

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Prohibition

in a Hurry

Banning booze, and creating the mob

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 7

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 32

Use It 37

Terms 42

Go Deeper 46

Notes and Sources 48

Bibliography 58

The Whole Thing in One Page

Prohibition is remembered as a joke with excellent costumes. America banned drink, people carried on drinking, Al Capone got rich, and thirteen years later the country came to its senses. Photographs support this version: speakeasies, agents tipping barrels into gutters, gangsters beside polished cars. Almost every image is real. The conclusion is not.

The campaign began with a serious problem. Alcohol was cheap, saloons were woven into male work and political life, and drunkenness could turn a wage packet into an empty cupboard before many wives had much independent legal or economic protection. Temperance reformers tried persuasion, pledges, licensing and local bans. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union made drink a national moral question. The Anti-Saloon League turned that question into a machine for counting votes. War supplied the final opening. Beer could be portrayed as wasted grain, German-American breweries as suspect, and opposition as disloyal.

The Eighteenth Amendment did not ban drinking. It prohibited the manufacture, sale, transport, import and export of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes. The Volstead Act defined intoxicating with startling severity: 0.5 per cent alcohol by volume. Private stocks acquired before the law took effect could still be consumed at home. Medicine, religion and industry operated through exceptions. The law erased the ordinary legal supply chain while leaving demand and lawful channels in place.

It changed behaviour. Drinking fell, especially early, and so did several indicators of alcohol-related harm. Exact totals are uncertain because an illegal market does not file honest returns, wartime controls began before national Prohibition, and illness responds slowly. The claim that nobody drank less is untenable. So is the claim that the ban achieved abstinence.

Where demand survived, price rose to include risk. Beer was bulky, spirits concentrated, and every hand between still and glass required payment, secrecy or protection. Existing gangs, gamblers, corrupt officials and smugglers did not need Prohibition to invent crime. They needed it to supply

a mass market with repeat customers and high margins. Bootlegging brought capital, lorries, boats, warehouses, telephones, political purchase and territory worth killing over. Prohibition did not create the Mafia from nothing. It enlarged selected organisations and helped create the richer, more connected and more visible mob that entered American memory.

The federal design that helped make the amendment possible also weakened enforcement. Federal and state governments held concurrent power, while local police, juries and voters often disagreed about whether the law deserved help. A continental ban depended on thousands of local choices. At its peak, the federal Prohibition Bureau employed about 4,300 people. Congress itself had a bootlegger making roughly twenty-five deliveries a day.

Repeal came through another coalition. Scandals, cultural conflict and organised crime damaged legitimacy. The Depression made jobs and alcohol tax revenue harder to dismiss. Women who had been assumed dry organised for repeal. In 1933 the Twenty-first Amendment ended national Prohibition, but it did not restore the old saloon world untouched. States gained broad authority, licences and excise returned, and many places stayed dry.

The ban reduced some harm, displaced other harm and changed who supplied the drink. Its deepest lesson is not that prohibition always fails. It is that removing a legal market does not remove demand, and the law must answer for what fills the space.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

For ten years, the United States Congress had its own bootlegger.

George Cassiday returned from the First World War and began by finding alcohol for two members of the House of Representatives. Both had voted for Prohibition. Business expanded. Wearing a green hat and carrying bottles in a leather briefcase, he passed through the Capitol often enough to

average about twenty-five deliveries a day. Police recognised him. Legislators knew what he did. After the House barred him, he moved his route to the Senate and continued. Access to illegal drink followed access to power. The Capitol that had sent national Prohibition to the states for ratification contained a private distribution network protected by status, familiarity and reluctance to expose colleagues.

This is funny until you ask what kind of law can be broken so openly by the people who made it. The easy answer is hypocrisy, and there was plenty. The more useful answer is that Prohibition exposed a gap between legal command and social cooperation. Congress could amend the Constitution. It could close breweries, issue permits, hire agents and prosecute traffickers. It could not make every voter, doctor, police officer, judge, juror, mayor, hotel manager and congressman treat a drink as conduct worth suppressing. Enforcement was a chain of human decisions, and a chain breaks wherever enough links decline the work.

That makes Prohibition a better case study than its reputation suggests. It lets you watch three things happen at once.

First, a reform can address a real harm and choose an instrument that creates new ones. Heavy drinking damaged health, wages and families. The early dry years reduced consumption and some measurable harm. Those gains belong in the account. So do toxic illicit liquor, corrupt enforcement, violent distribution and unequal intrusion into communities with less power to protect private space. Calling the episode either a public-health triumph or a comic failure discards half the evidence.

Second, a market does not vanish when its lawful sellers do. The legal producer can be closed by inspection. The illegal producer survives by hiding, bribing or moving. That selection pressure changes the product and the firm. Concentrated spirits travel better than barrels of beer. Large operators can afford boats, warehouses, lawyers, informants and officials. Violence becomes more useful because a contract for contraband cannot be taken to court. The law did not leave crime unchanged. It altered which criminal organisations could win.

Third, political coalitions often unite around different meanings of the same policy. One dry voter wanted to protect women and children. Another wanted disciplined workers. Another distrusted Catholic immigrants, German brewers or city machines. Another saw alcohol as a disease-producing commodity. Those motives could vote together before anyone had to agree on the exact law. The Volstead Act then supplied a stricter definition than some supporters expected, and enforcement forced the coalition's contradictions into view.

The subject matters beyond drink, but analogy needs restraint. Alcohol is a legal intoxicant in most of the modern world, with deep cultural roots, repeat demand and a product that can be made in kitchens, farms and factories. No other prohibited market has exactly the same chemistry, users, geography or institutions. The transferable question is narrower: when government suppresses supply, what happens to demand, price, product strength, enforcement, supplier selection and legitimacy?

Prohibition gives unusually clear answers because America tried the policy at constitutional scale and then formally reversed it. The reversal did not erase regulation. It produced a different settlement built around licences, taxation, controlled outlets and local choice. The country did not move from control to freedom. It moved from one architecture of control to another.

The gangsters are worth meeting. The mechanism that made them matters more.

The Core Ideas

The Saloon Made Drink Political

Prohibition makes no sense if alcohol begins as a private taste. Reformers did not look at a glass and see a harmless pleasure that happened to be overused. They saw a traffic: manufacturers, wholesalers, saloon keepers and political allies making money from a substance whose heaviest costs often landed on people with the least control over its purchase.

The saloon concentrated the argument. In the late nineteenth-century city it could be a bar, dining room, social club, hiring point, news exchange and ward office. It offered warmth and company to men living in crowded lodgings or working long shifts. Immigrant communities found familiar language and association there. Political machines found voters, organisers and places where favours could be exchanged. Brewers often financed retailers or tied them to their brands. The saloon was embedded because it did useful work as well as harmful work.

Its benefits and costs were distributed differently. The customer was commonly male. Depending on state, class and year, a wife could have little independent income, limited control of property and few effective protections from violence or abandonment. If a wage was drunk before it reached home, the children did not get a vote on the transaction. Reformers therefore framed temperance as home protection, not as an argument about refined personal preference. To them, the liquor trade had converted one person's purchase into another person's hunger, injury or insecurity.

This explains the unusual political energy of women in the movement. Women entered temperance work before most could vote nationally because alcohol gave private suffering a public cause. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, founded in 1874, built local chapters, petitions, education campaigns and a broad programme of social reform. Frances Willard's leadership connected temperance to women's political power. The movement could be moralistic, coercive and hostile to cultures it did not respect. It was also one of the routes by which women learnt to organise beyond the household.

The target shifted over time. Early temperance often meant moderation or voluntary abstinence. Repeated pledges and moral appeals seemed inadequate against an industry that could recruit new customers and reward political protection. Reformers moved from changing the drinker to closing the seller, from temperance to prohibition. Local-option laws let towns or counties vote themselves dry. States experimented with bans. The campaign accumulated legal practice long before Washington acted.

There was no single dry motive. Employers could hope for more reliable labour. Progressives could see alcohol as a public-health and urban-governance problem. Rural Protestants could resent city saloons tied to Catholic and immigrant life. Black reformers could condemn alcohol's damage while confronting racist policing and white violence. Some labour leaders supported restrictions; others saw them as class discipline imposed by people who drank in private.

The saloon made these motives compatible because it was a visible institution joining drink, money and politics. Closing it promised to protect the home, clean the city, weaken a hated industry and defeat a rival culture in one action. That breadth won votes. It also concealed how little the coalition agreed about the behaviour that should follow once the saloon door was shut. Reformers chose the seller as the strategic target because a premises, licence and commercial interest were easier to identify than millions of private decisions. The choice made political sense before it became an enforcement problem.

A Movement Built a Constitutional Machine

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union made prohibition a mass cause. The Anti-Saloon League made it a legislative result.

Founded in Oberlin, Ohio, in 1893, the League was designed around one issue. It did not need a candidate to share its whole programme. It asked whether the candidate would vote dry, then organised churches, newspapers, petitions and local workers around the answer. A politician could disagree with the League on tariffs, banks or foreign policy and still receive its support. A wet vote could bring a concentrated campaign at the next election. The opposing drinker cared about many things. The League cared about one.

Wayne Wheeler became the system's most effective operator. He understood that a disciplined minority can dominate an issue when the majority's attention is divided. The League gathered voting records, identified vulnerable legislators and treated party labels as secondary. It

backed dry Democrats against wet Democrats and dry Republicans against wet Republicans. The method later became known as pressure politics, but the pressure was less mysterious than its reputation. It converted intensity into credible electoral punishment.

The movement advanced from the outside in. Local options created dry districts. State laws created larger dry territories. Each victory weakened the legal liquor trade, trained campaigners and made national prohibition seem less abrupt. By the time the Eighteenth Amendment was ratified, a majority of states already had prohibition laws. National action did not descend on a uniformly wet country. It attempted to bind together places that had already chosen dryness with large cities and communities that had not.

Much of the organising power came from women who still lacked a national vote. Their petitions, churches and local organisations influenced legislatures before the Nineteenth Amendment changed the electorate. Political power was wider than the ballot, although the absence of votes still limited who could punish or reward a legislator directly.

Constitutional amendment solved a strategic problem. Ordinary federal legislation could be challenged as beyond Congress's power, changed by a later majority or undermined by interstate trade. An amendment put the principle above ordinary politics and gave both Congress and the states power to enforce it. Drys wanted permanence. They selected the hardest legal container available.

