



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Regulating Drinking through Alcohol Taxation and Minimum Unit Pricing: A Historical Perspective on Alcohol Pricing Interventions*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/109805/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Yeomans, H orcid.org/0000-0001-7095-1141 (2019) Regulating Drinking through Alcohol Taxation and Minimum Unit Pricing: A Historical Perspective on Alcohol Pricing Interventions. *Regulation and Governance*, 13 (1). pp. 3-17. ISSN 1748-5983

<https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12149>

© 2017 John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Yeomans, H. (2017) Regulating drinking through alcohol taxation and minimum unit pricing: A historical perspective on alcohol pricing interventions. *Regulation & Governance*, doi: 10.1111/rego.12149., which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12149>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Regulating Drinking through Alcohol Taxation and Minimum Unit Pricing: A Historical Perspective on Alcohol Pricing Interventions

Abstract

Discourse on alcohol policy in several countries has recently become dominated by discussions of pricing. In Britain, proposals for a minimum unit price for alcoholic drinks are frequently depicted as radical and new. However, other means of legally intervening in alcohol pricing have long been used to shape consumption habits. Key to recognising this historical lineage is a conceptualisation of taxation as partly a form of regulation. This article builds upon findings from a wider historical study of alcohol excise duties in England and Wales to develop an empirically-based typology of the main forms of government interventions in alcohol pricing. By connecting some instances of alcohol excise taxation to government attempts to shape behaviour, this typology enables advances in understandings of the relationship between taxation and regulation. In doing this, the article also provides an original historical perspective on an ongoing policy debate.

Keywords

Alcohol, Pricing, Taxation, Excise, Regulation

1. Introduction

In various countries, recent debates about alcohol policy have featured sustained consideration of proposals for the introduction of minimum prices per unit of alcohol. There has been serious discussion about minimum pricing in Australia (Sharma & Vanderberg 2014), the Irish Government has brought forward a Public Health Bill which would introduce a similar measure (Ireland Department of Health 2015) and the relevant governing authorities in all the constituent countries of the United Kingdom have expressed, in some form or degree, an enthusiasm for the introduction of minimum unit prices (MUP). It is usually contended that a MUP would increase the price of some or all alcoholic drinks and thus impact positively on public health. This paper concentrates on England and Wales where health professionals and organisations have been coordinated, consistent and vocal in arguing that MUP policies will, by increasing the price of some drinks, limit alcohol's availability and reduce overall consumption (AUTHOR 2013). Lower average drinking would, it is then argued, significantly reduce levels of alcohol-related morbidity and mortality, and studies of projected impacts of MUP have found evidence to support these claims (Meier et al 2008). MUP has also been attributed with the capacity to reduce other social problems, notably alcohol-related crime. It has been projected that a MUP of 40 pence would lead to 16,000 fewer crimes per year in England (Meier et al 2008) and, in an evaluation of existing minimum pricing policies operated through state alcohol monopolies in some Canadian provinces, the measure was associated with a nine percent fall in crimes against the person (Stockwell et al 2015). MUP is now widely considered to merit attention as an

additional or alternative means for states to manage the consumption of alcohol (e.g. see World Health Organisation 2015).ⁱ

Although government plans to introduce it in England were shelved in 2013, MUP continues to be a serious proposition in UK politics. The National Assemblies of Wales and Northern Ireland both plan to introduce a MUP in their jurisdictions (BBC News 3/12/2014; BBC News 15/7/2015) and the Scottish Government, having legislated for the creation of a MUP in 2012, remains embroiled in a protracted legal dispute with the drinks industry over the legality of its implementation (Scottish Government 2015). The campaign for a MUP in England also continues unabated (see Alcohol Health Alliance 2015). Within social and public policy studies, discussion of this live political issue has tended to position MUP as a “novel” policy (Katikireddi et al 2014, p.1) or a potential “turning point” (McCambridge 2012, p.377; Nicholls 2012: p.355). Cairney and Studlar equate MUP with a “neo-prohibitionist restrictive regime” (2014, p.309), Nicholls and Greenaway (2015) depict it as an unusual governmental foray into supply-side controls and Haydock (2014) explores its jarring inconsistency with the prevalent neo-liberal approach to governance which valorises the unfettered decision-making of individual rational actors. These accounts are right to the extent that the imposition of a price floor on the trade in any commodity would indeed be a deeply unusual public policy in twenty-first century Britain.ⁱⁱ

However, this emphasis placed on novelty should not obscure the historical antecedents of MUP. It is crucial to understand that, through other means, British governments have been using interventions in price to try to shape alcohol consumption for centuries.

The key to recognising this often-overlooked historical lineage is a conceptualisation of taxation generally and alcohol excise duties specifically as forms of behavioural regulation. Excise duties are selective taxes that are applied to certain commodities and have become a ubiquitous in Western countries. A varying range of commodities are currently subject to excise duties in different countries, but there is a smaller group of commodities that are commonly and consistently taxed in contemporary Western societies (see Cnossen 2007; Yelvington 1997). Although this group includes alcoholic drinks, alongside things like tobacco and petroleum products, analyses of alcohol policy or regulation frequently overlook excise duties. There is a sizeable literature within criminology and social or public policy which examines the multiple means through which governments seek to shape or control public drinking habits, such as licensing, public health initiatives, private security, screening of offenders for alcohol problems, courts' sentencing powers and treatments for alcoholism (e.g. Valverde 1998; Thom 1999; Valverde 2003; Hobbs et al 2003; Hadfield 2006; Hopkins & Sparrow 2006; Barton 2011; Skellington Orr et al 2013; McSweeney 2015). But, thus far, excise duties have remained largely absent from this alcohol policy discussion. In public policy studies generally, as well as in economics, it is more common to recognise that taxation can impact on alcohol consumption.ⁱⁱⁱ But this insight is rarely accompanied by developed analyses of how alcohol taxation can function as a form of behavioural regulation (as well as a fiscal tool for revenue-raising).

