



Townhall > Columnists > Andrew Tallman > Did Prohibition Fail?



**Andrew Tallman**  
**Did Prohibition Fail?**

Email Andrew Tallman | Columnist's Archive



Like 31 likes. Sign Up to see what your friends like.



Share  
Tweet Sign up for Townhall Alert  
Sign-Up



"Well, since we all know Prohibition failed..." This assertion is widely taken as the starting premise to many discussions on such modern social issues as prostitution, drugs, and gambling. In reply, the advocate of enforcing moral norms through the law must either explain how his plan differs from Prohibition or else admit defeat. In fact, the reliability of this premise is so widely taken for granted that even raising the question of whether or not it's true rings absurd. But if a thing is both widely held and true, there shouldn't be any real danger in exploring to verify it, right?

Of course, the fact that an opinion is widely held does not always guarantee truth. Most Americans believe that the people of Columbus's time thought the Earth was flat. Sadly, they don't realize this myth sprang from anti-Catholic propaganda and was cemented in the 19th Century by two unreliable histories and Washington Irving's fictionalized account of Columbus. Even common sense would tell you that lesser-educated people in a society (sailors) are unlikely to risk everything on some novel academic hypothesis. They knew the Earth was round (you'd have to be a special fool not to grasp the meaning of a horizon), they just didn't know how big it was. Columbus thought he had reached the "West Indies" because he didn't know the Americas existed, thinking that the Earth was perhaps only 10,000 miles around.

Another widely held myth is that the colonists came to America because they wanted to establish a land of religious pluralism. The reality is that most of them came here to flee cultures they viewed as too corrupted in order to establish more rigorous religious societies than those they left behind in Europe. This is why so many early states had [explicit religious identity](#).

("Mary"land was Catholic and surely no one thinks Puritans were renowned for their lax ideas about public morality and religion.) It's also why it was so necessary to have a First Amendment and the Constitutional ban on [religious test oaths](#): not to protect Muslims, but to insure that the Federal Government wouldn't squelch the States' devout religious identities.

So is it possible that the failure of Prohibition could be yet another widely held historical/political myth? Well, it seems that two questions need to be answered. First, what were the harms of Prohibition? Second, what, if any, benefits came from it?

The harms are fairly well known. Prohibition led to bootlegging, death or blindness from consuming adulterated alcohol, loss of tax revenue, loss of business activity, and crime as the mob expanded from gambling and theft to liquor. It also was the first period in American history when the law was so widely broken that disrespect for the authority of the law became its own social evil. As I said, all of this is well known.

But here's something a little trickier: Can you name any of the benefits of Prohibition?

To hear the tale most people believe, Prohibition was such an unmitigated failure that it's scarcely believable it was passed in the first place. "How on earth could the wise people of 1933 have just 14 years prior been the imbeciles of 1919?" But if the 18th Amendment was so foolhardy, why did it come when 19 states had already banned alcohol (starting with Kansas in 1881), when roughly 65 percent of the country was already dry, and when the margin of "dries" to "wets" in Congress was more than 2 to 1? And if it was so obviously a mistake, why did it take until 1966 for Mississippi to repeal it and until 1987 for Kansas to allow "by the drink" alcohol sales?

Again I ask you, can you tell me any of the benefits of Prohibition?

The reason I ask is because it's generally unwise to be dogmatic about anything without at least some knowledge of the other side of the discussion. Although believing there just isn't one feels like certainty, it's really the precarious security of ignorance.