The First World War supplied the final acceleration. Grain used for drink could be described as stolen from food and fuel. German-American brewers became vulnerable to suspicion after the United States entered the war. Dry propaganda fused beer with disloyalty and portrayed the liquor traffic as wasteful, foreign and treacherous. Wartime measures restricted distilling and then beer and wine before constitutional Prohibition began. By January 1920, national dryness arrived after years of local restrictions and months of federal wartime controls.

The war mattered enormously without being the origin. The movement had

spent decades creating dry states, political discipline and a constitutional proposal. War changed the cost of resisting it. Legislators who might have defended beer, local custom or federal restraint could now be accused of protecting waste or German interests while soldiers fought abroad. An old campaign acquired emergency language.

That victory carried a defect. Coalitions formed around a destination can postpone disagreement about the route. Some voters imagined the end of the saloon and hard liquor. Some expected moderate beer to survive. Some wanted total abstinence. The Eighteenth Amendment did not define intoxicating liquor. Congress did that later, through the Volstead Act, after ratification had been secured.

The campaign's skill therefore outran its agreement. It won the constitutional power to prohibit before the country had faced the exact meaning of prohibition. The machine was excellent at getting to yes. Enforcement would require millions of people to keep saying yes after they saw the details.

The Law Banned a Trade, Not a Thirst

The Eighteenth Amendment is often remembered through a verb it did not contain. It did not prohibit drinking. It prohibited manufacture, sale, transportation, importation and exportation of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes.

That distinction was deliberate and consequential. Lawmakers attacked the supply system rather than making every drinker the direct object of federal prosecution. The Volstead Act supplied penalties, enforcement powers and the missing definition. A beverage containing 0.5 per cent alcohol by volume or more counted as intoxicating. The threshold reached ordinary beer and light wine, surprising people who had expected the amendment to remove the saloon and spirits while sparing weaker drinks.

The law still contained channels. Alcohol could be manufactured and used under permit for industry, medicine and religious rites, subject to restrictions. People could keep and consume liquor lawfully acquired before Prohibition in their own homes. Purchase itself was not specifically made a federal

crime, a point the Supreme Court confirmed in 1930. These were not trivial drafting quirks. They shaped behaviour, enforcement and inequality.

A wealthy household could stock a cellar before the deadline and drink from it without entering the street market for years. A doctor could prescribe whiskey within the permit system. Clergy could obtain sacramental wine. Industry required alcohol for solvents, medicines, fuels and manufacturing, so substantial legitimate flows continued. Each legal channel created records and controls. Each also offered a possible point of diversion or fraud. The same liquid could be lawful in a bonded warehouse, unlawful in a delivery lorry and lawful again as evidence in court. Purpose, paperwork and route mattered alongside chemistry.

The supply ban nevertheless had force. Legal breweries producing full-strength beer disappeared. Distilleries and wineries closed, converted or survived through permitted products. Saloons lost lawful stock. Prices rose. Many citizens obeyed because the law had authority, drink became harder to obtain, social habits changed or the risk was not worth it. Evidence from consumption estimates and alcohol-related indicators shows a substantial early decline.

The exact size cannot be read from a clean national ledger. Illegal sellers hid output. Drinkers shifted between beer, spirits, home production, medicinal supplies and substitutes. Wartime restrictions and state bans had already reduced availability before January 1920. Cirrhosis deaths reflect years of exposure and other influences. A peer-reviewed study estimated that constitutional Prohibition reduced cirrhosis by about 10 to 20 per cent, but that is an econometric result with assumptions, not a direct count of saved lives.

The law therefore neither erased thirst nor bounced harmlessly off it. It changed the price, convenience, setting, product and social meaning of drinking. Occasional drinkers were more likely to stop or reduce than people willing to search, pay or break rules. Beer lost ground because water and glass made it bulky. Spirits carried more alcohol in the same car, boat or suitcase. What survived was selected for intensity and concealment.

This is the first correction needed to understand the mob. A market can shrink and become more criminal at the same time. Lower total consumption does not prevent the remaining illegal trade from producing high margins. The customer base need not include everyone. It needs enough repeat buyers willing to pay for supply, and a law severe enough to keep lawful competitors out.

Prohibition's result was not one number called success. It was a bundle: less drinking, less of some harm, more illicit profit, more dangerous supply and a permanent contest over whether the law deserved cooperation.

Illegality Put a Premium on Every Bottle

A bottle of legal whiskey contains grain, labour, time, glass, transport, tax and profit. A bottle of illegal whiskey must pay for those things plus secrecy.

That extra price is the prohibition premium. It covers the chance that a still will be seized, a boat intercepted, a driver arrested, a warehouse raided or a retailer betrayed. It pays lookouts, false papers, lawyers and officials willing to look elsewhere. It compensates each participant for handling a contract that cannot be enforced in an ordinary court. The premium does not require gangsters to invent greed. The law creates it by excluding legal suppliers while demand remains.

The illegal trade formed a chain. Alcohol could be distilled in rural stills, made from industrial supplies, produced in hidden urban plants, diverted from permits or imported from Canada, the Caribbean and Europe. Boats waited beyond territorial waters. Smaller craft ran cargo ashore. Lorries moved it inland. Warehouses broke bulk. Wholesalers allocated territory. Speakeasies, restaurants, clubs, hotels and private sellers completed the route. Many operators performed only one link.

Contraband therefore did not always begin in a hidden still. It could begin as lawful stock under government control and change legal character through a false permit, arranged theft or diverted shipment. The line between regulated alcohol and illegal alcohol was sometimes a document, a destination and an official willing to accept both.

Transport altered the product. A barrel of beer contains a great deal of water and yields less alcohol for the same space, weight and risk than spirits. Smugglers therefore had an incentive to carry concentrated liquor. Retailers could dilute it later, relabel inferior stock or mix it into cocktails. Prohibition did not merely reduce access. It changed the composition and information quality of what remained.

Quality became a market problem. A familiar legal label could be refilled. A customer could not complain to a regulator about counterfeit gin. Some illicit alcohol was competently made. Some was contaminated by poor distilling, private adulteration or industrial denaturants. Industrial alcohol had been made deliberately undrinkable before national Prohibition, chiefly to separate tax-free industrial use from beverage use. Bootleggers diverted some of it and tried to remove the additives.

In late 1926 federal policy required harsher formulas while officials knew redistillation continued. Toxic industrial alcohol entered illegal beverages alongside liquor poisoned by bad production or private adulteration. Agents were not secretly dosing drinks in bars, and no sound national total isolates deaths caused by the formula change. The narrower charge is enough: the policy increased a known hazard in order to deter diversion and exposed people consuming diverted alcohol to foreseeable harm.

Scale could improve survival. A small operator was flexible and hard to find, yet a large organisation could spread risk, finance inventories, maintain vehicles, buy information and replace losses. It could also corrupt enough of the enforcement chain to make size safer rather than more visible. Once officials were paid, volume became an advantage.

Violence performed jobs that law normally performs. It enforced debts, protected territory, punished theft, deterred informants and settled disputes. Most transactions did not end in gunfire, because constant violence is bad for trade. Its possibility mattered. A reputation for force could substitute for a written contract and a court order.

This did not make every bootlegger a member of a syndicate. Farmers,

fishermen, pharmacists, household producers and opportunists entered the market. Nor did one organisation control the country. Geography produced different systems: border smuggling, coastal rum-running, rural moonshine, urban wholesale networks and local political arrangements. The common mechanism was the premium.

Every successful seizure could raise prices by increasing scarcity and risk. Every selective bribe could give the protected supplier an advantage over the honest competitor. Enforcement could suppress the market and concentrate it in the same movement. The firms best able to survive prohibition were often the firms most capable of buying secrecy or imposing it.

Enforcement Depended on People Who Did Not Agree

The Eighteenth Amendment gave Congress and the states concurrent power to enforce Prohibition. The phrase sounded like reinforcement. In practice, it let every level of government expect another to carry more of the burden.

Dry strategists assumed state and local criminal-justice systems would do much of the work. That kept the amendment compatible with states' rights and avoided the cost of creating a vast federal police force. Yet national Prohibition was hardest to enforce in precisely the places where local voters, mayors, police, prosecutors and juries were least committed to it. A dry constitutional majority did not produce uniform local consent.

The country was too large for federal substitution. Agents had to monitor borders, coasts, factories, pharmacies, railways, roads, farms, warehouses and cities. The Prohibition Unit initially sat inside the Bureau of Internal Revenue, an administrative home that treated illicit liquor partly as a permit and tax-control problem. Corruption, weak recruitment and organised resistance damaged it. In 1927 the unit became a separate Bureau of Prohibition and attempted to professionalise. At its peak, it employed about 4,300 people. That total included the organisation's staff, not 4,300 agents

patrolling every route in America.

Enforcement was a sequence, not an arrest. An informant or investigator had to find the offence. A search had to be lawful enough to survive challenge. Evidence had to identify the responsible person rather than a room containing bottles. Prosecutors needed time. Courts and prisons needed capacity. Juries had to convict neighbours for conduct they might practise themselves. Property owners could be targeted through nuisance and padlock proceedings, but closing one premises did not remove the customer.

Federal courts absorbed enormous numbers of liquor cases. Plea bargaining and administrative routines expanded because full trials for every violation were impossible. Assistant Attorney General Mabel Walker Willebrandt became one of the most visible federal enforcers, coordinating prosecutions and using tax and nuisance law as well as direct liquor charges. The effort enlarged federal criminal administration even while it failed to create uniform obedience. States could withdraw support without changing federal law. When local enforcement receded, constitutional validity remained, but the distance between the written rule and the street widened.

Corruption was not an external accident. The law generated a repeated bargain between profitable sellers and officials whose discretion controlled access. A single bribe could be cheaper than repeated seizures. A protected operator could then charge the same illegal premium while facing less risk. Honest agents confronted colleagues, politicians or police departments with reasons not to cooperate.

The burden also fell unevenly. Affluent drinkers could use private clubs, guarded homes, doctors and established suppliers. Enforcement histories repeatedly show poorer, Black and immigrant communities facing raids, street policing and federal intrusion more directly, although the records do not support one clean national disparity ratio. Local prejudice could decide which drink looked like private recreation and which looked like criminal disorder. A formally national rule entered institutions already divided by

class and race.

This is why open defiance by legislators mattered. George Cassiday's congressional route showed that lawbreakers did not all reject Prohibition as a principle. Some supported a ban for other people while keeping access for themselves. Selective compliance preserved votes and destroyed legitimacy.