This article seeks to address these shortcomings through a dedicated examination of how taxation has been used, for much of the modern historical

period, as a means to regulate drinking in England and Wales. It builds on the findings of a wider empirical project which examined the records, held at The (UK) National Archives (TNA), of the successive government departments who have overseen the administration of excise duties. These sources are supplemented here with a consideration of relevant statutes, parliamentary debates as well as secondary historical literature. Importantly, this information is then interpreted in light of both contemporary policy developments and the socio-legal literature around regulation. Through an empirically-based conceptualisation of how taxation can function as a form of regulation, this paper will therefore extend the wider socio-legal study of regulation as well as providing an original historical perspective on the topical political issue of interventions in alcohol pricing.

2. Taxation and Regulation

Taxation is not unfamiliar within the literature on regulation. Searches for articles mentioning 'tax' or 'taxation' in this journal yield a fairly healthy total of around 106 hits. However, the vast majority of these do not address taxation directly and only a handful make taxation practices or policies a significant component of their enquiries. Regulation and Governance is not unusual in this regard as searches of wider databases of literature produce equally modest quantities of publications which connect taxation to regulation or vice versa.^{iv} When this does occur, it is typically as part of empirical enquiries into compliance with tax laws and how this can best be promoted by relevant authorities. The work of Valerie Braithwaite and her colleagues is particularly notable in this respect. She has written extensively on, for example, how values

and trust in the system affect people's willingness to pay taxes (V. Braithwaite & Ahmed 2005; V. Braithwaite 2009) and how tax regimes can be designed and operated responsively in order to better engender compliance amongst taxpayers (V. Braithwaite & J. Braithwaite 2006; V. Braithwaite 2007; see also Leviner 2008; Farnsworth & Fooks 2015). It is also pertinent for the focus of this paper that there are a number of studies which explore compliance with tax laws by analysing the effects of national variations in alcohol duty rates on the phenomenon of cross-border shopping (e.g. Makela et al 2007; Beatty et al 2009; Chaiyasong et al 2011). These studies all concern the formulation and enforcement of tax regimes and, as such, might collectively be said to relate to the regulation of taxation. While this is a valuable and important object of study, it does not represent the sum total of ways in which the notion of regulation may usefully be applied to the study of taxation.

Of course, the primary function of most taxes is to raise revenues for the state. Within some disciplines, however, it has become common to also understand taxation, especially excise taxation, as partly a regulatory tool. Following Pigou (1920), economists often discuss the capacity of excise taxes to better manage activities that create undesirable social effects (or 'externalities'). Pigou specifically identified the alcohol trade within his argument that, in situations where the benefits of an industry to producers and retailers are greater than the benefits to the public at large, the state may usefully impose special taxes on that industry (1920, p.192). Such taxes are then argued to be justifiable as, by bringing the private cost of consumption (i.e. the cost to producers, retailers and consumers) into line with the social cost (which

includes things like healthcare and policing costs), they will engender a reduction in consumption and a resulting diminution of negative externalities (Pigou 1960 [1920], especially pp.172-203; see also Crossen 2011). Other economists have focused more on the connection of taxes to undesirable individual consequences resulting from personal decisions about consumption (or 'internalities'). Behavioural economists recognise that individuals do not always make decisions in a 'rational', benefit maximising way and often choose to engage in behaviour which, especially in the long term, may be detrimental to their interests (Thaler 1980; Thaler & Sunstein 2008). For many, it is therefore justifiable for the state to impose taxes on risky or harmful commodities as this will, in theory at least, discourage their consumption and thus help to align personal decision-making with long-term individual wellbeing (see Fennell 2009; Lorenzi 2004, 2006). A number of significant pieces of research by public health academics have found that alcohol excise duties may well address internalities and externalities in these ways as alcohol consumption is often found to decrease at a population level as tax rates increase (Meier et al 2008; Wagenaar et al 2009; Babor et al 2010). In recent years, there has also been parallel discussion of whether sugar taxes are a viable means of improving public health (e.g. Atwell 2013; von Tigerstrom 2012; Galle 2016). Within economics and health, the capacity of excise taxes to 'correct' internalities and externalities, thus regulating consumption, is fairly well recognised.

Other scholars, working primarily within economics, have developed alternative accounts of 'sin taxes' that draw upon the study of public choice. These scholars recognise that taxation can place restrictions on private

consumption choices and concentrate on how such restrictions can be motivated by political self-interest more than public good (see: Shughart 1997a; Gifford 1997). Rather than concentrating on the 'correction' of internalities and externalities, these scholars explain excise taxes as primarily responses to the lobbying activities of various pressure groups and special interests as well as to the rent-seeking behaviour of politicians (Shughart 1997a; Shughart 1997b; Hoffer et al 2014). This 'political economy' approach is a helpful complement to the more usual Pigouvian studies of taxation. However, while excise taxes are sometimes depicted as aspects of state paternalism or 'nannying', the principal focus on the politics of taxation in this literature militates against any sustained consideration of how taxation can be connected to regulation. Indeed, for William Shughart, "the objective of discouraging 'sin' is at bottom just a handy political pretext for pushing back the limits of taxpayer resistance to feeding government's insatiable revenue appetite" (1997a, p.8).

So the insight that taxation can be used for regulatory purposes, found in economics as well as public policy studies and health, has not been developed fully. Crucially it appears to have made only a limited impact upon the more explicit study of regulation. This situation may exist partly because of the ambiguity of regulation as a concept. As Koop and Lodge describe, some scholars regard regulation as referring quite narrowly to the direct intervention of "public-sector actors in the economic activities of private sector actors" (2015, p.11). Excise taxes are typically levied on the production of commodities and so, if they are intended to reduce the manufacture or sale of the taxed commodity, might fit this definition of regulation. But, often, these taxes do not

conform to this definition as they entail also other actors, such as individuals and populations, and an intended indirect impact (through producers passing on the cost of the excise) on non-economic outcomes, such as public health or public order. Many other scholars, however, employ broader definitions of regulation. Grabosky speaks of regulation as “any activity, legal, political, social, economic or psychological, the purpose of which is to steer the flow of events” (2010, p.73). This notion of ‘steering’ is commonly distinguished from ‘command and control’ styles of governance which apparently correspond to the analogy of ‘rowing’ (Baldwin et al 1998; Smith et al 2010). Elucidating the notion of ‘responsive regulation’, Ayres and Braithwaite (1992) conceptualised these various means of steering within their famous regulatory pyramids. These typically position criminal law, the most serious and least used regulatory response, above less serious and more widely used practices, such as civil action, licensing, education and persuasion (see also J. Braithwaite 2008). Both the targets as well as the mechanisms involved in regulation are thus considered, by these scholars, to be broader than simply direct intervention in the private sector. Koop and Lodge explain that, in this approach, regulation is defined as an “intentional intervention in the activities of a target population” which may be direct or indirect, economic or non-economic and involving public and private sector actors (Koop & Lodge 2015, p.10).^v Importantly this broader definition of regulation creates greater possibilities to conceptualise taxation as a potential form of behavioural regulation.