So what was the benefit of Prohibition? Here's a hint: It's the one thing people arguing against current

Commentary Archives >

- Browse by Author
- Browse by Subject
- Browse by Date

New! from Townhall

- Mike Adams: **Fat Honkies Need Exercise, Too**
- Lurita Doan: **Dems Are Asking: Will Issa Go Too Far?**
- Debra J. Saunders: **'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' on the Way Out**
- Douglas MacKinnon: **Must Liberals Ruin Our Sports, Too?**
- Rich Galen: **Wiki This**
- Bruce Bialosky: **Bring an End to the Death Tax**
- Elisabeth Meinecke: **Pence: Simplify the Fed's Job**
- Terry Paulson: **Offended by the Offended**
- Star Parker: **Deficit Cutting Commission Gets It Wrong**
- David Stokes: **That Other Thing Teddy Said**
- Austin Hill: **Bankruptcy? No Worries! California Is "Going Green!"**
- Salena Zito: **Rendell, blunt to the end**

Video >

more



Rangel Lashes Out: I Don't Deal in 'Average American Citizens'



Inside a Game of "Chicken"

behavioral taboos don't like to acknowledge. The main benefit of Prohibition was ... you guessed it ... people drank a lot less alcohol. But to hear the tale often repeated, Prohibition either had no effect on consumption or, more amazingly, actually increased it!

The reality is that average consumption of alcohol in the years prior to most legal restrictions (1906-1910) was [2.60 gallons per year](#). In 1934, when it was again possible to accurately measure, the number had dropped below one gallon, and it didn't return to the pre-Prohibition level until 1973! During Prohibition, admissions to psychiatric facilities for alcohol-related issues dropped 60 percent, arrests for drunkenness decreased 50 percent, cirrhosis deaths for men dropped over 70 percent, and welfare agencies reported tremendous drops in alcohol-related family problems. Also, although crime is widely cited as the result of Prohibition, organized crime was actually well-established in cities by 1920. And until the St. Valentine's Day Massacre in 1929, most voters believed Prohibition was succeeding, if imperfectly.

Temperance movements have been around since at least the founding of the country with Dr. Benjamin Rush and other religionists. Consumption was so high in the middle 1800s that Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and Abraham Lincoln all urged abstinence for the good of family and country. Long advocated by wives, mothers and Christian groups, Prohibition was the "final straw" solution to rampant alcoholism. And if you asked those victims, they would have told you that their lives were better off because of the effects Prohibition had on their husbands.

I'm not saying Prohibition was a complete success, or even that on balance it was a success. I'm just saying that it had the most direct success at its intended goal: reducing alcohol abuse. And in discussions about other socially harmful behaviors, it's important to at least be honest about our past efforts to regulate such things.

One final note is worth mentioning. Alcohol was widely used long before Prohibition, which means the culture had a longstanding acceptance of it. In a sense, then, it's amazing this same society banned it at all. The legal restriction of it brought a significant reduction, which isn't all that surprising, and those who wanted it eventually got it back, thankfully at lower levels of abuse.

But it should be obvious that restricting a thing people are already long accustomed to having is much more difficult than simply keeping a thing restricted they have long viewed as forbidden (like marijuana). The cultural shift on contraception and abortion (both universally despised just 60 years ago but now widely accepted) should serve as an illustration of what would happen if currently illicit behaviors were decriminalized.



### Andrew Tallman

Andrew Tallman is host of *The Andrew Tallman Show* on AM 1360 KPXQ from 5-7PM weekdays in Phoenix, AZ.

Be the first to read Andrew Tallman's column. Sign up today and receive Townhall.com delivered each morning to your inbox.

#### Most Recent Articles

Eurozone under pressure to aid euro with more cash  
Offensive boss Davis resigns in Texas shake-up  
International court investigating North Korea  
Red Sox get 1B Gonzalez in trade with San Diego  
US-USREPORT Summary  
Obama to speak on tax cuts, economy in NC  
Obama confident on tax cut deal in days  
Author Jonathan Franzen appears on 'Oprah' show

#### Sign-Up to receive Updates from TH

Email

### Join the Debate

144 Comments So Far

Login to Post Your Comments

« Previous 1 2 Next »

#### olive Wrote:

Nov 17, 2010 8:46 PM

Andrew Carnegie was the prototype for the hypocrite, redistribute wealth from the bottom to the top, 'small government for you, big government for me' that the modern Republican was and will always continue to be.

Carnegie wanted a free market and small government when it came to hiring workers for his steel mills. All fine and good for now.

