). Decrease in consumption resulted. In the 1880s and 1890s increasing industrialization caused migration to cities, where drunkenness became a problem among unskilled laborers (Sariola 1959:357). A

strong absolute abstinence movement arose in close alliance with Lutheran religious thinking. The Friends of Temperance was established in Helsinki, grew in strength, and obtained a yearly subsidy from the state (Wuorinen 1931, Sariola 1959:357). The movement included the upper classes but drew much of its leadership and support from the masses. As propaganda alone proved ineffective, it began to emphasize legal coercion. Highly restrictive legislation reflected the absolutist attitudes that excessive drinking is sinful and immoral (Wuorinen 1931:32-33, Sariola 1959:357).

Regulations were imposed on beer in 1883 and on wine 1895. Duties on imported liquors were increased in 1886 and 1888. The tax on domestic liquor was raised in 1889. In 1891, a law was passed (effective 1893) regulating all alcoholic beverages of 22% and over, prohibiting rural sales, and regulating the liquor trade in the cities through the use of the Swedish Gothenburgh system (Sariola 1959:30-35).

In 1898, labor leaders adopted a policy of "drinking strike". This movement had strong temporary appeal, and workers Absolutist Associations were founded. In 1900, Parliament officially was asked by a petition of 140,000 signatures to promote immediate prohibition laws. The temperance movement made steady progress and in 1901 the Workers Party adopted total prohibition as part of its program (Wuorinen 1931:36-37, Sariola 1959:359). The New Diet met in 1907 and passed a bill prepared by Friends of Temperance and designed to introduce total prohibition in Finland. The Bill, however, did not come into force (Sariola 1959:357, Wuorinen 1931:38-40). During World War I, while Parliament was determinedly for prohibition, the government under the influence of the Russian Administration was determinedly against it. The

liquor trade did become virtually illegal through temporary wartime administrative legislation, but not via parliamentary process.

Between 1917 and 1932 Finland experimented with national prohibition. As Bruun observes, few countries have tried to control alcohol as compulsively as did Finland, where a long tradition has regarded alcohol as primarily a moral question and vigorously condemned its consumption despite notorious high levels of use or abuse (Bruun 1970:548). The temperance movement was financed by state and municipal authorities, with a special temperance board in every municipal area whose job was to support local temperance organizations. Moreover, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health had a special division that gave advice to these boards and supported the temperance movement (Bruun 1970:175-176).

Prohibition was passed and ratified by the first parliament of Finland when it became independent after World War I. The law, effective July 1, 1919, forbade the production, import, sale, transport and storage of alcohol except for medical, technical, and scientific purposes. The Prohibition Law was not respected, however, and drinking continued under cover, illicit distillation burdened the police, and smuggling from other countries such as Germany and Estonia increased (Wuorinen 1931:56,59-73, Sariola 1959:362). In 1922 a greatly extended law replaced the first prohibition enactment. Nonetheless, the Alcohol Committee report of 1926 indicated that consumption had increased, especially among the young (Wuorinen 1931:91-93).

Opponents of prohibition argued that prohibition was an infringement on individual liberty. Anti-prohibition associations formed in the late 1920s and were often supported by leading citizens (Wuorinen 1931:207-208, 224-32). Alcoholic beverage sales were considered as a possible source of state revenue during the severe budget deficits of the Depression years. In a

referendum of this period, a majority of 70.6% supported the free production and sale of all spirits (Sariola 1959:363).

A strong temperance movement was still very influential in determining Finnish policy toward alcohol even after the repeal of Prohibition in 1932. Following repeal, a State Alcohol Monopoly was established to control production, distribution, and sale of alcoholic beverages. The Monopoly sought to check illegal trade in alcohol, reduce consumption to the minimum, and prevent drunkenness and its injurious results. The Monopoly maintained liquor stores in cities only and retail stores were still banned in rural areas (Sariola 1959:364, Fosdick 1933:191-195).

Alcohol pricing and tax policies continued to favor mild drinks over spirits both in price and in ease of purchase in 1950. The pricing policy also favored mild alcoholic beverages such as beer and wine. The price of alcoholic beverages was 10% higher in 1950 than in 1935, and 10% higher in 1960 than the 1950s, making wine and beer relatively cheaper and more attractive than strong liquor (Sariola 1959:364, Bruun 1970:32). Such differential taxation was based on the belief that alcoholic beverages differ in their behavioral effects, and that beer is a drink of moderation. It was still a criminal offense to appear drunk in public until 1968, when alcohol policies were liberalized and the number of outlets selling alcohol increased and sales were allowed in rural areas for the first time (Popham and Schmidt 1976:500, Makela 1971:7). Also in 1969, medium strength beer was released for unrestricted retail distribution (previously it was only available through the State Monopoly). On the whole, it appears that liberalization brought an increase in consumption. A study was made on the effect of opening wine and beer stores in selected "dry" market towns in rural areas; findings suggested there was an appreciable effect on consumption, though the increase was in part offset by a decline in consumption of illicit alcohol

(Kuusi 1957:229-231, Popham and Schmidt 1976:500, Smart 1974:109). After the reform the share of light drinking increased to some degree, as did the absolute frequency of occasions for heavy drinking (Bruun 1970:351-352). Thus it appears as if all consumer groups increased their ingestion of alcohol roughly in relation to their previous consumption levels.