These possibilities to examine taxation as a form of regulation have been partially explored. Notably, Ogus argues that “an important function of law is to

attach prices to choices” (1998, p.770). As well as through the fines and awards made under criminal law and tort law, financial impositions made by tax law can be connected to government efforts to affect behavioural change. Ogus further suggests that such efforts to change behaviour through taxation can be split into several types. “Rectificatory” taxes exist to ‘correct’ the sort of market failure that enables a commodity to be sold at a price that does not equate to its social cost (Ogus 1999, p.245; see also Kaplow and Shavell 2002). If the state can levy a duty on the commodity that is commensurate to its externalities, then the social cost is recouped by the state and the market failure is rectified.^{vi} “Nudging taxes”, by contrast, are described by Ogus as any tax that’s existence is related to motivations other than revenue raising (1999, p.245). Broadly, these exist in situations where states act to promote a desirable behavioural outcome but, for whatever reason, prefer to do this through subtler or ‘softer’ means than a direct, ‘command and control’ type legal intervention. Additionally, Ogus describes how significant financial impositions can sometimes engender deterrence. In criminal and tort law this can occur through the imposition of fines that are large enough to ensure the disutility of an illegal action outweighs its utility, and thus the boundaries of lawful activity are reinforced (Ogus 1998). Taxes, however, are said to rarely fit this category as they apply only to lawful activities and states rarely aim to so forcefully deter an activity that is revenue-raising.

To summarise, adopting a broader view of the sort of objectives and mechanisms that constitute regulation opens up significant scope for taxation to be connected to behavioural regulation. Although the regulatory potential of

taxation is often recognised, existing literature that links taxation to regulation is not extensive. Ogus' work does provide some useful starting points for this analysis by outlining several forms of regulatory taxation and assesses whether their economic logic can be reconciled with the practicalities of law and government. While Ogus' work on this topic is largely theoretical, this paper provides an empirical examination of the main forms of state intervention in alcohol pricing which have been employed in England across the modern historical period. It concentrates specifically on alcohol as a commodity and connects regulation through taxation to other pricing interventions used at various point in time. So, in addition to the implications relating to alcohol policy, the paper also seeks to develop new, empirically-based ways of conceptualising regulation through taxation.

3. Alcohol pricing interventions through time

This section presents a historical overview of the main ways in which British governments have used pricing interventions as part of wider efforts to govern drinking. The intention is not to offer a comprehensive historical analysis but to identify the major pricing interventions which have been used in England and Wales and describe how, in addition to possessing fiscal or other uses, they also function or functioned as regulatory devices. In line with the wider discussion of regulation here presented, particular attention is paid to the objectives and mechanisms associated with each intervention in addition to, due to its prominence within the examples which will be presented, the form of actor targeted also. The section draws upon original archival research as well as secondary historical literature focusing on the development of alcohol excise

duties. While it is largely concerned with excise duties, the section begins by identifying an earlier form of alcohol pricing intervention.

3.1 Maximum pricing

For much of the Middle Ages, a system of price control existed to suppress the price of some drinks. The Assize of Bread and Ale 1266 established price limits which meant that ale could not be sold for more than a halfpenny a gallon in towns and around farthing a gallon in the countryside (Clark 1983). Until the Victorian period, beer was a dietary staple and an important source of nutrition for many British people, especially from the lower social orders (Burnett 1999, pp.111-140). The Assize was thus designed to ensure that beer and ale, as well as bread, were always available at affordable prices (Clark 1983). While enforcement appears to have been inconsistent, this law was in effect until around the mid-sixteenth century and, into the seventeenth century, further laws were passed to set maximum prices for beer and ale (Clark 1983; Hunter 2002). The medieval and Tudor period also saw attempts to regulate the price of wine at the local and national level (Heinze 1976; Hunter 2002). For example, 1536 legislation sought to ensure the sale of wine at a “reasonable price” (Nicholls 2009, p.26). Wine was not consumed by a mass market in this period but, obviously, Parliament still saw fit to protect its availability through price suppression. These statutes thus indicate that British governments have, in earlier historical periods, extensively intervened in markets by limiting the price of certain drinks with a view to protecting their availability.

Of course, for much of this period, it was common for governments to intervene in various markets in order to suppress prices. The prices of bread,

sugar and meat, for example, were suppressed by governments until the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Heinze 1976; Thompson 1991, pp.185-258).^{vii} These practices fit squarely into what John Braithwaite terms the “police economy” to emphasise the interventionist role which governments played in policing markets and the flow of goods (J. Braithwaite 2008, p.26). This police economy eventually gave way to liberal ideas of free trade and laissez faire government which promoted economic and social non-intervention. This shift is usually located around the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century (Thompson 1991, pp.185-258; J. Braithwaite 2008, pp.26-27; Foucault 2009, pp.29-54), although there was a lack of maximum pricing statutes applicable to alcoholic drinks across the whole eighteenth century. The salient points to note here are, firstly, that government interventions in the price of alcoholic drinks have a very long history indeed. Secondly, for many centuries these interventions were, in stark contrast to contemporary proposals, designed to support public consumption by creating maximum prices for some alcoholic drinks.