A law can survive some evasion. It cannot easily survive when enforcement appears both omnipresent and optional: intrusive for the exposed, negotiable for the connected, and dependent on officials who do not share the rule's moral urgency.

Prohibition Accelerated the Mob

Organised crime did not wait for 1920. American cities already contained gambling businesses, brothels, protection rackets, street gangs, corrupt political relationships and illegal markets. Italian criminal traditions existed alongside Irish, Jewish, Black and other networks. The word Mafia names a particular set of organisations and inheritances, not every group of men selling contraband.

Prohibition changed the opportunity. Gambling depends on repeated bets, but its customer base and locations can be limited. Alcohol had been a mass legal commodity consumed across class lines. Closing lawful supply handed criminals a product with broad demand, frequent repurchase and a price lifted by risk. It was a growth market protected from legal competition by the Constitution.

Johnny Torrio and Al Capone entered that opening in Chicago through an organisation that already operated vice and protection. Capone had belonged to a New York street gang before moving west around 1920. He did not become a criminal because beer was banned. Bootlegging gave him and his rivals a larger commercial system to contest. Breweries, delivery routes, saloons, suburban protection and official influence could now be joined into an enterprise.

Territory mattered because distribution was physical. A gang that controlled a brewery or import route still needed retailers and roads. Expansion crossed another organisation's claims. Violence could remove rivals, warn defectors and display capacity, although the most successful business arrangements also relied on negotiation, shared suppliers and political protection. The surviving photographs overrepresent the bodies because quiet delivery leaves less evidence.

The St Valentine's Day Massacre supplied the era's most durable image. On 14 February 1929, seven members or associates of George Moran's organisation were shot against a Chicago garage wall by attackers posing as police. The killings were generally attributed to Capone's organisation, but Capone was in Florida and no conviction established his responsibility. The episode made a local gang war look like the governing picture of national life.

There was no single Capone model. In some cities bootleggers took over established gambling operations. Elsewhere gamblers and liquor suppliers remained separate and cooperated when useful. Black numbers operators, Jewish and Italian bootleggers, Canadian producers, Caribbean suppliers, corrupt officials and legitimate businesses interacted in different arrangements. Telephones, lorries, ships, warehouses and credit linked them more effectively than a mythical national board meeting.

The largest gains appeared where illegal enterprise could attach itself to existing transport, finance, vice markets and political protection. Prohibition rewarded criminal capacity already in place rather than distributing opportunity evenly. This is why a national law generated regional criminal systems instead of one national company.

For some organisations, the durable gains were organisational. Illegal alcohol could supply capital and practice in logistics, secrecy, money movement, political purchase and interstate cooperation. It created or deepened relationships among criminals, lawyers, businessmen and officials. After repeal, those assets could be redirected into gambling, extortion, labour racketeering and, in some cities, narcotics. The pattern

differed sharply by city, and bootlegging did not produce one national successor organisation.

The subtitle refers to that transformation. Prohibition helped create the richer, more visible and better connected mob of popular memory. It did not create criminal organisation, the Sicilian Mafia or every American syndicate from nothing. It accelerated selected groups and gave them a public stage.

The paradox is clean. The state tried to destroy an industry by making its transactions criminal. In doing so, it gave some criminal firms a market large enough to transform them.

Repeal Replaced Prohibition With Control

Prohibition did not collapse the morning Americans discovered speakeasies. It retained committed supporters through the 1920s, and Herbert Hoover won a landslide in 1928 while supporting enforcement. Repeal required a new coalition capable of overcoming an amendment designed for permanence.

The dry coalition first lost its monopoly on respectable reform. Urban resistance had never disappeared. Enforcement scandals, corruption, court congestion and gangster violence made the law's secondary costs harder to dismiss. Some former supporters concluded that the ban weakened respect for law or exposed young people to uncontrolled sellers. Pauline Sabin, a prominent Republican woman, founded the Women's Organization for National Prohibition Reform in 1929. Its existence broke a useful dry assumption: women did not speak with one voice on alcohol.

The Depression altered political arithmetic. Closed breweries and distilleries now represented possible jobs. Legal alcohol represented excise revenue at a time when governments needed money. These arguments did not prove that repeal would end unemployment or balance budgets, but they gave economic urgency to an older legitimacy dispute. Business support, urban voters, anti-Prohibition organisations and Democratic opportunity began to align.

Franklin Roosevelt ran for president in 1932 supporting repeal. Before the constitutional process finished, Congress and the new administration loosened the Volstead regime. The Cullen-Harrison Act permitted states to allow beer and wine up to 3.2 per cent alcohol by weight, bringing legal beer back in April 1933 where state law agreed. The measure showed how quickly the policy language had changed. A product recently defined as part of the national danger was now discussed as work, tax and ordinary commerce.

The Twenty-first Amendment took the unusual route of state ratifying conventions rather than state legislatures. This reduced the ability of entrenched dry legislative organisations to block repeal and let specially elected delegates decide the single question. Congress approved submission in February 1933. On 5 December, Utah became the thirty-sixth state to ratify. National Prohibition ended.

Repeal did not make the country wet in one uniform sense. Section 2 of the new amendment protected state authority over importation and delivery of alcohol contrary to state law. States chose different systems. Some retained prohibition. Some created state stores or control boards. Others licensed private producers, distributors and retailers under new rules. Localities could remain dry. Federal excise returned. Regulation moved from an attempt to eliminate the beverage market to a system for shaping who could make, move, sell and buy within it.

That settlement accepted continued demand without treating every form of supply as equal. The argument shifted from whether a legal market should exist to how visible, available and politically powerful it should be. Lawful sale became governable through licences, inspections, commercial records and taxes rather than through the claim that ordinary supply could be eliminated.

This shift changed criminal economics. Legal producers could use courts, insurance, advertising, quality controls and ordinary finance. Risk premiums fell. A gangster could no longer charge merely for making beer available when a licensed brewer and retailer could do it more cheaply and safely.

Some criminal organisations survived or adapted because they had other markets, capital and political relationships, not because repeal left bootlegging unchanged.

The argument began with the saloon as an embedded institution that reformers tried to remove in one stroke. The repeal settlement accepted the embedded demand and rebuilt controlled channels around it. The old saloon did not return untouched. Neither did temperance disappear. Licensing hours, age rules, taxation, local choice and distribution controls carried parts of the dry project into the wet order.

The constitutional ban ended. Alcohol control did not. America replaced the impossible promise of no legal market with a permanent argument about the terms on which the market should exist.

How It Actually Works

A republic learns to fear the saloon

The United States was never one steadily drinking country that suddenly chose abstinence. It moved through waves.

In the early republic, distilled spirits were cheap and common. Alcohol marked hospitality, work rituals, elections and trade. Reformers in the 1820s and 1830s attacked habitual spirits first. Voluntary temperance societies persuaded many Americans to reduce or stop, and national consumption fell from its early nineteenth-century heights.

The movement then divided. Moderation left the seller intact. Abstinence blamed the drinker but still depended on resolve. Prohibitionists wanted law to close the source. Maine adopted a statewide ban in 1851 under the influence of Neal Dow, and other states experimented, retreated or replaced prohibition with licensing. The pattern taught both sides that alcohol law was possible and politically explosive. Enforcement could become a conflict between Protestant reformers and immigrant or working-class communities whose social life centred on beer halls and saloons.

The Civil War displaced the first campaign and strengthened federal dependence on alcohol tax. Afterwards, rapid urban growth gave the saloon more customers and more political uses. Reform returned against a larger, better organised trade.

Women enter politics through the home

In December 1873, women in several towns entered saloons, prayed, sang and asked owners to stop selling. The Women's Crusade was brief as direct action and lasting as organisation. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union was founded the following year.

Under Frances Willard, the WCTU widened far beyond a bottle. Its members worked on suffrage, education, labour conditions, sexual conduct and legal protection. The programme could become intrusive and culturally narrow, but its political logic was clear. A household problem could not be solved by household authority when husbands controlled wages, property and votes. Women needed public power.

The movement's symbols could obscure its machinery. Carry Nation smashed Kansas saloons with bricks and a hatchet around the turn of the century and became the figure everybody remembered. The WCTU's quieter network of local unions, meetings, petitions, lectures, newspapers and youth education mattered more. It gave prohibition a national female constituency and trained women to act politically before the Nineteenth Amendment barred sex-based denial of the vote nationwide, while racial barriers continued to exclude many women.

Yet moral mobilisation did not by itself produce the Eighteenth Amendment. That required an organisation built to control elections.

Wayne Wheeler counts votes

The Anti-Saloon League began in Ohio in 1893 and expanded through Protestant churches. Its offices looked less like a revival meeting than a modern campaign headquarters. Lawyers drafted measures. Researchers produced claims. Publicists supplied newspapers. Local organisers knew which legislator had promised what.

Wayne Wheeler perfected the method. The League did not ask whether a politician was virtuous. It asked whether he was useful. A dry candidate could receive support despite disagreement on other issues. A wet incumbent could face a concentrated challenge in a low-turnout primary. Legislators learnt that the League remembered individual votes longer than most voters remembered an entire session.

The strategy advanced through local option and state prohibition. By the 1910s, large territories were already dry, although maps coloured by county area exaggerated how many people lived under those laws. Rural victories covered more land than urban ones. Cities remained the hardest problem because immigrants, organised labour, political machines and drinking establishments were concentrated there.

Federal measures weakened interstate protection for liquor shipped into dry states. The movement then sought an amendment. This was an extraordinary legal ambition, but the League had already turned enough state legislatures dry to make ratification plausible.

War closes the route

Congress proposed the Eighteenth Amendment in December 1917, eight months after the United States entered the First World War. The timing mattered.

Wartime government restricted the use of grain for distilling and reduced beer and wine production. Drys argued that food should feed soldiers and civilians rather than breweries. German-American brewers, once a wealthy and confident opposition, became easy targets in a climate of suspicion.

The language of efficiency, sacrifice and loyalty gave prohibition an emergency case.

The campaign also exposed its nativism. Irish, German, Italian, Jewish and Catholic drinking cultures could be presented as alien obstacles to an older Protestant America. Not every prohibitionist held those prejudices, and many supporters were motivated by health, domestic security or political corruption. The movement's final push used all of the available pressures.

Nebraska became the thirty-sixth state to ratify on 16 January 1919. The amendment would take effect one year later. Wartime prohibition meanwhile restricted stronger beverages, so the transition began before the constitutional date. By the time national Prohibition formally arrived, the public had already seen pieces of it without seeing the full Volstead definition.