However, he and his Republican cronies put a 50% tariff on British and German steel imports. Guess what? The price for steel in America sky-rocketed. Every consumer good made from steel shot-up. This is, yet, another example of Republican hypocrisy of 'small and free markets for me, yet BIG government and rigged markets for you.' They never explicitly say it, but watch what they do.



Jennifer Grey: 'It Feels Damn Good' to Defeat Palin



Boehner Calls Tax Vote "Chicken Crap"

## TH Blog

Breaking news and commentary from the Townhall crew

- **Maier & CNN's Zakaria Spend Some Quality Air Time Laughing At Christianity**  
Greg Hengler
- **Charlie's Not Sorry**  
Guy Benson
- **The Marines' Cool New M27**  
Jillian Bades
- **Aw: Wikileaks Founder Whines About Death Threats**  
Guy Benson
- **WikiLeaks Defender-Sites Flourish**  
Jillian Bades
- **Lugar on New START: "The Votes Are There"**  
Guy Benson

## New! from HOT AIR

- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Ed Morrissey | FCC commissioners demand authority over campaign financing, free Internet |
| Ed Morrissey | New Fed study suggests net job creation from Porkulus was ... zero        |
| Ed Morrissey | Wikileaks: Assange kind of like ... Osama bin Laden?                      |
| Ed Morrissey | Dems to try passing omnibus environmental bill in lame-duck session       |
| Ed Morrissey | Obamateurism of the Day   |
| Allahpundit  | Quotes of the day   |

## Townhall Regular Contributors [more](#)

- Ann Coulter
- Thomas Sowell
- Walter E. Williams
- Jillian Bades
- Mike Adams
- John Stossel
- Michelle Malkin
- Chuck Norris
- John Hawkins
- Dennis Prager
- Mike Gallagher
- Hugh Hewitt

This is an example of Republican wealth-redistribution. It is wealth redistribution from American consumers to a card-carrying member and generous donor of the Republican party.

And once the American people became cognizant of this Republican Socialist wealth redistribution program in the early 1900's, guess what happened, you got it, the American people passed the 16th Amendment. Yes, you can thank the Republican party for the national income tax. They got tired of the Republican party's redistribution of wealth from the poorest to the richest.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**John C Wrote:**

Nov 18, 2010 12:03 AM

Gentle Readers,

'olive' repeatedly posts this, and other, off-topic and deceptive comments throughout Townhall columns, irrespective of relevance.

As to this off-topic comment:

Pres. Grover Cleveland was not a Republican.

Sincerely,

John Lepant

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

- Michael Medved
- Robert Morrison
- Michael Barone
- Joseph C. Phillips
- Pat Buchanan
- Ken Blackwell
- Jonah Goldberg
- Oliver North
- Brent Bozell
- Larry Kudlow
- Michael Reagan
- Victor Davis Hanson
- Larry Elder
- Cal Thomas
- Tony Blankley
- David Limbaugh

**HARVARD - MIT Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 8:32 PM

**THE ULTIMATE BOMB AND ILLEGAL CONTRABAND DETECTOR FOR USE AT AIRPORTS**

... and it is utterly non-invasive (though expensive)

There is a device that can identify all explosive compounds (C4 - C24) and do so in parts per trillion. This device comes in three models.. the 4200, 4300 and 4500. It is called the ZNOSE.

We use them at the Pentagon and Andrews Air Force Base along with US bases worldwide.

Though quite expensive for a hand held unit (about 35,000 - 40,000 dollars each when fully configured).. they get the job done very quickly and without failure. They can also be programmed to simultaneously search for any illegal street drug contraband.. also in parts per trillion.

Contact your local US Senate and House representatives. Demand that the ZNOSE 4200, 4300 & 4500 models of explosive and narcotics detectors be bought and used at all airports.. worldwide. They are pretty much foolproof.. nothing to date is as sensitive or accurate.