3.2 Regulation through taxation

3.2.1 Taxation as prohibition

Excise taxes were created by Parliament in 1643 and included new duties on various goods, including some drinks such as beer, wine and cider. Some levies on the drinks trade had been made in earlier periods, but these were operated inconsistently and on a local level (Clark 1983, p.171). Customs duties date from around the early thirteenth century and were applied to the import and export of alcoholic drinks, but their use was closely tied to trade and national

interests (Ashworth 2003). Excise duties, by contrast, were national taxes which were (usually) levied on the domestic production of various commodities, including beer, spirits and other drinks. Significantly, the emergence of alcohol excise duties created the possibility for governments to regulate drinking through taxation. The regulatory potential of this new form of taxation was not instantly apparent as excise duties were created with the primary purpose, not of controlling consumption, but of raising money to fund the Civil War (see Coffman 2013).^{viii} The first clear instance in which alcohol excise duties were used to regulate consumption occurred during the 'gin craze' in the early 1700s. Public anxieties about the consumption of spirits intensified in this period. The consumption of spirits, especially gin, appeared to have increased rapidly in England and was associated with a range of problems including public disorder, violence, sickness, poverty and maternal neglect (Dillon 2003; Warner 2004). In this alarmed context, excise taxation was adapted by government in order to better regulate public consumption of alcohol.

From 1729, a series of Gin Acts were passed which extended licensing restrictions and altered taxes. As well as an existing wholesale excise duty paid by the original producers, an additional excise duty of five shilling per gallon was imposed in 1729 on compound distillers, who were typically persons who added flavouring to liquor before selling it (Dillon 2003). This Act was repealed in 1733 but followed in 1736 by a further reform which created an excise duty of twenty shillings per gallon which was to be paid by all retailers of alcoholic spirits. In both cases, it was envisaged that, by imposing the new duty on retailers, these reforms would increase the price at which spirits were available

to drinkers and thus reduce drinking levels. These retail excises were part of wider government attempts to control public consumption of gin and other spirits. Their imposition on retailers rather than producers was intended to engender a more direct effect on drinkers than usual excises had. The Gin Act 1736 is also especially important due to the rate at which the retail excise was imposed. The new duty of twenty shillings per gallon was almost ten times higher than the usual retail price of a gallon of gin at this time (Wilson 1940, pp.192-193). Hence, the new duty rate was so high that it was judged by contemporaries, and is usually viewed in retrospect, as effectively a prohibition on alcoholic spirits (House of Commons 1803 [1736], pp.1073-1110; Wilson 1940; Warner et al 2001). In this era, excise duties thus provided a new means through which governments could shape consumption habits by 'policing' the drinks trade.

Both retail excises were generally ineffective. With a large quantity of people selling spirits, collection and enforcement was almost impossible. Evasion became common, a black market for spirits flourished and drunkenness did not appear to decrease (Dillon 2003; Warner et al 2001). Both retail excises were soon abandoned with the 1729 imposition being abolished in 1733 and the 1736 tax lasting only until 1743. This short historical episode does exhibit some continuity with the older operations of a police economy in that the government was intervening in markets and seeking to affect the availability of certain goods. But, in other respects, it illustrates a strange and radical way in which taxation has been used to shape consumption, in a fairly direct manner, through the effective enactment of a prohibition on the consumption of a certain

category of drinks. The Gin Act 1736, in particular, provides a rare example of a tax that fits Ogus' (1998) description of the deterrent model of financial impositions as government intervention through tax resulted in a price which was intended to deter spirits consumption. Strangely, and unlike in Ogus' discussion of deterrent impositions in criminal and tort law, the deterred behaviour in this example (spirits-drinking) is not unlawful. This practice of taxation as prohibition is historically unusual, but it does demonstrate a further means through which governments have sought to regulate drinking through legal interventions which affect price.

3.2.2 Taxation as governance through choice

Retail excise duties imposed on alcoholic drinks are not typical. The historically more normal type of excise taxes, often called wholesale excise duties, are levied on the manufacture of alcoholic drinks and other goods and so are paid higher up the supply chain (by brewers, distillers and other producers). Despite their imposition being further removed from consumers than with retail excises, wholesale excises have also been regularly used to shape consumption. It is not clear when this first occurred, but it was permissible for the costs of the tax to be passed to consumers from at least 1671. In this year, an Excise Act endorsed this practice by stipulating that retailers must not be "sued, impleaded or molested, by any indictment, information, or popular action" for selling beer or ale at a price above the rate of excise laid out in statute (see also Hunter 2002). If producers and retailers could pass the cost of excise duties on to consumers, then it was possible for governments to encourage them to raise prices by increasing duty. Equally, a cut in duty could encourage a fall in price. Through

these indirect mechanisms, governments gained the capacity to regulate alcohol consumption through normal wholesale excises. There are examples of government attempts to use these duties to regulate alcohol consumption from the eighteenth century (Warner et al 2001) but this practice becomes particularly prominent in the nineteenth century.

The Beer Act 1830 abolished beer duty along with the requirement for beer-sellers to possess a magistrate's licence. The objectives of this legislation were largely tied up with a wider government commitment to free trade but, within this agenda, there was a specific government vision to make beer a more preferable alternative to spirits. Spirits-drinking was believed to have increased in the previous decade and had been linked to health problems as well as an apparent rise in crime (see House of Commons 21 May 1830). Beer-drinking, by contrast, was not seen as problematic to the same extent and, to some MPs, was even a "healthful nutritious" (House of Commons 21 May 1830) and "moral" beverage (House of Commons 4 May 1830). It was widely envisaged that, in an era of concern about both spirits-drinking and the adulteration of beer,^{ix} removing legislative impediments (such as beer duty) would stimulate competition thus improving the taste of beer and reducing its price. With these conditions in place, drinkers would be much more inclined to, as Lord Grenville Somerset MP put it, start "substituting good beer for an abominable adulteration and for gin" (House of Commons 4 May 1830). This practice of using tax to promote a desired form of consumption above an undesired one became quite common in the 1800s. For example, Gladstone justified the reduction of import duties on wine in his 1860 budget by arguing that poor people, like wealthy

people, will choose the superior beverage of wine over other drinks if it could be made available at more competitive prices (Gladstone 1860). If taxation could influence taste and price, governments believed they could weight or structure individual decisions in a manner that would promote the behavioural outcomes that they favoured.