The law arrives

Congress passed the National Prohibition Act in October 1919 over President Woodrow Wilson's veto. Representative Andrew Volstead gave the law its name, but the dry lobby shaped its severity.

The amendment had forbidden intoxicating liquor without defining intoxicating. The Act drew the line at 0.5 per cent alcohol by volume. That was close to total beverage prohibition, not a compromise that preserved ordinary beer. The Act declared places used for illegal manufacture or sale to be nuisances, created penalties and forfeitures, regulated permits and assigned federal enforcement.

On 17 January 1920, the legal market changed category. A brewery could not continue selling normal beer because customers wanted it. A railway could not knowingly transport beverage liquor because local police were relaxed. Constitutional law reached across state lines and overrode wet local custom.

Yet the regime began with exceptions. Existing lawful household stocks stayed lawful in the home. Doctors could prescribe. Religious bodies could

obtain wine. Industry could use alcohol under control. Vineyards sold grape products capable of fermentation. The law banned a commercial route more cleanly than it could separate every lawful molecule from an unlawful drink.

A legal industry disappears

The visible achievement was swift. Full-strength legal breweries went from roughly 1,300 in 1916 to none a decade later. Distilleries and wineries closed or converted. Licensed wholesalers and retailers collapsed in number. The saloon as a licensed institution was broken.

Survivors improvised. Breweries made near beer, malt products, soft drinks, ice or other goods. Distillers held stocks for medicinal channels. Pharmacies handled prescriptions. Religious and industrial permits became valuable because a lawful origin could feed an unlawful diversion farther down the chain.

Best reconstructions show consumption falling sharply around the wartime and early Prohibition years. Some drinkers stopped. Some drank less because access cost more. Public drunkenness, alcoholic psychosis admissions and deaths associated with chronic heavy drinking declined. The pattern is strong enough to reject the claim that law did nothing, but not clean enough to assign one exact percentage to January 1920 alone.

Then supply adapted. The legal industry's closure did not leave an empty shelf. It created demand for anyone able to refill it.

The supply chain returns underground

Domestic stills served local markets. Industrial alcohol was diverted and redistilled. Liquor crossed from Canada and the Caribbean. Ships carrying liquor waited beyond the limit of American territorial jurisdiction in lines that became known as Rum Row. Fast boats met them at night. Customs officers, Coast Guard crews and Prohibition agents tried to intercept a coastline far longer than any patrol budget.

The route continued inland through warehouses, lorries and wholesalers. A speakeasy might buy from a local gang, a politically connected distributor or

an independent supplier. The most visible premises had passwords and concealed doors. Many others were rooms, clubs, restaurants or ordinary businesses that sold quietly. New York's night life made rebellion stylish, but most illegal drinking was less theatrical.

Experience depended on money, gender, race and place. A wealthy household could pour pre-ban stock in private; a club could guard its door; a neighbourhood restaurant might serve regulars quietly; a poorer buyer could face uncertain liquor and greater exposure to raids. Some urban venues admitted women into mixed drinking spaces more openly than the saloon culture they displaced, while segregation and policing shaped who entered safely. There was no single Prohibition night out.

The product changed with transport. Spirits offered more alcohol per crate than beer. A supplier could stretch stock with water or counterfeit labels. Cocktails helped disguise rough taste. Customers paid for access but could not verify every bottle. Poisoning came from badly made alcohol, deliberate adulteration and industrial products that remained toxic after crude attempts at purification.

At each link, illegality added a cost and an opportunity. Seizure raised risk. A bribe reduced it. A reliable protected route could undercut rivals and still earn more than a lawful wholesaler had earned before the ban.

A lawyer turns the exception into a business

George Remus saw that the cleanest route into bootlegging might begin inside the law. He had practised as a lawyer in Chicago and understood that medicinal whiskey remained legal under permits. He created a pharmaceutical business, bought Midwestern distilleries and acquired access to stocks held in government-bonded warehouses. Cincinnati placed him close to many of them.

The whiskey could leave custody under paperwork claiming a medicinal destination. Remus arranged for some of his own shipments to be hijacked, converting a legal withdrawal into contraband while placing an apparent robbery between the permit and the illegal sale. Bribes reduced the chance

that officials would examine the pattern too closely. The scheme used the enforcement system as part of the supply chain.

This was not a loophole in the sense of conduct left lawful. Diversion and conspiracy remained crimes, and Remus was convicted in federal court in 1922. The importance lies in the route he selected. Prohibition could not abolish industrial and medical alcohol, so it surrounded permitted stocks with forms, bonds, warehouses and officials. Every control point carried information, but also discretion. A criminal entrepreneur with legal knowledge could exploit the gap between a document and the cargo it described.

Remus became famous as the King of the Bootleggers. His business was less a backwoods rebellion than regulatory arbitrage backed by theft and corruption. Lawyers, corporations, inventory, permits and logistics joined the still and the gun.

Enforcement by consent

The federal government seized stills, cars, boats and stock. It prosecuted manufacturers, transporters and sellers. It used nuisance law to padlock premises and tax law to pursue criminal income. Agents such as Eliot Ness became famous later, but most enforcement was administrative, repetitive and local.

Its weakness was coordination. The amendment's concurrent power allowed federal and state action, but no single government possessed the whole machinery. A state could repeal its own enforcement law while the federal ban remained. A city police force could treat liquor as a low priority. A prosecutor could bargain cases. A jury could decline conviction. A judge could face a docket swollen with offences that neighbours did not regard as serious.

Mabel Walker Willebrandt, appointed assistant attorney general in 1921, pressed federal cases with unusual energy. She had responsibility for Prohibition prosecutions but did not command the Treasury agents who investigated many of them. The split captured the system: law, investigation,

prosecution, courts and local police sat in different hands.

The Bureau of Prohibition emerged as a separate Treasury body in 1927, then moved to Justice in 1930. Recruitment and training improved, yet the market had also matured. Better enforcement could close weak operators and leave space for organisations with money, information and corrupt protection.

The courts became an enforcement technology of their own. From fiscal 1921 through 1933, Volstead cases made up nearly two-thirds of federal criminal cases. New federal criminal filings averaged about 75,400 a year, compared with about 17,300 before the wartime surge. Congress added judges, but most defendants could not receive a full trial without stopping the system. Guilty pleas, light sentences and hurried processing became methods of capacity management. A constitutional campaign against drink was remaking ordinary criminal procedure.

Searching a moving vehicle produced another legacy. In *Carroll v. United States* in 1925, the Supreme Court allowed a warrantless car search when officers had probable cause to believe it carried illicit liquor. A car could cross a county before a warrant arrived, and enforcement would have been weaker if agents always had to wait. The resulting automobile exception outlived Prohibition. The bottle disappeared from the case law; the power to search the vehicle remained.

Chicago becomes the picture

Chicago combined breweries, dense neighbourhoods, political corruption, transport links and competing gangs. It therefore produced a spectacular version of a wider process.

Johnny Torrio saw illegal liquor as an extension of existing vice. Al Capone, who joined him from New York, became boss in 1925 after Torrio was wounded and retired. Capone's organisation controlled production, distribution, gambling, prostitution and protection in parts of Chicago and its suburbs. It bought officials and fought rivals. Newspapers supplied him with a national face.

The violence was real and locally concentrated. The St Valentine's Day Massacre in 1929 killed seven men linked to George Moran's gang. Attackers wore police-like clothing, turning the authority of enforcement into camouflage. The killings were widely attributed to Capone's organisation, but no court established that Capone ordered them.

Capone's fall also showed the limits of the familiar story. He was convicted in 1931 for federal income-tax evasion, not for commanding a national Mafia or for the massacre. The government reached a criminal business through records and taxes when direct proof of violence and liquor offences could not carry the whole case.

Other cities followed different paths. Some criminal partnerships were less violent. Some bootlegging remained small-scale. Organised gambling predated Prohibition and later absorbed liquor capital. Chicago became the symbol because it concentrated the mechanism and photographed it well.

The law loses its coalition

Prohibition's opponents did not need to prove that every dry goal was false. They needed to show that the constitutional instrument had become worse than a regulated legal market.

Urban politicians had resisted from the beginning. Business organisations joined more strongly as enforcement costs, lost revenue and illegal competition became visible. Lawyers attacked intrusive searches and overloaded courts. Reformers worried that routine evasion taught contempt for law. Repeal campaigners argued that unregulated clubs exposed the young rather than protecting them.

Women reorganised the argument. Pauline Sabin had been active in Republican politics and initially supported Prohibition. In 1929 she organised the Women's Organization for National Prohibition Reform. Its members framed repeal as protection of the home, constitutional government and children rather than surrender to drink. The language met dry claims on their own ground.

The stock-market crash did not cause repeal by itself. It changed the weight of every economic argument. Breweries promised jobs. Excise promised public revenue. Maintaining a costly ban while legal business collapsed looked different in mass unemployment. John D. Rockefeller Jr., whose money had supported dry work, publicly turned towards repeal, a sign that elite respectability had moved.

The Wickersham Commission's 1931 investigation documented serious enforcement problems while producing a divided and cautious result rather than one clean verdict. That ambiguity was revealing. The federal government could describe the defects more easily than it could restore consensus.

Repeal and the new control state

Franklin Roosevelt's 1932 platform supported repeal. Congress proposed the Twenty-first Amendment in February 1933 and chose state conventions for ratification. This route asked voters to select delegates for one purpose and reduced the power of dry state legislatures to bury the question.

Before final repeal, the Cullen-Harrison Act let participating states authorise beer and wine at 3.2 per cent alcohol by weight. Legal beer returned in participating states on 7 April 1933. Breweries reopened into a regulated market while the constitutional ban still formally existed.

State conventions then moved quickly. Utah supplied the thirty-sixth ratification on 5 December 1933. The Eighteenth Amendment became the only amendment ever repealed, and the Twenty-first the only one ratified by conventions.

The new amendment did two jobs. It ended national prohibition. It also protected state control over alcohol entering their territory. Some states stayed dry. Others created monopolies or licensing systems. Local-option rules survived. A legal market returned inside a regulatory structure of producers, distributors, retailers, excise and permitted premises.

Bootlegging lost its constitutional protection from legal competition. Quality,

contracts and disputes moved back into ordinary institutions. Criminal groups retained skills, money and relationships, but alcohol no longer paid the same premium. The mob did not disappear. Its constitutional protection from lawful alcohol competition did.