Google ZNOSE to see the very impressive specifications and capabilities for this foolproof detector of explosive compounds and street drugs.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Otto Bismarke Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 8:11 PM

I've met many Tea Party people who do not blame BP for the mess caused in the Golfo de Mexico, expected, and even demanded that the federal government clean up the mess caused by that foreign company. These Tea-Partiers say that since the federal government regulated BP and gave BP a license to drill then the lease-holder is responsible. But let's take a closer look.

Let's say an automobile driver has her state government give her a driver's license, and then give her automobile a state inspection and then give her automobile a certificate of registration. It looks like the state government has given this automobile its seal of approval forever and ever to do what automobiles do. (or until the registration and license expires)

Now let's say the owner of the car does some texting while driving and hits a van filled with nuns and everyone in the van gets killed. I say the driver is responsible. I this scenario to a Tea Partier and he told me that the government was responsible because the automobile got a clean bill of health from the government.

Can't we say this Tea-Partier should be called a Tea-Bagger?

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**John C Wrote:**

Nov 18, 2010 12:10 AM

Gentle Readers,

OB repeatedly posts this off-topic, cut & paste comment throughout TownHall columns irrespective of relevance.

As to this off-topic comment,

**#1: Tea-Baxxer is a deliberately offensive reference to a specific sexual activity. Please flag anyone using it, including OB.**

**#2: As to this hypothetical presented,**

**a. The Tea Party member is simply a fictional figment of OBs imagination. This person is repeatedly referenced, but no name or organizational affiliation is presented.**

**b. Most Americans and ' Tea Party ' members would not ban all driving due to one accident. The idiotic policy adopted by OBs preferred politicians was to ban all offshore drilling due to one accident by one company.**

**Most Americans would say punish a driver who recklessly caused an auto accident, or a specific oil company that recklessly caused an accident, but would oppose punishing all auto drivers and all oil companys.**

**Otto Bismarke's preferred politicians, Progressive Democrats, punished all the responsible oil companies who have drilled over 50,000 offshore wells without incident for what BP did.**

**Is that good policy? Is it Justice? No!**

**Is Otto Bismarke a Progressive Troll who promotes the worst possible policies using deception and outright lies? Yes!!!**

Sincerely,

John Lepant

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Keith Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 6:14 PM

**Any statistics about alcohol use during Prohibition are in essence pulled out of thin air. Alcohol was illegal and its sale and consumption were clandestine how is anyone to know how much people actually drank. On the other,hand, the black market violence and corruption caused by Prohibition are well documented.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**John C Wrote:**

Nov 18, 2010 12:10 AM

Dear Keith,

Your point is well taken, but the other data, especially the medical data, is sound.

Sincerely,

John Lepant

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**David Wrote:**

Nov 18, 2010 12:20 AM

**Doesn't matter. The government still has no right to tell adults what they can or cannot consume.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Mary Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 5:51 PM

**Mr. Tallman: Thank you for this article. It told much I hadn't read before. The positive effects of prohibition are not widely disseminated.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**thomas Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 5:49 PM

**Tallman, like others, uses stats to make his case. The problem is, stats don't lie but liars use stats. In 1934 most people could hardly afford food let alone liquor. No wonder alcohol consumption was down. What was the number in 1928 or 29? That would be a better comparison. The number of deaths and hospital admissions increased 3-4 times from 1920 to 1928. If you want the history of alcohol prohibition click below. It's a bit different than Tallman writes.**

**<http://www.druglibrary.org/schaffer/library/studies/nc/nc2a.htm>**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**John C Wrote:**  
Nov 18, 2010 12:12 AM

Gentle Readers,

Dear thomas,

People living in the 1930s had more disposable income than people living in the 19th century and a technologically based infrastructure capable of bringing large quantities of consumer goods, including alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Tallman is correct.