Taxation was, in these examples, clearly used as a way to seek to regulate drinking. While the previous section explained how the Georgian experiments with taxation as prohibition correspond closely to Ogus' (1998) deterrent model of financial imposition, these nineteenth century practices of regulatory taxation are distinct. The difference is that, in the examples described, the duty is not being used to elevate prices to a level which closes off a specific lawful avenue of consumption. Nor do these examples fit with Ogus' (1998) description of a rectificatory tax in which the duty is fixed on specific commodities in line with the cost of the externalities that their consumption produces. Parliamentary debates about the Beer Act, to elaborate, did not feature notable efforts to quantify the cost of these harms and/or fix the levels of taxation accordingly (see e.g. House of Commons 4 May 1830; House of Commons 21 May 1830). The Beer Act 1830, however, did exaggerate the differences between levels of taxation applied to various drinks and, especially as the rate of spirits rose by sixpence in the same year (TNA CUST 44/1), it did result in the higher duty being attached to the commodity perceived as most personally and socially harmful (spirits). This measure could therefore be seen as loosely Pigovian in the sense that the private cost of beer drinking and spirits drinking were being adjusted to reflect the apparently divergent social costs of

these activities. As well as discussing government revenue, agriculture and the beer industry, parliamentary supporters of the Beer Act 1830 argued its provisions would make beer cheaper and, through greater competition, improve its taste (e.g. House of Commons 4 May 1830). The key to behavioural change was considered to be an ability to alter taste and price and thereby affect individual decision-making.

This regulatory approach contrasts the instances of prohibitive taxes in the eighteenth century in which, due to anxieties about the decision-making capabilities of individual drinkers, the government viewed a deterrent-type intervention as necessary. The importance of taste, price and decisions in the nineteenth century policies discussed belies the fact that a liberal faith in the individual rational actor lay at the heart of the regulatory mechanisms that they sought to engender. The police economy that supported earlier interventions in the marketplace had, as Braithwaite describes, thus deteriorated and been replaced by a liberal economy. By altering the taste and price of alcoholic drinks, it was envisaged that the rational individual would be more likely to choose drinks which were perceived as less personally and socially problematic. Behavioural change would thus be produced by working through personal autonomy rather than through the imposition of constraints upon it. This practice is broadly consistent with the category of interventions that Ogus (1999) calls nudging taxes. However, the term 'nudge' has become tied to a slightly different set of regulatory techniques since the publication of Thaler and Sunstein's (2008) famous book of the same name. Thaler and Sunstein's nudges are adaptations to "choice architecture" (2008, p.3) that are designed to

modify individuals' non-rational decision-making without significant economic inducement.^x Given the centrality of the rational actor to their intended operation, and to their fundamental existence as financial measures, it is preferable to use a separate term for the tax practices described here; namely, governance through choice. This term is adapted from Rose and Miller (1992) who use it to refer (more appropriately) to largely indirect governmental practices, historically characteristic of liberalism, which work to bring individual decisions into line with socio-political objectives (see also Miller & Rose 2008).

The instances of taxation discussed here thus show that, in the nineteenth century, the state sometimes used tax in an attempt to alter price and taste and thus shape decisions about alcohol consumption. Individuals were, therefore, being governed "through their freedom to choose" (Rose & Miller 1992, p.201). So, as well as prohibiting certain forms of consumption, excise duties can also engender governance through choice. This characterisation constitutes the third historical means through which governments have intervened in alcohol pricing and the second which has specifically operated as an attempt to regulate drinking through taxation.

4. Regulation through taxation today

The historical evidence presented so far has been sufficient to build up a typology of alcohol price interventions which have existed at some point in British history. It has further been possible to illustrate that these interventions, especially the taxation-based interventions, have sometimes been deployed by governments with the intention of regulating drinking. But what relevance does this historical evidence hold beyond the chronological boundaries of the periods

discussed? This section considers how practices of regulation through taxation continue to be important today with respect to both current alcohol policy and the study of regulation.

The abolition of the beer duty in 1830 is not an isolated historical example of the use of taxation to govern through choice. In many respects, British governments have continued to seek to regulate drinking in this fashion. Beer duty was reinstated in 1880, although this was explained at the time mainly in reference to the fact that it would be easier and cheaper to collect than the malt duty (which was simultaneously repealed) (House of Commons 24 June 1880). Spirits continued to be taxed at a proportionately higher rate than other drinks into the early twentieth century. Explaining this situation in 1914, a Customs House official asserted that “Apart from questions of revenue, the theory has always been that the consumption of Beer and light Wine should be encouraged as against the consumption of Spirits and stronger Wine” (TNA CUST 118/27). More recent evidence shows that taxation constituted a much greater proportion of the retail price of spirits than other drinks throughout the 1970s and 1980s (TNA CUST 44/69; TNA CUST 44/79); that, per 100 milligrams of alcohol, beer was taxed at nine pence and spirits 16 pence in 1989 (Crooks 1989); and spirits were taxed at a higher rate per unit of alcohol than other drinks in 2011 (Leicester 2011). It also became common, from the 1970s, for understandings of price-demand elasticities to facilitate statistical projections of how specific changes in rates of excise duty would affect levels of alcohol consumption (TNA T328/764; also Crooks 1989; Home Office 2012). A governmental interest in the regulation of drinking through taxation is not