Between 1969 and 1975 liberalization induced a 48% rise in the level of consumption. Medium strength beer released for unrestricted retail distribution apparently accounted for most of the increase, but in following years strong drinks increased at the same rate as before (Bruun 1970:458, Makela 1975:351). The increase spread in such a way as to cause an increase in the proportion of heavy consumers. There were increases from 2.9 liters of absolute alcohol per capita in 1968 to 4.2 liters in 1969.

The increase might have been less dramatic if the legislative changes had been accompanied by government action in setting prices (Bruun 1970:177-178). Economic studies in Finland show that pricing policies powerfully influence the structure of consumption. Along with determining legal availability, setting prices may be the most powerful tool in the alcohol policy adopted by the Finnish State Alcohol Monopoly.

Conclusions

The case of alcohol policy and use in Finland is similar to and different from that of the other cases we have considered. In all these instances, as perhaps in all human communities, alcohol has been known since time immemorial. Thus in each case the use of the drug as a beverage was already established, as were patterns of its trade as a commodity, and of its taxation as a source of revenue. Thus alcohol in Sweden and Finland had well established cultural

meanings and perhaps for this reason it was less semiotically open to definition as a foreign or subversive substance, unlike newly introduced drugs such as tobacco or coffee.

Moreover, compared to England and the United States, Sweden and Finland in the periods considered were relative less modern -- their production was less capitalistic, less industrialized, their populations less floating and anomic. They were, and are, smaller, more homogeneous societies. For these reasons, alcohol use and its stigmatization and regulation may have become a vehicle for class conflict in England and the United States, where "classes" themselves had replaced "estates" as the basic social structural unit and hordes of new rural to urban migrants or trans-Atlantic immigrants formed new proletariats that appeared threatening to the new bourgeoisie.

By contrast Sweden and Finland were less rent by class conflicts, the settled rural population was more demographically and socially significant, and the anti-alcohol movement was motivated by community-minded elites or labor leaders. Indeed, the restriction of alcohol in the Scandinavian cases was directed more against use by the rural population, where sales were prohibited, than against urban dwellers, where they were merely restricted. Especially in Sweden the entire approach was non-punitive and pro-community.

We also see in these cases, as in others, an internationalization of what is defined as a problem and what is seen as a solution. The prohibition movements in the United States and Great Britain interacted with each other, Finland in part borrowed its definition of an alcohol problem from the United States and its solution from England.

We also see in these cases, as in those concerning other drugs, that alcohol is a staple commodity with relative inflexibility of demand. That is, levels of consumption are not totally

sensitive to changes in price; if the price goes up demand will drop, but not in proportion to price rises. Such a situation invites legal or illegal monopolization, because demand will not drop proportionally even if costs to consumers go up through monopoly pricing. Hence, the possibility of super profits encourages drug entrepreneurs to establish monopolies or oligopolies that eliminate or reduce competition and permit pricing for optimal revenue, either to government monopolists, as with the British opium purveyors within India, Frederick II with coffee in Prussia, or the Papal monopoly on tobacco. However, if a commodity such as alcohol or other drugs becomes unavailable (either through excessive taxation, pricing, or physical suppression), three consequences are likely to follow: first, overall demand, at least for a short time, may drop; second, smuggling, illicit manufacture, and illegal market and consumption will likely occur; and third, there will be a shift of demand to a similar but unrestricted substance. Such was the case with competing substances like the highly restricted bravin and wine in Sweden, coffee and beer in Prussia, and wine and coffee in the Islamic world. Similar price-responsive switches in the United States occurred from tobacco to marijuana by Mexican Americans in the Southwest in the 1920's, alcohol to marijuana during Prohibition, and heroin to cocaine in the 1980's.

These examples suggest that drugs are quasi-staples insofar as demand for them is relatively inflexible, especially if we consider drugs in closely related sets or pairs. Our cases also suggest a relation between monopolization and criminalization, and between law enforcement and price enforcement. For example, the establishment of legal monopolies by the state directly or through franchise thereby criminalizes manufactures and traders who operate independently. Conversely, criminalization of a substance creates new costs and risks for

producers, thereby limiting business operations to those providers who have the resources to operate clandestinely, to terrorize, kill, or have their competitors arrested, and to co-opt law enforcement officials downward. Thus legal monopolization of a drug can lead to the growth of a criminal sector if the monopoly seeks large profits through drastic price increases. At the same time, criminalization of a substance tends to generate illegal economic concentrations as well.

Demand for alcoholic beverages may fluctuate with changes in price and changes in legal restrictions, but it does not disappear. Furthermore, serious social problems, or what are at least perceived to be serious social problems, are liable to appear when states restrict, monopolize, or encourage certain kinds of alcohol consumption or production. The gin epidemic in Great Britain and the rise of organized crime in the Prohibition-era U.S. attest to this. Some exceptions have been state monopolies that have engaged in very moderate pricing with a communal orientation, geared towards a fairly sedentary, homogenous population, such as in Sweden, and, to a lesser extent, Finland. However, when class conflicts or monopoly profits motivate alcohol policies, our data shows that the results are often disastrous. It would seem that for alcohol policy to be successful it must be free from the kinds of symbolic associations and rhetorical baggage of racial and class bias, foreign competition, religious influence, and monopoly profits that have too often skewed regulatory efforts in the past.