Sincerely,

John Lepant

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**David Wrote:**  
Nov 18, 2010 12:24 AM

They may have had more disposable income in the 1920's, but by the 1930's , disposable income was almost nill.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Sharon Wrote:**  
Nov 17, 2010 3:00 PM

There is no myth that the Christian U.S. of our fathers is being halted by the ACLU (jew organization). They have removed the pledge, flag, cross and public prayer. They promote homosexual behavior.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**BryanKD Wrote:**  
Nov 17, 2010 3:26 PM

" by the ACLU (jew organization). "

Got your brown shirt and arm band ready? Time to go goose stepping. Genuine Christans are not anti-semite boobs.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**John C Wrote:**  
Nov 18, 2010 12:12 AM

Dear BryanKD,

Thank you, Sir!

John Lepant

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

There are More Comments on this Thread. [Click Here To See them All](#)

**Gayle Wrote:**  
Nov 17, 2010 2:30 PM

I'm all for the legalization of drugs with the one restriction that sales be regulated locally and advertisement be restricted to the locality in which it was sold. I would also like to see the advertising of alcohol and tobacco to be curtailed. The advertising is extremely misleading. Alcohol and tobacco don't make you look smarter, sexier, or more sophisticated, they just make you less healthy and lower your inhibitions prompting you to do things that you wouldn't do if you were exercising any self control.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**BryanKD Wrote:**  
Nov 17, 2010 3:01 PM

Regulate advertising? That is the same sort of tyranny as prohibition. Anybody selling a product should be able to exercise free speech in advertising messages. Are we to think that people are so stupid as to slavishly buy anything they see advertised? What about the CHILDREN? The latter, though a favorite Democrat-socialist theme justifying whatever hideous social program or regulatory oppresioon they're pushing this week, DOES have some minimal validity. Of course, as with alcohol, selling to kiddies would be illegal. But really, advertising appeals to potential customers; adults. It is up to PARENTS to regulate what thier children do or do not buy. If US Tobacco wants to advertise the benefits of "Maui Wowie," fine with me. I won't buy it.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 1:19 PM

As a former police officer and prosecutor, I believe you would be amazed at the consumption of marijuana. Many people do not appear to even realize it is illegal. Others believe that like moonshine whiskey, there is nothing wrong with it, it is just illegal. When 10 ton quantities are being discovered routinely, the demand in the U.S. must be extremely high. Tax it like cigarettes, and watch the general coffers fill.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**BryanKD Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 1:49 PM

How utterly true. Just visit most any small university town; small enough that the college population dominate the local politics. In most cases I've observed the marijuana laws are literally not enforced. I've seen people sucking on "joints" right in front of cops who, like the proverbial sergeant Shultz of "Hogan's Heroes" seem to be saying, "I see nothing, NOTHING!"

Then there's the matter of wasting law enforcement time, money, and energy eforcing victimless crimes. Something like 80% of the folks in our prisons-jails are there due to drug "crimes." Moreover such absurd laws make thousands (heavily minority) youths into felons for no good reason,.

There's an organization of current and former police officials who FAVOR drug de-criminalization. They make an excellent case.

<http://leap.cc/cms/index.php>

5

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**anonymous Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 4:41 PM

Sounds good in theory, but first look at other countries like the Netherlands where the drug laws are lax enough to effectively be non existent. Has it worked out for them?

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**TonyXL Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 1:11 PM

Since innocent people were killed due to the illegality of a liquid during Prohibition, one can conclude that this author is not pro-life.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**olive Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 12:59 PM

Why worry about the deficit? Why not just apply some more 'supply-side' theory as the Republicans did during the entire George W. Bush 'Reign of Error'?

Let's not forget the four tenants of supply-side theory.

- 1.) Tax cuts increase revenue.
- 2.) Deficits do not matter.
- 3.) The more debt there is, the more opportunities there are for tax cuts in the future.
- 4.) Every program that the federal government creates or expands presents yet another opportunity for a tax cut.

I suggest you read Alan Greenspan's book 'Age of Turbulence' where he says that in 2001 the USA had 'budget surpluses as far as the eye can see.'

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Gayle Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 2:32 PM

Olive, you need to quit smoking weed then posting on TH. This article has nothing to do with George W. Bush, taxes, deficits or republicans.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Thomas Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 2:43 PM

Oh Olive, you silly goose! Dont you know that the Democrats controlled spending while GWB was our president?