confined to isolated spells of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and is clearly visible for much of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Recent government changes to alcohol excise duties have also been widely understood with reference to the regulation of consumption. The New Labour Government (1997-2010) introduced an 'alcohol duty escalator' in 2008 which enforced successive annual increases in alcohol excise duties at two percent above the rate of inflation. Government ministers mostly stuck to the line that the escalator was designed to raise revenue only (Seely 2014), although its introduction did follow substantial pressure for action on alcohol pricing and was understood by many interested parties in reference to efforts to lower general alcohol consumption (e.g. Alcohol Health Alliance 2013). The Coalition Government (2010-2015) continued the duty escalator until 2014 and also introduced other duty reforms which were more openly connected to efforts to regulate drinking. In 2011, a new higher rate of duty for strong beer (minimum 7.5% ABV) was justified in reference to addressing "the consumption of cheap, 'super strength' lagers that are also associated with high, and dangerous, levels of alcohol consumption" (Seely 2014, p.19). Simultaneously, a new lower duty rate for weak beer (maximum 2.8% ABV) was created in 2011 and described as helping to "encourage the production and consumption of lower-strength beers and give responsible drinkers additional choice" (Seely 2014, p.19). Furthermore, the Coalition's 2014 ban on the sale of alcoholic drinks at below cost price (defined as excise duty plus VAT) was attributed to efforts to "stop problem drinking" (Seely 2014, p.32). These taxation measures are not designed to affect the taste of drinks as in earlier eras, but they do similarly

embody an attempt to use excise duties to financially weight behavioural decisions in order to favour certain outcomes. The specific creation of new strength-based brackets of beer duty again engenders regulation by promoting more politically desirable forms of alcohol consumption. These super strength 'binge drinks' have joined spirits as alcoholic beverages which are constructed as especially problematic and thus suitable for higher taxes.

The Coalition's duty reforms can thus be seen as an attempt at regulation through taxation and, more specifically, a contemporary example of the use of taxation to govern drinking by structuring choices. From a historical perspective, the ongoing favour of such policies should not be especially surprising. This is, firstly, because of the waning fiscal importance of alcohol excise duties in the last century. Along with alcohol import duties, these taxes typically provided 30-40% of total annual government revenue across the nineteenth century (Harrison 1971, p.246). While governments in the 1800s did use tax policies to seek to shape drinking habits, these behavioural projects clearly had to be balanced against the state's considerable pecuniary interest in maintaining at least some level or type of alcohol consumption.^{xi} While the rates and receipts increased massively in both the First and Second World Wars, alcohol taxes actually shrank as a proportion of total tax revenues across the first half of the twentieth century (Harrison 1971, p.246). Figure One illustrates the further decline of alcohol taxes as a proportion of total government revenue from the 1950s onwards. They provided 7.2% of government revenue in 1960 and 5.1% in 1980. In the tax year ending 2015, the £10.5bn collected in alcohol taxes provided only 2% of total revenues.^{xii} As they came to rely less on the

revenue provided by alcohol taxes, British governments will have gained an enhanced capacity to attempt to reduce drinking through taxation or, at least, to direct consumption towards outcomes attuned to behavioural objectives as well as fiscal ones.

The second reason why the continued use of alcohol taxes to govern drinking through choice is unsurprising is its neat consistency with dominant political ideas and trends in governance. The study of regulation became popular in the context of socio-political changes since the 1980s which have, so it is widely claimed, seen neo-liberal ideals of minimal government and free trade pursued by states with a new vigour. The privatisation of many publicly-owned industries, the decline of state economic planning and the retraction or reduction of many welfare entitlements have exemplified this transformation. Importantly, as regulation scholars have shown, these changes did not and do not necessarily amount to a lessening of governance or social control so much as they constitute a shift towards differing means of influencing behaviour, through steering above rowing or regulating responsively rather than through command and control style interventions (Ayres & Braithwaite 1992; Baldwin et al 1998; Braithwaite 2008; Smith et al 2010). So, on the one hand, the purchase of alcoholic drinks is not controlled tightly by legal prohibitions or other state commands and exists as a lawful activity which individuals are notionally 'free' to engage with. But, on the other hand, choices about drinking are financially weighted by taxes in order to steer individuals in certain directions. Just as historical forms of alcohol pricing intervention have been connected to the police economy and liberal economy, the contemporary usage of alcohol excise

duties to govern through choice are consistent with the wider forms of regulation prevalent within a neo-liberal socio-economic climate.

In the present, the use of alcohol excise duties to regulate drinking is thus characterised by several features. It is non-prohibitive, legally enforced and universal (in the sense that it is applied to all licit alcohol sales within the UK jurisdiction). It is steering or directive in nature and operates primarily through choice. While taxes must be legislated into existence and their collection is backed by criminal sanctions, the means through which they impact upon behaviour is economic rather than legal as they operate through price. These crucial features help to make sense of alcohol taxes in relation to other ways of regulating drinking. Of course, as with their historical antecedents, today's regulatory tax policies are accompanied by a range of other measures. Drawing on the work of Ayres and Braithwaite (1992), it is useful to express these different forms of regulation as a pyramid. As discussed, the avoidance of drunkenness, through the discouragement of spirits-drinking or binge drinking, has been constructed as the objective of historical and contemporary examples of regulation through taxation. Hence the pyramid in Figure Two depicts the principal means used by contemporary British governments to respond to drunkenness. The width of each level indicates how broadly the response is applied and the vertical order is determined by its severity and formality. Criminal prosecutions for drunkenness offences thus sit at the top of pyramid, as severe, formal but not extensively used responses which allow certain individuals to be convicted and punished. Education and persuasion, which encompasses anti-binge drinking advertising campaigns and public health

advice on 'safe' levels of drinking, sit at the bottom as they are broadly dispensed but non-legal and fairly informal. Licensing and civil orders are both legal measures which are employed on an individuated basis to either control the behaviour of individuals (by giving them a Drinking Banning Order, for instance) or to limit the selling of alcoholic drinks to specific people on certain premises (through licensing). Taxation thus sits below the individuated and potentially severe legal measures, but above the more informal, less severe and non-legally-based regulation through education and persuasion. It is also notable that the levels of the pyramid become more preventive with each descending tier.

Presenting alcohol regulation as a five-tiered pyramid may appear a little reductionist. It is also fair to say that the forms of regulation depicted are not necessarily utilised in a manner that is coordinated or complementary.^{xiii} But the point is less about providing an entirely accurate and adequate depiction of the complex web of interventions and practices which are brought to bear on drunkenness, and more about situating alcohol taxation in relation to other means of regulating drunkenness. The contemporary usage of alcohol excise duties can thus be conceptualised as a practice of governance through choice that is as widely-applied as any form of alcohol regulation as well as being less individuated and severe than licensing, civil orders or criminal prosecution. In this form, alcohol excise duties contribute to the regulation of drinking today just as they did in the nineteenth century.