The institutional release was immediate enough to count. New federal criminal cases fell from 82,675 in fiscal 1933 to 34,152 in fiscal 1934, the statistical year during which Prohibition was repealed. That fall does not measure every consequence of Prohibition, but it shows how much federal legal capacity had been consumed by enforcing the alcohol ban.

How we know

Prohibition left abundant law and poor measurement. The amendments, Volstead Act, court decisions, agency reports, congressional records, permit files and repeal proceedings establish the legal machinery. Newspapers, photographs, business records, organisational archives, police files and memoirs show campaigning, enforcement and illegal trade, but participants had reasons to boast, conceal or blame.

Legal production and tax series collapse precisely when the legal market closes. Modern studies therefore reconstruct drinking from sales before and after, mortality, hospital admissions, arrests, surveys and estimates of illicit supply. These measures are not interchangeable. Cirrhosis responds slowly; arrests record policing as well as conduct; seizures record detection rather than total production. Publication dates in the 2000s do not make the observations contemporary: the evidence concerns historical reference periods reanalysed with later methods.

Organised-crime evidence is regionally uneven and distorted by famous killings. Chicago and New York produced records and publicity that quieter systems did not. The broad sequence is secure: legal supply contracted, consumption and some harms fell, illicit markets expanded, enforcement remained divided, selected organisations gained capital, and repeal restored regulated legal supply. Exact illegal volumes, national criminal revenues, attributable poisoning deaths and responsibility for unsolved

violence remain uncertain.

What People Get Wrong

“Prohibition made drinking alcohol illegal”

The federal regime attacked supply. The Eighteenth Amendment prohibited manufacture, sale, transport, import and export for beverage purposes. The Volstead Act added possession offences in many settings and enforcement powers, but it did not specifically criminalise the act of drinking. Purchase itself was not made a federal offence, as the Supreme Court confirmed in 1930.

Lawfully acquired pre-Prohibition stock could be kept and consumed in a private dwelling by the owner, family and genuine guests. Medicinal and sacramental channels remained. State laws could be stricter. Possession also depended on place and provenance, so a bottle in a lawful cellar and the same bottle during an illegal delivery did not occupy the same legal position.

Why does the myth persist? A ban on every ordinary legal route feels equivalent to a ban on the final act. For most people without a cellar or permit, the practical difference narrowed quickly. The legal distinction still matters because it determined who agents pursued, favoured people with private stock and access, and left demand less directly punishable than supply. Prohibition governed the bottle's route more clearly than the drinker's mouth.

“It was a sudden wartime craze”

The First World War helped Prohibition win. It did not invent the dry movement.

Americans had organised temperance societies for nearly a century. States and towns had tried bans and local options. The WCTU had built a nationwide female movement since the 1870s. The Anti-Saloon League had spent decades identifying legislators, organising churches and making wet

votes costly. By ratification, more than half the states were already operating under prohibition laws. Dry maps could exaggerate agreement because sparsely populated rural counties covered more territory than wet cities, but the movement had secured far more than an emergency vote in Washington.

War supplied exceptional leverage. Grain conservation, national efficiency and suspicion of German-American brewers weakened opposition. Drys could attach abstinence to patriotism and resistance to disloyalty. Wartime restrictions also introduced federal controls before January 1920.

The correction matters because a short panic cannot explain constitutional ratification across the states. Prohibition required deep organisation and broad support. War changed timing, rhetoric and the balance of power. It accelerated a prepared movement, and its aggressive use of wartime identity politics helped store the resentment that enforcement later released.

“Nobody drank less”

People drank illegally, so the most entertaining evidence is survival: speakeasies, flasks and seized stills. Survival is not the same as no reduction.

Legal full-strength brewing disappeared. Prices and effort rose. Estimates of alcohol consumption fell sharply around wartime restrictions and early national Prohibition, while cirrhosis deaths, alcoholic psychosis admissions and public-drunkenness measures also declined. A peer-reviewed state-level analysis estimated that constitutional Prohibition reduced cirrhosis by roughly 10 to 20 per cent.

None of this yields one uncontested success rate. Illegal production is hard to count. State bans and wartime law began earlier. Mortality has lags and confounders. Consumption recovered from its early low, and heavy drinkers could remain determined customers.

The honest result is mixed but not vague. Prohibition reduced drinking and some alcohol-related harm. It did not eliminate either, and it added harms

through illicit products, criminal enforcement and violent supply. The result also changed over time: the first dry years were not identical to the mature illegal market of the late 1920s. “It worked” and “it failed” are both too small unless the outcome and period are named.

“It created organised crime from nothing”

Gambling businesses, gangs, vice markets, extortion and political corruption existed before national Prohibition. Capone belonged to a street gang before the Volstead Act took effect. Criminal organisation did not begin when legal beer ended.

What changed was scale and opportunity. Alcohol brought a broad customer base, repeat demand and a price raised by legal risk. Successful bootlegging required production, import, transport, storage, wholesale distribution, retail outlets, finance, information and protection. Those needs rewarded organisations able to coordinate people and buy cooperation.

The effect varied. In some cities bootleggers moved into established gambling businesses. Elsewhere the two remained separate. Small producers and independent smugglers continued beside syndicates. There was no single American mob under one command. Criminal organisations also survived repeal unevenly, which shows that alcohol profits had joined older vice, protection and political systems rather than replacing them.

The subtitle's “creating” refers to transformation: Prohibition helped create the capital, logistics, territorial reach and public image associated with the modern mob. Saying it invented organised crime gives the law too much credit and hides the older institutions that made rapid criminal expansion possible.

“All speakeasies were glamorous”

The surviving fantasy has a concealed door, jazz band, cocktails and women in short dresses. Some establishments delivered that scene, especially in large cities and in publicity aimed at affluent customers. In some cities, illicit venues brought women and men into the same public drinking rooms more freely than older saloons had done, making nightlife feel modern.

A speakeasy was any illegal drinking place, not one interior design. It could be a restaurant serving regulars, a back room, a private club, a basement or a dangerous room selling counterfeit spirits. Many customers drank at home or in social halls. Working-class men displaced from licensed saloons did not all enter Manhattan nightclubs. Black nightlife could generate music and commerce while facing segregation, exploitation and police attention.

Glamour became persuasive because it reversed the reformers' moral script. The law looked old; the violator looked free. That image helped repeal culture, then survived in films and themed bars. It also turned wealthy urban consumption into the representative experience, leaving the ordinary home drinker and the person searched on the street outside the frame.

The correction matters because stylish defiance hides the market's inequality. Better-connected customers bought privacy and quality. Exposed communities met raids, adulterated stock and violence. The same ban produced champagne behind guarded doors and toxic alcohol in an unlabelled bottle.

“The government deliberately poisoned drinkers”

Industrial alcohol had legitimate uses and had been denatured before national Prohibition, chiefly so tax-free industrial ethanol could not be sold as beverage alcohol. Bootleggers nevertheless diverted it and tried to remove the additives. Some redistilled product entered illegal drinks.

In late 1926 federal policy required harsher denaturing formulas while officials knew diversion continued. Toxic industrial alcohol then reached

consumers alongside liquor contaminated by incompetent distilling, counterfeit ingredients or private adulteration. The formula change increased a known danger, but the surviving evidence does not yield one secure national total of deaths caused by that decision.

That is serious enough without inventing a false scene. Federal agents did not visit speakeasies and pour poison into drinks. Nor did every poisoning arise from federal denaturants. The historical issue is a regulatory choice made with the illicit route already visible, not proof of one centrally directed killing programme.

The correction cuts both ways. Saying the government secretly poisoned bar drinks overstates direct action and implies an exact death ledger that does not exist. Saying bootleggers alone caused the hazard ignores a deliberate policy that increased foreseeable exposure. Responsibility is shared; the causal contribution of the harsher formulas cannot be reduced to one sound total.

“Repeal was a national confession that control had failed”

The Twenty-first Amendment ended national constitutional Prohibition. It did not announce that alcohol should be unregulated.

Repeal returned lawful production and sale while giving states strong authority over importation and distribution. Some states remained dry. Others used state stores, control boards or licensing. Local options survived. Federal and state excise returned. The regulated producer, wholesaler, retailer and permitted premises replaced the constitutional promise of no beverage market. The country therefore retained control over availability while restoring a supplier that could be inspected, taxed and held to ordinary commercial law.

Why call this surrender? The memorable contrast is dry against wet, and repeal celebrations looked like release. Yet the political settlement preserved much of the reformers' concern with access, outlets and local choice. It abandoned the claim that all ordinary legal supply could be

removed across the country.

The correction matters because policy learning is often mistaken for reversal. America did not choose between one ban and no rule. It replaced an enforcement architecture that lacked durable consent with several controlled legal markets. Repeal failed to deliver abstinence. It succeeded in making alcohol governable through institutions that did not depend on pretending demand had disappeared.

Use It

Read the verb in the law

Policies are remembered through nouns: ban, tax, regulation, right. Their effects sit in the verbs.

The Eighteenth Amendment did not say no American may drink alcohol. It targeted production and commercial movement for beverage purposes. Those verbs selected the supply chain as the target. The Volstead Act then defined the product, created offences and built enforcement around places, permits, goods and movement.

Use the same test elsewhere. Ask which act is forbidden, which person bears the duty, which object changes category and which stage remains lawful. A rule against sale differs from a rule against possession. A rule against possession differs from one against use. A licensing requirement differs from a quantity cap even when both are called control.

This prevents two mistakes. The first is assuming the slogan describes the statute. The second is evaluating a policy by an outcome it was not designed to reach directly. Prohibition can be criticised for leaving demand, but it should first be understood as a supply law. Exact verbs reveal the mechanism before opinion begins.

Separate suppression from displacement

A prohibited activity can become smaller without disappearing. The part that survives can also move.

Prohibition reduced legal production to almost nothing and lowered total alcohol use, especially early. It displaced remaining supply into homes, hidden plants, permit diversion, foreign imports and criminal distribution. It moved drinking from licensed saloons into private and illicit settings. It shifted the product mix towards concentrated spirits. It moved enforcement towards searches, informants, forfeiture and federal courts.

Failure cannot hold all of that. Build an account with four columns: what fell, what remained, what moved and what appeared because of the move. Then ask who experienced each result.

This demands more than pointing to continued violation. If one illegal bottle proves failure, almost every law fails. If one reduced disease indicator proves success, secondary costs disappear from view. Prohibition shows that suppression and displacement can occur together. The sensible argument concerns their size, distribution and durability.