You also probably failed to realize that that surplus Greenspan was talking about came from a Republican congress.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive



There are More Comments on this Thread. [Click Here To See them All](#)



**None Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 12:37 PM

No, the question is, when has governemnt been able to stop people from doing what they want to do? The next question is, when should government try to stop people from doing what they want to do? The third question is, why do you want to stop people from doing what they want to do? The fourth question is, if you want to try to stop people from doing what they want to do, does the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages? Just a couple of the questions that need to be asked and answered.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Jim Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 12:25 PM

There were many more, and serious harms done than goods done. It's the same with the war on drugs.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Happy Jake Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 12:01 PM

It seems that a great many people here are missing the point. Tallman is not saying "Prohibition actually worked." He is merely saying "it wasn't an unmitigated failure." Neither is he arguing for a return to prohibition. All he's saying is that using the "Prohibition was a failure" argument to counter arguments opposing illegal drugs and similar, vice-related, crimes shouldn't be the end-all-be-all, and that, shockingly, just like EVERYTHING else, there's a side to the story that we don't ever hear, anymore.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**sinner Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 11:51 AM

only those that want their wrongs to be seen as right want their right to do wrong protected.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Joe on St. Croix Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 11:45 AM

Dazzle me with numbers! Sorry Mr. Talman, your assessment just doesn't add up. Crime increased remarkably and became Corporate in its organization; a factor that echos in today's criminal enterprises. Crimelords became tremendously wealthy and were able to buy and corrupt politicians on a grand scale. This is happening today in South and Central America thanks to today's prohibitions. In my own youth, attending college in a State where liquor was tightly controlled, I saw more drunkenness than I saw in my home town of NYC (Manhattan, of course). There are other ways to help addictive personalities, but sometimes you can't do anything. In steps the Federal Government to help, where it has no conceivable business being involved, and to tell people what they can smoke or drink. Today we have armies of police, and even military personel, waging a War on Drugs. Well, the word is that the drug dealers and users have won, and will continue to win. Hundreds of thousands of individuals are incarcerated, tens of thousands of lives have been lost, billions of dollars have been wasted to stop the unstoppable. By the way, cocaine and marijuana are ancient; heroin dates back to the 1890's. How did man ever survive without Federal interdiction?

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**BryanKD Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 10:46 AM

Mr. Tallman misses the central point in the prohibition arguement. It is NONE of the government's business what adult individuals choose to put into thier OWN bodies! Nor is it the concern of any government what any adult individual does sexually with a consenting adult partner. Nor is it any business of any level or

branch of government what a woman does regarding a pregnancy. Oppose abortion? Fine, then don't have one. You may even counsel women to not have them. But government sanctions? NO, never.

Lest you mistake me for a liberal-socialist, think again. I've been a "movement conservative" ever since I worked in the Goldwater campaign as a kid. I noticed Andrew hails from the Phoenix area. The "sage of Camelback Mountain" and founder of today's conservative movement was similarly libertarian in his views. If government attempts to enforce a particular set of moral imperatives in individual choices regarding drugs, sex, or marriage, in what way does that differ from the same oppressive government telling us wha to eat, drive, wear, what to do with our own money etc.? Do I advocate drug use or sexual perversion? Absolutely NOT. I'm a recovering alcoholic (24 years) and believer in the ethics common to western civilization. I just don't think I have any right to make such choices for others or, worse, to use FORCE (which is all government really IS) to inflict my views on others. We are first and last INDIVIDUALS. That is the very essence of being a free man-woman and an American.

Would I have government approve drunkenness, drug use, sexual perversions? NO! But that's not the issue. Simply ALLOWING some form of behavior does NOT indicate APPROVAL. Just means "none of my business."

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**bhan999 Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 11:38 AM

A constitutional amendment was passed making it the Federal Government's business. Then it was repealed.

Except for taxes and standards, states and the people put controls on alcoholic consumption (10th Amendment).