5. Conclusion

This article has used historical analysis to build up a typology of alcohol pricing interventions that consists of maximum pricing, taxation as prohibition and taxation as governance through choice. For each intervention, the discussion has identified the relevant objective in relation to behaviour or consumption (ensure availability of beer, prevent the consumption of spirits or increase beer-drinking at the expense of spirits-drinking), the regulatory mechanism through which it was intended behaviour would be effected (price suppression, price inflation to deterrent levels or varied duty rates between drinks to weight individual choices) and the type of actor upon whom an effect was envisaged (rational or irrational). Examining these historical interventions gives rise to new perspectives on the present. This occurs partly as the present regime of alcohol excise taxation can be seen more clearly to be characterised by historically-familiar attempts to govern drinking through choice. These practices are very similar to the nineteenth century tax policies examined in the sense that, in both cases, varied duty rates are intended to alter the decisions made by individual rational actors. Although current policies are justified more as anti-binge drinking measures rather than anti-spirits measures, in both cases the objective is to reduce a form of drinking which is believed to cause a disproportionate amount of alcohol-related social problems. A longer-term perspective thus highlights a fair degree of consistency in the operation of regulation of drinking through taxation in England and Wales.

As well as bringing the present into sharper focus, the historical perspective adopted here enables more informed reflections on the future of

alcohol policy. This article began by outlining current debates about the introduction of a MUP in various parts of the UK and how this is often perceived as a new and different policy that is tantamount to a 'turning point'. It was noted at the outset that the mechanism involved in this policy, the creation of a legal price floor for alcohol sales above and beyond the amount of taxation involved in any transaction, would indeed be new. It can be added that such a policy would starkly contrast the system of maximum pricing operated for much of the medieval and early modern periods. Moreover, it is notable that the statutory price boost of MUP is justified more with regards to the control of irrational drinkers (see Haydock, 2014) than governance through the choices of rational drinkers. In this respect, it may have more in common with eighteenth century experiments with taxation as prohibition rather than the ongoing usage of taxation as governance through choice. But, crucially, the long history of alcohol pricing interventions examined here undermines any conception of the total novelty of MUP proposals. It has been amply demonstrated that the manipulation of alcohol prices for the purposes of altering general patterns of drinking behaviour is a well-established historical practice for British governments. It has also been suggested that the waning fiscal importance of alcohol excise duties in the last century has enabled their operation to be directed increasingly towards behavioural objectives as opposed to financial ones. It is thus suggested that MUP should not be seen as anything paradigmatically distinct in alcohol policy.^{xiv} As depicted in Table One, it is a (potential) fourth type alcohol pricing intervention which is distinct, but also similar, to its historical antecedents. MUP, therefore, is less a turning point and

more a potential next step along a regulatory path that British governments have been walking for centuries.

Finally, this article has sought to make a contribution to the wider socio-legal study of regulation. It should be stressed that the article has not sought to obscure the distinction between taxation and regulation. Instead, it has argued that valuable existing studies of the regulation of taxation, as well as frequent assertions that taxation can be used to shape consumption, should be accompanied by additional enquiries into how taxation can, in some circumstances, be connected to wider projects of behavioural regulation. To further this end, this article has identified historical examples of the sort of deterrent, prohibitory taxation previously only described hypothetically and examined, in some depth, the more usual historical operation of taxation as governance through choice. It has drawn on existing regulation literature to develop an analytical framework based on objective, mechanism and target, and used this to compare these two forms of regulation through taxation to other means of intervening in alcohol pricing. Through this historical typology of pricing interventions, that has empirically and conceptually extended understandings of taxation as a form of behavioural regulation, it is envisaged that this paper will help to facilitate further studies in this area. Such studies might examine alcohol further but need not be limited in this way. Excise duties on tobacco, gambling and petrol are, in various countries, often justified with reference to the social or environmental problems resulting from the consumption of these commodities. It is notable that the UK Government recently announced plans to follow other jurisdictions, such as France and

many US states, by introducing a tax on sugary drinks as a means of tackling childhood obesity (BBC News 16/3/16; Hoffer et al 2014; Von Tigerstrom 2016). Furthermore, Colorado's bold move to legalise the trade in marijuana has involved the creation of marijuana taxes (see Colorado Department of Revenue, 2016). In all these examples, it is either apparent or possible that the use of taxation may form part of the regulation of the consumption of these apparently problematic commodities. It is therefore hoped that this paper can contribute towards a wider and better understanding of important and evolving practices of regulation through taxation.

Table 1 - Comparison of Alcohol Pricing Interventions

	Objective	Mechanism	Target
Maximum Pricing/Price Suppression	Ensure availability of beer	Price suppression	-
Taxation as Prohibition	Prevent, or radically reduce, spirits drinking	Price inflation to deterrent levels	Irrational actors
Taxation as Governance through Choice	Consumption of less problematic drinks	Varied duty levels to weight prices in favour of desired outcome	Rational actors
Minimum Unit Pricing	Lower consumption generally	Minimum unit price to increase prices	Irrational actors

Figure 1: Alcohol Tax (Excise and Import Duties) as % of Total Government Revenue

Figure 2 – Regulatory Strategies for Responding to Drunkenness

Bibliography

Archival Sources

House of Commons (1803) *Cobbetts's Parliamentary History of England Vol. 9* 1733-1737. Hansard, London.

House of Commons (1830) Beer trade, 4 May 1830. Available at:

http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1830/may/04/beer-trade-1#S2V0024P0_18300504_HOC_61 (accessed 24 August 2015).

House of Commons (1830) Sale of Beer Bill, 21 May 1830. Available at:

http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1830/may/21/sale-of-beer-bill#S2V0024P0_18300521_HOC_50 (accessed 24 August 2015).

House of Commons (1880) Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, 24 June 1880.

Available at:

http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1880/jun/24/second-reading#S3V0253P0_18800624_HOC_120 (accessed 8 September 2015).

The National Archive CUST 44 Series. Board of Customs and Excise or Predecessor: Annual Reports.