Follow the risk premium

When lawful competitors are excluded, the illegal price pays for more than production. It pays for seizure risk, concealment, corrupted access, unreliable contracts and force.

Follow that premium through the market. Who can finance a lost shipment? Who can replace an arrested driver? Who can buy information, lawyers or officials? Who can enforce payment without a court? Small operators may enter because legal barriers are gone, yet large protected operators may dominate because risk makes capital and organisation more valuable.

Then look at product selection. Under Prohibition, spirits were easier to move than beer because water is heavy and alcohol is compact. The law therefore changed what suppliers preferred. A similar rule applies whenever enforcement is attached to bulk, visibility or transaction count: firms redesign

the product and route around the risk.

The risk premium is not pure profit. Much of it pays real illegal-market costs. But the organisations able to lower those costs through corruption or violence can keep more of it. Strong enforcement against weak sellers may unintentionally concentrate supply among stronger ones. The lesson is to analyse supplier selection, not merely supplier count.

Map the enforcement coalition

A rule is enforced by more people than its named agency.

National Prohibition required federal investigators, customs officers, the Coast Guard, state law, local police, prosecutors, judges, juries, landlords, employers, doctors, pharmacists, clergy and ordinary witnesses. Each held a small veto over implementation. Concurrent power looked like extra capacity, but responsibility could dissolve across levels.

Draw the chain. At every link ask three questions: does this actor have the authority, the resources and the willingness? A missing power blocks action. A missing budget creates delay. A missing belief creates selective enforcement or resistance. Corruption is one form of unwillingness, but so are electoral pressure, cultural disagreement and the judgment that another offence matters more.

Legitimacy is practical here. It is not applause for the law. It is the probability that people with discretion will spend time, reputation and money helping it work. Prohibition remained constitutional after that probability fell in many places. The gap between validity and implementation became the market's operating space.

Count substitution and secondary harms

A policy can improve its headline measure and worsen what replaces it.

Beer lost ground under Prohibition partly because it was inefficient contraband. Spirits carried more alcohol per vehicle. Regulated bottles gave way to uncertain ones. A licensed saloon subject to inspection gave way to

premises whose operators already had reason to conceal other conduct. A tax-paying industry gave way to an illegal one that bought protection.

None of those substitutions proves that the original harm was acceptable. Heavy drinking had severe costs. The analytical discipline is to count the replacement alongside the reduction. Product strength, contamination, violence, corruption, enforcement injury, lost revenue and unequal intrusion belong in the same ledger as lower consumption and disease.

Do not assume every secondary harm was caused entirely by the law. Criminal violence and toxic alcohol had other causes. Do not hide behind that caution either. When a policy changes incentives predictably, the resulting substitution belongs in evaluation even if individual offenders remain responsible for their acts.

The best comparison is not the banned world against perfection. It is the full prohibited regime against the strongest feasible alternative.

Ask what regime comes after repeal

Repeal is often treated as an ending because the visible rule disappears. The next institution decides whether the problem is abandoned or governed differently.

In 1933 America did not return to the pre-1920 market. States gained room to choose prohibition, public monopoly, licensing or private sale under controls. Local dryness survived. Excise returned. The legal supply chain could be inspected, taxed and sued. Criminal suppliers lost the advantage created by excluding lawful competition.

When a rule is failing, ask what replaces each function it was trying to perform. Prohibition tried to reduce availability, intoxication, saloon power, domestic harm and political corruption. Repeal solved none automatically. Later regulation could control outlets, hours, age, advertising, quality and tax while allowing supply. It could also be captured, unequal or too weak. The comparison remained institutional, not moral.

This question protects against two lazy positions: keep a defective regime

because repeal sounds permissive, or remove it without designing the successor. The Twenty-first Amendment mattered because it ended one constitutional command and allocated authority for the next system.

The limits

Prohibition is one historical case in one federal country. Alcohol can be produced from common agricultural materials, has long cultural use and creates both pleasure and harm. Its demand, chemistry and supply routes differ from firearms, gambling, narcotics, sex work, abortion, digital files or environmental pollutants. Copying its conclusion across subjects is analysis by costume.

The evidence is also incomplete. Illegal output was hidden, enforcement records reflect agency choices, health measures have lags, and famous cities dominate memory. Regional variation was large. A dry rural county, a border city, a wealthy private club and a poor urban neighbourhood did not experience the same law.

The case cannot tell you that bans always fail, that regulation always wins or that lower consumption always justifies enforcement. It can tell you what must be measured before such claims deserve confidence: demand, supply adaptability, product substitution, risk premium, enforcement capacity, legitimacy, distribution of burdens and the replacement regime.

The one thing to keep

Keep the empty shelf.

A legislature can clear it by closing legal factories and shops. That is real power. The shelf then becomes a question. Does demand fall enough to leave it empty? Does a safer substitute appear? Does supply move abroad, into the home or into an illegal firm? What price now includes risk? Who can pay that price, and who can profit from it? Which police officer, juror or neighbour must cooperate to keep the shelf bare?

Prohibition's mistake was not believing law could change behaviour. It did. Drinking fell and institutions changed. The mistake was treating the

disappearance of the legal seller as though it completed the work. Demand, exceptions, federalism and unequal consent made the space valuable, and organised criminals were among the people equipped to fill it.

After this book, a ban should no longer look like a wall. It should look like a market and enforcement redesign. The prohibited object may become scarcer, dearer, stronger, dirtier or more concentrated in the hands of suppliers able to survive enforcement. Some harms can fall while others move.

The permanent question is therefore not whether the shelf is empty on inspection day. It is who supplies it next, under what risks, and whether the replacement is better than the strongest lawful alternative.

Terms

Temperance. A movement to reduce or eliminate alcohol use. Early temperance often meant moderation; later American organisations increasingly demanded abstinence and legal prohibition of the trade. The changing meaning tracks a shift from persuasion towards coercive law.

Teetotalism. Complete abstinence from alcoholic drink. The word distinguished total abstainers from reformers who accepted moderate use or opposed distilled spirits while tolerating beer or wine.

Dry. A person, place, law or political position favouring prohibition. A dry voter could still drink, so electoral support did not guarantee personal abstinence or enforcement cooperation.

Wet. A person, place or position opposing prohibition or favouring legal alcohol. Wet did not necessarily mean support for unrestricted sale, saloon politics or heavy drinking.

Saloon. A licensed drinking establishment that could also provide food, company, labour contacts and political organisation. Its mixed functions made closure socially disruptive as well as morally attractive.

Local option. A law allowing a town, county or other locality to decide

whether alcohol sales were permitted. It let prohibition advance district by district before national action and allowed dry majorities to bypass wider resistant coalitions.

Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The national women's organisation founded in 1874. It joined temperance to political education, suffrage and social reform, building durable organisation before most women could vote.

Anti-Saloon League. The single-issue pressure group founded in 1893 that organised churches and voters around dry legislation. It helped carry prohibition from local contests to the Constitution.

Eighteenth Amendment. The constitutional amendment ratified in 1919 that barred the production and commercial movement of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes from 1920. It left drinking unnamed.

Volstead Act. The National Prohibition Act of 1919. It defined intoxicating beverages, created offences and permits, authorised enforcement and translated the Eighteenth Amendment into an operating federal regime.

Intoxicating liquor. Under the Volstead Act, most beverages containing at least 0.5 per cent alcohol by volume. The severe threshold included normal beer and wine, not merely spirits.

Concurrent power. Authority held by both Congress and the states to enforce Prohibition. It multiplied possible enforcers but also allowed each level to expect more effort from another. The shared mandate became a practical route for shifting responsibility.

Bootlegging. Illegal manufacture, transport or sale of alcohol. The term covered household supply, permit diversion, rural distilling and large interstate or international distribution systems. The word describes conduct, not one scale or organisational form.

Moonshine. Illicitly distilled spirits, often associated with rural stills. Quality varied, and the romantic image conceals tax evasion, unsafe production, corruption and organised routes to customers.

Rum-running. Smuggling liquor by sea, especially from ships or foreign ports to the American coast. Fast craft connected offshore supply to warehouses, wholesalers and inland retailers.

Speakeasy. An illegal drinking establishment. Some were fashionable clubs; many were ordinary rooms, restaurants or back premises whose prices, quality, clientele and safety varied sharply. The label describes legality, not glamour.

Blind pig. A concealed or evasively described drinking place, sometimes pretending to charge for entertainment while supplying liquor. The term and the practice predated national Prohibition.

Rum Row. The informal line of liquor ships waiting beyond American territorial waters. Smaller boats collected cargo, making the legal boundary part of the illegal supply chain.

Denatured alcohol. Industrial ethanol made deliberately undrinkable by added chemicals. Diversion and crude attempts at purification exposed consumers to severe poisoning when beverage supply moved underground.

Medicinal whiskey. Whiskey legally produced, held or supplied through the medical permit system. A genuine therapeutic exception also created valuable paperwork, stocks and opportunities for generous prescribing or diversion.

Sacramental wine. Wine permitted for religious use under the Volstead regime. Clergy and congregations operated through controlled legal channels whose protection was necessary and whose administration could be abused.

Padlock provision. Nuisance-law power used to close premises associated with illegal liquor activity. It targeted the place and property, sometimes reaching owners beyond the person who made a sale.

Bureau of Prohibition. The federal enforcement body created as a separate Treasury bureau in 1927 and transferred to Justice in 1930. Its peak staff of about 4,300 covered many roles.

Organised crime. Durable coordination of illegal enterprise through finance, specialised roles, protection, corruption or force. It existed before Prohibition and developed differently across cities, products and ethnic networks.

Mafia. A term for specific criminal organisations and traditions, especially Sicilian and Italian-American ones. It should not be used as a loose synonym for every gang or illicit business.

Racketeering. Conducting or protecting recurring illegal business through coercion, corruption or organised arrangements. Prohibition supplied unusually valuable rackets but did not invent either recurring crime or protection.

Protection. Payment or influence exchanged for safety from attack, competition or enforcement. In illegal markets, protection can substitute for police, contract law and impartial dispute resolution.

Territory. A route, neighbourhood or customer area claimed by an illegal supplier. Physical distribution made boundaries commercially valuable, while overlapping claims could turn competition into negotiated division or violence.

Twenty-first Amendment. The 1933 amendment that repealed the Eighteenth and protected state control over alcohol importation and delivery. It was ratified through state conventions rather than legislatures.