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**BryanKD Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 1:29 PM

I was NOT speaking about law but of justice. No law or constitution can make something as oppressive as prohibition RIGHT, just legal. Law and reason are not only frequently different but more often than not at odds. Legislatures may pass as many stupid unreasonable laws as they wish and people will, with greatest relish, DISOBEY 'em.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive



There are More Comments on this Thread. Click Here To See them All



**Jack Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 8:24 AM

I find it odd that Andrew Tallman is trying to speak with reasonable skepticism about long held beliefs such as Prohibition Failed when he offers little research to back up his claims. In fact, if someone tries to check the facts they'll find evidence to the contrary. Not only did prohibition fail, it actually INCREASED the number of alcohol related deaths and that the claims that it was decreased was based on faulty data. Check the facts and the research. It shows that Tallman is dead wrong and the crazies who think the Drug War is a bad idea are right.

<http://www.druglibrary.org/Prohibitionresults.htm>

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Francis W. Porretto Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 8:02 AM

"The main benefit of Prohibition was ... you guessed it ... people drank a lot less alcohol."

Let's stipulate that for the moment. Would you care to argue that all the social chaos, the blood in the streets, and the cancerous growth of organized crime mattered LESS than that people drank less? Because if you do, you have the oddest definition for "it worked" that I've ever encountered.

Oh, by the way, it's not legitimate to be dogmatic about the "people drank less" bit either. They who moonshined and bootlegged, who recurred to speakeasies, and who brewed their own beer and wine -- all legal activities even under the Eighteenth Amendment -- are highly unlikely to have been accurately included in any such assessment.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Sharon Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 3:03 PM

I thought they were trying to create a higher demand so they could profit more.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Dorthy Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 11:40 PM

**Why did the Federal government overstep its boundaries and choose to prohibit an activity that the state had the power to regulate as it saw fit?**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Douglas Paul Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 12:23 AM

**Because thats what the federal government does. And we have been indoctrinated to think they are the ultimate authority.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Independent in Texas Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 12:44 PM

**Dufus (writing as Dorothy): by definition the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States put it within federal jurisdiction.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive



**There are More Comments on this Thread. Click Here To See them All**



**Dorothy Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 11:12 PM

**And Amen! Mankind does not progress or evolve.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Dorothy Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 11:09 PM

**I would rather organized crime stayed in the bootlegging business rather than taking up residence in the government. But I suppose they have always been there too.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Sharon Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 3:04 PM

**Yes and remove the criminal federal reserve.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Roy-WV Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 11:05 PM

**I'm not surprised to see Mississippi mentioned as having retained some parts of \*prohibition\* until fairly.. I lived in Harrison (Biloxi) and Jackson (Pascagoula, sp.)at times during the 60s and, tho I didn;t see the need for hard liquor, I found the absence of such to be weird. Asking around I was informed of a \*tax\* (laughingly called "Bootlegger or Sheriff's tax") which meant you COULD IN FACT buy liquor, but had to pay this self-imposed, by State/County, Tax.. I guess that was what made the job of Sheriff" albiet low paying, one of the most sought after jobs around!! At least that was the local legend! I truly liked that area and took a side trip to the Casinos a day or two after 9-11..Didn't even recognize \*The Point\* etc..In a word U can't go back to anything!!**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Danny Wrote:**

Nov 17, 2010 8:18 AM

**Anybody who was living in Mississippi in the early 1960's will tell you that it was cheaper to have liquor delivered to your residence by a bootlegger in Mississippi before prohibition ended than to buy it in a legal outlet after. Prohibition continued to exist in Mississippi due to the connivance of the bootleggers, the ministers and the politicians.**

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Donjindra Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 10:48 PM

**I suppose it was inevitable that conservative revisionism would eventually get to Prohibition. Authoritarians simply refuse to believe their authority is inept. So they resort to fantasy. The truth is that alcohol**

consumption probably did not go down during Prohibition. True, legal sales went down. And that makes measurement very difficult. When a product is made illegal it stands to reason that the vast majority of business is hard to track. Nevertheless, there is no solid evidence to suggest consumption went down. The only way to "measure" consumption during those years is by way of proxies, like alcohol related arrests and deaths. Those are open to interpretation. But most interpretations estimate there may have been a short-term effect but that effect reduced to zero within a few short years.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Douglas Paul Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 11:42 PM