Local control. Authority retained by states and localities after repeal to license, restrict or prohibit alcohol. National repeal therefore produced several regulatory systems rather than one uniform wet market.

Go Deeper

W. J. Rorabaugh, *Prohibition: A Very Short Introduction*

Start here for the whole argument in a compact scholarly form. Rorabaugh moves from nineteenth-century drinking and temperance through the Eighteenth Amendment, enforcement, organised crime and repeal, while keeping the political coalition visible. Oxford University Press published it in 2020. Its compression is the benefit and the warning: regional experience, race, policing and individual criminal systems receive less space than in specialist studies. Read it to test the sequence and to see why serious historians no longer describe Prohibition as thirteen years in which nothing changed. It also keeps reduced consumption beside the growth of illegal supply, rather than choosing one as the verdict.

Daniel Okrent, *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition*

Read this for the large narrative and the people who drove it. Okrent follows the temperance movement, Wayne Wheeler's lobbying machine, legal exceptions, bootleggers, political operators and repeal campaigners with a journalist's eye for the revealing transaction. Scribner published the book in 2010. It is long enough to supply the human texture this book compresses and lively enough for a newly interested reader. Its national sweep and taste for striking stories should be balanced with more analytical work on public health and enforcement. Use its detail to inhabit the system, then check memorable claims against the notes and stronger primary evidence.

Lisa McGirr, *The War on Alcohol: Prohibition and the Rise of the American State*

Read McGirr for enforcement, class and state power. Published by W. W. Norton in 2015, the book shifts attention from fashionable speakeasies towards raids, courts, prisons and the disproportionate burden placed on poor, immigrant and Black communities. Its strongest contribution is to show that a policy remembered as failed still enlarged federal policing and punishment. The interpretation is deliberately forceful and often draws connections to later drug prohibition. Keep those comparisons as arguments to examine rather than automatic equivalences. Pair the book with work on consumption and health so that coercion does not become the only outcome measured.

David E. Kyvig, *Repealing National Prohibition*

Read this for the ending, which popular histories often rush. Kyvig reconstructs the organisations, constitutional strategy, women, business interests, party shifts and state conventions that made repeal possible. Kent State University Press issued the second edition in 2000. It explains why dissatisfaction was insufficient: opponents had to build a coalition and select a ratification route capable of defeating entrenched dry legislatures. This is the best follow-on for understanding repeal as institution-building rather than a collective hangover. Its political focus is a strength: it shows that ending a failed rule still requires organisation, constitutional design and a viable successor.

Notes and Sources

The Whole Thing in One Page and Why You Should Care

The book treats Prohibition as a national constitutional regime beginning when the Eighteenth Amendment and the National Prohibition Act became effective on 17 January 1920 and ending with ratification of the Twenty-first Amendment on 5 December 1933. Wartime restrictions, state prohibition and local-option law began earlier, so neither alcohol use nor alcohol-related harm can be attributed to those two dates alone.

The legal distinction between drinking and the prohibited supply acts comes from the text of the Eighteenth Amendment, the National Prohibition Act and *United States v. Farrar*. The amendment prohibited manufacture, sale, transportation, importation and exportation for beverage purposes. The Act defined covered beverages at 0.5 per cent alcohol by volume, created possession and nuisance offences, regulated permits and preserved bounded industrial, medicinal and religious channels. *Farrar* held that purchase was not itself made a federal offence. State law could impose additional restrictions.

George Cassiday's route through Congress follows the United States Senate Historical Office account, which places his Capitol trade from 1920 to 1930 and reports his estimate of about twenty-five deliveries a day. The first two House customers had supported Prohibition. Cassiday's later newspaper account helped make him famous, so the scale rests partly on a participant's reporting. The Senate history supports the retained facts without turning every detail into a verified ledger.

The public-health balance draws chiefly on Jack Blocker's synthesis and Angela Dills and Jeffrey Miron's state-level analysis of cirrhosis. Blocker brings together apparent consumption, mortality, hospital and arrest indicators and argues that national Prohibition reduced alcohol use, especially early, while its effects weakened over time. Dills and Miron estimate that constitutional Prohibition reduced cirrhosis by about 10 to 20

per cent. Cirrhosis is a lagged and incomplete proxy, and their estimate depends on econometric specification. The manuscript therefore rejects both zero effect and a single total success rate.

The claim that Prohibition expanded selected criminal organisations is a bounded synthesis of Mark Haller's organisational history, Lisa McGirr's enforcement history, Daniel Okrent's narrative and official accounts of Al Capone. The text distinguishes pre-existing gambling, vice, gangs and corruption from the new scale and margins created by illegal alcohol. It assigns no national revenue total to the mob and does not treat Chicago as a complete sample of the United States.

The Bureau of Prohibition figure comes from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives historical account. About 4,300 was the peak number of bureau employees, not a count of field agents available at one time. The manuscript preserves that distinction.

The saloon, temperance and the dry coalition

The description of the saloon as a social, economic and political institution follows Rorabaugh, Okrent, McGirr and Michael Lerner. Saloons varied by city, clientele and period. They could supply company, food, information, labour contacts and political organisation while connecting brewers, retailers, machines and heavy drinking. The book uses the saloon as the movement's strategic target, not as a claim that every drink was purchased in one.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union was founded in 1874 after the Women's Crusade of 1873 to 1874. Frances Willard widened its work through a programme of social reform and women's political organisation. The account treats home protection as both a response to material vulnerability and a political language that could carry coercive, nativist and culturally hostile projects. Kenneth Rose and David Kyvig supply the later contrast with organised women working for repeal.

The Anti-Saloon League began in Ohio in 1893 and developed a concentrated, single-issue approach to elections and legislation. K. Austin

Kerr is the main specialist source for its organisation and Wayne Wheeler's pressure politics. Rorabaugh, Okrent and Lerner support the sequence from local option and state prohibition to federal measures and constitutional amendment. Dry maps based on land area could make rural support look more populous than it was, so the manuscript refers to territories and state laws without turning area into a vote count.

The wartime account follows the chronology in the Federal Judicial Center, Rorabaugh and Lerner. Congress proposed the amendment in December 1917. Grain controls and wartime prohibition restricted legal production before January 1920. Anti-German hostility weakened brewers and allowed dry campaigners to attach alcohol to waste and disloyalty. War accelerated a movement with decades of organisation; it did not create the cause.

Nebraska supplied the thirty-sixth ratification on 16 January 1919. The amendment took effect one year after ratification. Forty-six of the forty-eight states eventually ratified. The manuscript does not infer unanimous popular consent from state ratification, especially where urban and rural opinion diverged.

The legal design and the disappearing industry

The National Prohibition Act was enacted on 28 October 1919 over President Woodrow Wilson's veto and became effective with the amendment on 17 January 1920. Representative Andrew Volstead chaired the relevant House committee; the Anti-Saloon League and its counsel also shaped the enforcement bill. The manuscript uses Volstead's name for the statute without presenting him as its sole author.

The treatment of lawful pre-Prohibition stocks, medicinal prescriptions, sacramental wine and industrial alcohol follows the Act, *Farrar* and the Federal Judicial Center's legal history. These channels had distinct rules and changed over time. The body uses them to show the administrative boundary between permitted alcohol and beverage contraband, not to imply that permits made diversion lawful.

Blocker's industry figures support the scale of formal contraction. He reports

that full-strength breweries fell from about 1,300 in 1916 to none ten years later, while distilleries, wineries, wholesalers and legal retailers also declined sharply. These counts describe licensed establishments and categories, not hidden producers or every premises selling illicitly.

The early decline in consumption and harm was already under way during state and wartime controls. The text therefore says that consumption fell around the wartime and early national Prohibition years rather than assigning the whole movement to one midnight. Public-drunkenness arrests depend on police practice, and hospital admissions depend on access and diagnostic categories. They are supporting indicators, not interchangeable measures.

The illegal supply chain and product substitution

The outline of domestic stills, industrial diversion, Canadian and Caribbean supply, Rum Row, coastal craft, warehouses, lorries and retail premises follows Okrent, Rorabaugh, Lerner and federal enforcement histories. No one route dominated every region. Border geography, local agriculture, political protection and consumer income produced different illegal markets.

The movement towards spirits is an incentive claim rather than a national product census. Concentrated alcohol carries more saleable alcohol per unit of weight and volume than beer, which makes it attractive when transport and seizure risk are costly. Beer production continued where local breweries and distribution could be protected. The manuscript therefore describes selection pressure, not the disappearance of illegal beer.

The prohibition premium is an editorial economic model grounded in the documented costs of smuggling, concealment, seizure, bribery, violence, unreliable contracting and inventory loss. The premium can raise prices while the total market shrinks. It is not treated as pure criminal profit, since much of it pays costs created by illegality.

George Remus's operation follows the Federal Judicial Center. Remus was a lawyer who created a pharmaceutical business, acquired distilleries and used access to whiskey held in government-bonded warehouses under the

medicinal system. He arranged the diversion of shipments through staged hijackings, used bribery and was convicted of conspiracy in 1922. The manuscript excludes unstable estimates of his fortune and later sensational details that do not explain the supply mechanism.

The denatured-alcohol correction draws on Bureau of Prohibition regulations and the fuller historical accounts in Okrent and McGirr. Federal denaturing predated national Prohibition, and the 1927 regulations document the controlled industrial-alcohol system then in force. The body states only the narrower claim supported across those sources: policy required harsher formulas in late 1926 while diversion and attempted purification were known. Toxic industrial alcohol, poor distillation and private adulteration all caused deaths. No precise mortality total is assigned to the formula change, and the text distinguishes foreseeable policy exposure from a claim that agents secretly poisoned drinks in bars.

Enforcement, courts and unequal burdens

Concurrent enforcement power came from section 2 of the Eighteenth Amendment. Supreme Court decisions confirmed that federal law could operate in states without state consent. In practice, state and local withdrawal still reduced investigative, prosecutorial and political cooperation. Blocker identifies this divided structure as a central weakness, while McGirr shows how national enforcement entered local systems marked by class, race, religion and immigration politics.

The federal administrative chronology comes from the Federal Judicial Center and ATF. Prohibition enforcement began within the Bureau of Internal Revenue. A separate Bureau of Prohibition was established in 1927 and transferred from Treasury to Justice in 1930. Reorganisation improved professional capacity but could not supply uniform local consent.

The federal court figures come from the Federal Judicial Center's compilation of Attorney General reports. Volstead cases constituted nearly two-thirds of federal criminal cases from fiscal 1921 through fiscal 1933. New federal criminal cases averaged about 75,400 a year over that period,

compared with 17,269 a year from 1904 through 1917. Authorised district judgeships rose from 98 in 1921 to 143 in 1931. These figures describe filings and institutional pressure, not convictions or unique offenders.

The discussion of guilty pleas and docket management follows the same source and the Wickersham Commission material it summarises. In fiscal 1930 more than eight-ninths of liquor convictions followed guilty pleas. The manuscript states the mechanism without claiming that modern plea bargaining began from nothing under Prohibition.

Carroll v. United States upheld a warrantless automobile search based on probable cause that the vehicle carried illicit liquor. The later automobile exception developed through subsequent cases and remains broader than its Prohibition origin. The manuscript uses *Carroll* to show that enforcement tools can outlive the policy that generated them, not to supply a full Fourth Amendment history.

Mabel Walker Willebrandt served as an assistant attorney general from 1921 to 1929 and oversaw federal Prohibition litigation among other responsibilities. Investigative agents remained in Treasury for most of that period, so she could coordinate prosecution without commanding every investigator. The split supports the book's chain model of enforcement.

The claim of unequal burden follows McGirr and related scholarship on enforcement. Wealth, private space, political access and lawful exceptions reduced exposure for some drinkers. Documented campaigns show poorer, Black and immigrant communities more vulnerable to raids, street policing and discretionary criminalisation. The book does not silently universalise one city's pattern or assign a national disparity ratio because records and categories are too uneven for a clean comparison.

Organised crime and Chicago

Haller's 1976 study is central to the distinction between organised crime before Prohibition and its development under bootlegging. It documents established gambling businesses after the Civil War, different relationships between gamblers and bootleggers across cities, Black numbers operations, international supply links and investment in telephones, lorries, ships and fast boats. Its language and categories reflect the scholarship and federal criminal-justice setting of its time, so the manuscript uses its organisational findings without adopting every generalisation.

The Capone chronology follows the FBI and Federal Judicial Center. Capone had belonged to a New York street gang before moving to Chicago around 1920. He worked within Johnny Torrio's existing vice organisation and became its leading figure in 1925. Illegal brewing and distribution were among the organisation's major businesses, alongside gambling, prostitution and protection.

Seven men linked to George Moran's organisation were killed on 14 February 1929 by attackers using police-like clothing. The crime was generally attributed to Capone's organisation, but Capone was in Florida and no conviction established that he ordered it. The manuscript preserves the uncertainty and uses the event chiefly to explain how one local gang war became the national visual memory of Prohibition.

Capone was convicted of federal income-tax evasion in 1931 and sentenced to eleven years, rather than being convicted for the massacre or for leading one national Mafia. His case supports the narrower point that financial records and tax law could reach income that was difficult to connect to a specific violent or liquor offence.

The phrase modern mob refers to increased capital, logistical reach, political connections, territorial organisation and public visibility among selected criminal groups. It does not claim that every American city followed Chicago, that the Sicilian Mafia began in 1920 or that repeal left one unified national syndicate. The market mechanism and selected organisational gains are

well supported; their national magnitude and counterfactual contribution are not reducible to one estimate.

Repeal and the successor regime

Pauline Sabin founded the Women's Organization for National Prohibition Reform in 1929. Rose and Kyvig show how repeal women reused home-protection language and challenged the dry movement's claim to speak for women. Sabin's prominence mattered symbolically, but repeal resulted from a wider coalition of urban voters, business groups, lawyers, political organisations and changing party strategy.

The Depression strengthened employment and excise arguments without acting as a single cause. Closed breweries could be represented as unused productive capacity; legal alcohol offered taxable transactions; enforcement consumed public money and court time. These claims mattered because political legitimacy had already weakened. The manuscript does not treat projected revenue as proof that repeal could solve the wider fiscal or employment crisis.

John D. Rockefeller Jr. had supported temperance and dry organisations before concluding publicly that Prohibition's costs had overtaken its benefits. His change is used as evidence of elite coalition movement, not as the cause of repeal. Herbert Hoover's 1928 landslide shows that enforcement support remained compatible with electoral victory late in the decade; it does not prove that every Hoover voter was dry.

The Wickersham Commission reported in 1931 after a large investigation of law observance and enforcement. It documented corruption, evasion, weak state cooperation and pressure on courts while producing a divided position on repeal. The manuscript calls the result cautious rather than treating it as a simple government endorsement of either continuation or repeal.

Franklin Roosevelt's 1932 platform supported repeal. Congress proposed the Twenty-first Amendment in February 1933 and specified ratification by state conventions. The convention route let voters select delegates on the repeal question and reduced the ability of established dry legislative

organisations to prevent a vote.

The Cullen-Harrison Act permitted beer and wine containing up to 3.2 per cent alcohol by weight where state law allowed. It took effect on 7 April 1933. Alcohol by weight and alcohol by volume are different measures, so the 3.2 figure should not be compared directly with the Volstead Act's 0.5 per cent by volume without conversion.

Utah became the thirty-sixth state to ratify the Twenty-first Amendment on 5 December 1933, completing the required three-quarters. The Eighteenth Amendment remains the only amendment repealed, and the Twenty-first remains the only amendment ratified through state conventions.

Section 2 of the Twenty-first Amendment protected state authority over importation and delivery contrary to state law. The post-repeal settlement varied: state prohibition, public monopolies, control boards, licensing, local option and private sale under regulation all existed. The book describes this as controlled legal supply rather than one national wet regime.

Federal criminal filings fell from 82,675 in fiscal 1933 to 34,152 in fiscal 1934, according to the Federal Judicial Center's compilation. The timing shows the immediate release of federal court capacity during the repeal transition. It does not separate repeal from every administrative or economic change between the two fiscal years, so the manuscript uses the number as institutional scale rather than a complete causal estimate.

What People Get Wrong, Use It and Terms

The first misconception preserves a legal distinction that popular summaries often erase. It does not suggest that ordinary access remained easy or that possession was universally lawful. The second separates long movement-building from the wartime opening. The third separates total consumption from visible evasion and separates early from later Prohibition. The fourth defines the subtitle's causal compression. The fifth counters the selection bias created by fashionable New York imagery. The sixth retains government responsibility for foreseeable toxic exposure without claiming a centrally directed poisoning campaign. The seventh treats repeal as a redesigned control system rather than absence of law.

The Use It section converts the historical explanation into six bounded lenses. These are editorial tools, not claims that every prohibited market follows the same path. Product chemistry, demand elasticity, geography, enforcement institutions and available lawful substitutes can change the result. The limits section therefore prevents a direct equation between alcohol Prohibition and any current policy dispute.

The terms use American historical names with British explanatory prose. “Whiskey” is retained where it is the American spelling used for the product and legal channel; “organised” and “organisation” follow British house style. The 0.5 per cent figure is alcohol by volume. The 3.2 per cent figure in the chronology is alcohol by weight.

Evidence limits retained in the manuscript

No secure annual series records total illicit alcohol production or consumption. Estimates combine apparent consumption, mortality, hospital data, arrests, seizures, surveys and reconstructed supply. Each carries different lags and selection effects. The manuscript states directions and named study estimates where support is strongest and leaves a national illicit-volume total unstated.

No single dataset measures the revenue, membership or territorial control of all organised-crime groups during Prohibition. Police and newspaper

records overrepresent violent, urban and detected activity. Chicago and New York provide unusually rich evidence but weak national representativeness. The book uses them as mechanisms and examples, not as averages.

Anecdotes are retained only where provenance and purpose are clear. Cassiday illustrates elite non-compliance; Remus illustrates permit diversion and regulatory arbitrage; Capone illustrates the interaction of pre-existing crime with a new illegal market. None is treated as a statistical sample.

The most contestable causal inference is the degree to which Prohibition, rather than urban growth, transport technology, political corruption and pre-existing vice markets, produced the later strength of American organised crime. The wording “accelerated selected groups” and “helped create the mob of popular memory” reflects that uncertainty. The counterfactual claim that the same organisations would have acquired equal capital and reach without illegal alcohol is not made.

Publication date, observation period and dataset vintage are kept separate. The principal quantitative studies were published in 2004 and 2006 but analyse historical state and national series. The official web pages were rechecked on 4 September 2026 for current text and metadata; their access date does not change the period observed.

Bibliography

Primary law and official sources

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. “Bureau of Prohibition.” Historical overview. Accessed 4 September 2026.

United States Bureau of Prohibition. *Regulations No. 3: Relative to the Production, Tax Payment, Etc., of Industrial Alcohol and to the Manufacture, Sale, and Use of Denatured Alcohol Under Title III of the National Prohibition Act of October 28, 1919*. Revised August 1927. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1927.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. "Al Capone." FBI History. Accessed 4 September 2026.

Federal Judicial Center. "Prohibition in the Federal Courts." Historical timeline and essays. Accessed 4 September 2026.

Haller, Mark H. *History of Organized Crime, 1920-1945*. NCJ 47389. United States Department of Justice, 1976.

United States. Constitution. Amendments XVIII and XXI.

United States. National Prohibition Act. 41 Stat. 305. 1919.

United States. Cullen-Harrison Act. 48 Stat. 16. 1933.

United States House of Representatives, History, Art and Archives. "The Ratification of the Twenty-first Amendment." Accessed 4 September 2026.

United States Senate Historical Office. "The Man in the Green Hat." Accessed 4 September 2026.

Carroll v. United States, 267 U.S. 132. 1925.

United States v. Farrar, 281 U.S. 624. 1930.

Scholarship

Blocker, Jack S. Jr. "Did Prohibition Really Work? Alcohol Prohibition as a Public Health Innovation." *American Journal of Public Health* 96, no. 2 (2006): 233-243.

Dills, Angela K., and Jeffrey A. Miron. "Alcohol Prohibition and Cirrhosis." *American Law and Economics Review* 6, no. 2 (2004): 285-318.

Kerr, K. Austin. *Organized for Prohibition: A New History of the Anti-Saloon League*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Kyvig, David E. *Repealing National Prohibition*. 2nd ed. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2000.

Lerner, Michael A. *Dry Manhattan: Prohibition in New York City*. Cambridge,

Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2007.

McGirr, Lisa. *The War on Alcohol: Prohibition and the Rise of the American State*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2015.

Okrent, Daniel. *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition*. New York: Scribner, 2010.

Rorabaugh, W. J. *Prohibition: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Rose, Kenneth D. *American Women and the Repeal of Prohibition*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.