Donjindra, spot on, this is nothing but revisionist, wishfull thinking.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Trig Palin Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 9:43 PM

Stupid, poorly-reasoned article (and at TH of all places! I'm shocked!). If you're going to make the argument that Prohibition was, in some meaningful way, a "success" based on the fact that it reduced alcohol-related deaths and illnesses, then you would also be obliged to agree that banning cars would be a prudent course of action because it would drastically reduce or eliminate motor vehicle-related deaths. The same with guns, tobacco, and a limitless number of other things.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Dorothy Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 11:15 PM

What has happened to driving fatalities due to the serious banning of drunk driving? Why would guns be considered immoral?

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

**Douglas Paul Wrote:**

Nov 16, 2010 11:43 PM

Ted, if you are the Ted that I think you are, we finally agree.

Login to Reply

Flag as Offensive

« Previous 1 2 Next »

[About Townhall](#) | [Become a Partner](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Radio Stations](#) | [Sitemap](#) | [Jobs](#) | [Contact Us:](#)

[Townhall](#) | [Conservative Columnists](#) | [Election Results](#) | [Tipsheet](#) | [Conservative News](#) | [Political Cartoons](#) | [Talk Radio](#)  
[Conservative Video](#) | [Photos](#) | [Community](#) | [Issues in Politics](#) | [Townhall Magazine](#) | [Finance](#) | [Townhall Radio](#)

[abortion](#) [immigration](#) [global warming](#) [congress](#) [Barack Obama](#) [Sarah Palin](#) [Townhall Magazine](#) [2010 taxes](#) [health care 2012](#)  
[war on terror](#) [Afganistan](#) [Iraq](#) [Iran](#) [Israel](#) [Glenn Beck](#) [Fox News](#) [second ammendment](#) [spending](#) [Constitution](#) [labor unions](#)  
[elections](#) [Tea Party](#) [environment](#) [marriage](#) [energy](#) [Christianity](#) [culture](#) [courts](#) [faith](#) [Supreme Court](#)  
[Chris Christie](#) [national security](#) [jobs](#) [economy](#) [finance](#) [MSM](#) [defense](#) [education](#) [Hollywood](#) [Founding Fathers](#) [Islam](#) [foreign affairs](#)

Read the latest conservative news and political commentary from the #1 conservative news source - Townhall.com. Stay up to date with news headlines, political news, and conservative opinion with Townhall columnists including Ann Coulter, Michelle Malkin, Bill O'Rielly, Dick Morris, Ken Blackwell, Michael Barone, Charles Krauthammer, Star Parker, Dennis Prager, Thomas Sowell, George Will, and many more of your favorite conservatives. Get your fix of funny political cartoons full of satire and political humor from editorial cartoonists including Michael Ramirez, Glenn McCoy, and Henry Payne. Townhall.com also features the latest news videos and pictures on the latest political hot topics. Get the latest news on hot topics including health care reform, the economy, immigration, government tax, President Obama, Sarah Palin, Iraq, Arizona politics, gay marriage laws, and many more big news issues. As an extension of Townhall.com, Townhall Magazine offers more than what you find online. Our conservative magazine coverage features investigative journalism, in-depth reporting, heavily researched analysis, interviews with the heavy hitters and powerful exposés - all in a monthly news and opinion journal from the same team of right-thinking reporters, opinions makers, insiders and political leaders conservatives have trusted for 15 years. In addition to being the leader news source for conservatives, Townhall provides the latest business and finance news at Townhall Finance. Get up to date stock market numbers, financial advice, and track your investments in your stock portfolio. Townhall - Your Source for Conservative News, Cartoons, Issues, Blogs, Finance & Magazine.



Copyright © 2010 Salem Web Network. All Rights Reserved. Terms under which this service is provided to you