The National Archive CUST 118 Series. Board of Customs and Excise or Predecessor: Private Office Papers.

The National Archive CUST 119 Series. Board of Excise and Successor:
Miscellaneous Bundles.

The National Archive T328 series, Central Economics Division and Fiscal and
Incomes Policy Division and Successors.

References

AUTHOR (2013)

AUTHOR (2014)

Alcohol Health Alliance (2015) About. Available at: <http://ahauk.org/about/>
(accessed 14 August 2015).

Alcohol Health Alliance (2013) The importance of maintaining the alcohol duty
escalator. Available at:
<http://www.ias.org.uk/uploads/AHA%20Briefing%20-%20The%20importance%20of%20maintaining%20the%20Alcohol%20Duty%20Escalator.pdf> (accessed 28
August 2015).

Ashworth WJ (2003) Customs and Excise: Trade, Production and Consumption
in England, 1640-1845. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Atwell BL (2013) Is sugar the new tobacco? How to regulate toxic foods. *Annals
of Health Law* 22 (1), 138-170.

Ayres I and Braithwaite J (1992) *Responsive Regulation: Transcending the
Deregulation Debate*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Babor T, Caetano R, Casswell S et al (2010) Alcohol: No ordinary commodity –
a summary of the second edition. *Addiction* 105, 769-779.

Baldwin R, Scott C, Hood C (1998) Introduction. In: Baldwin R, Scott C, Hood C
(eds) *A Reader on Regulation*, pp.1-55. Oxford University Press, Oxford,

Barton A (2011) Screening and brief intervention of detainees for alcohol use: A social crime prevention approach to combating alcohol-related crime? *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 50 (1), 62-74.

BBC News (2014) Alcohol: Jim Wells plans to bring in minimum pricing per unit. BBC News, 3 December. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-30296398> (accessed 29 September 2015).

BBC News (2015) Proposed minimum alcohol price law is published. BBC News, 15 July. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-politics-33522647> (accessed 29 September 2015).

BBC News (2016) Sugar tax: How will it work? BBC News, 16 March 2016. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-35824071> (accessed 21 April 2016).

Beatty TKM, Larsen ER, Sommervoll DE (2009) Driven to drink: sin taxes near a border. *Journal of Health Economics* 28, 1175-1184.

Braithwaite J (2008) *Regulatory Capitalism: How it Works, Ideas for Making it Work Better*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Braithwaite V, Braithwaite J (2006) Democratic sentiments and cyclical markets in vice. *British Journal of Criminology* 46 (6), 1110-1147.

Braithwaite V (2007) Responsive regulation and taxation: Introduction. *Law and Policy* 29 (1), 3-10.

Braithwaite V, Ahmed E (2005) A threat to tax morale: the case of Australian higher education policy. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 26 (4), 523-540.

Braithwaite V (2009) Attitudes to tax policy: Politics, self-interest and social values. Centre for Tax System Integrity. Available at:

<http://regnet.anu.edu.au/research/publications/629/attitudes-tax-policy-politics-self-interest-and-social-values> (accessed 29 September 2015).

Burnett J (1999) *Liquid Pleasures*. Routledge, London.

Cairney P, Studlar D (2014) Public health policy in the United Kingdom: After the war on tobacco, is a war on alcohol brewing? *World Medical and Health Policy* 6 (3), 308-323.

Chaiyasong S, Limwattananon S, Limwattananon C, Thamarangsi T, Tangchareonsahtien V and Schommer J (2011) Impacts of excise tax raise on illegal and total alcohol consumption: a Thai experience. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 18 (2), 90-99.

Clark P (1983) *The English Alehouse: A Social History, 1200-1830*. Longman, Harlow.

Colorado Department of Revenue (2016) Colorado Marijuana Tax Data. Available at: <https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/revenue/colorado-marijuana-tax-data> (accessed 21 April 2016).

Crossen S (2007) Alcohol Taxation and Regulation in the European Union. *International Tax and Public Finance* 14 (6), 699-732.

Crossen S (2011) The economics of excise taxation. In Albi E, Vazquez JM (eds) *The Elgar Guide to Tax Systems*, pp.278-299. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Coffman D (2013) *Excise Taxation and the Origins of Public Debt*. Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Crooks E (1989) *Alcohol Consumption and Taxation*. Institute for Fiscal Studies, London.

- Dillon P (2003) *Gin: The Much Lamented Death of Madame Geneva*. Justin Charles and Co, Boston.
- Farnsworth K, Fooks G (2015) Corporate taxation, corporate power and corporate harm. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 54 (1), 25-41.
- Fennell LA (2009) Willpower and legal policy. *Annual Review of Law and Society* 5, 91-113.
- Foucault M (2009) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-1978*. Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Gallant M (2007) Tax and terrorism: A new partnership? *Journal of Financial Crime* 14 (4), 453-459.
- Galle, B (2016) Tax, Command... Or Nudge?: Evaluating the New Regulation. *Texas Law Review* 92 (4), 837-894.
- Gifford A (1997) Whisky, Margarine, and Newspapers: A Tale of Three Taxes. In Shughart WF (ed) *Taxing Choice: The Predatory Politics of Fiscal Discrimination*, pp.57-77. Transaction, London.
- Gladstone W (1860) *Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the finance of the year and the treaty of commerce with France*. John W.Parker and Sons, London.
- Hadfield P (2006) *Bar Wars: Contesting the Night in Contemporary British Cities*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hall PA (1993) Policy Paradigms, Social Learning and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics* 25 (3), 275-296.
- Harrison B (1971) *Drink and the Victorians*. Faber and Faber, London.

Haydock W (2014) The rise and fall of the 'nudge' of minimum unit pricing: The continuity of neo-liberalism in alcohol policy in England. *Critical Social Policy* [online first], 1-20.

Hayward K, Hobbs D (2007) Beyond the binge in booze Britain: Market-led liminalisation and the spectacle of binge drinking. *British Journal of Sociology* 58 (3), 437-456.

Heinze RW (1976) *The Proclamations of the Tudor Kings*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

HM Revenue and Customs (2016a) HMRC Tax and NIC Receipts: Monthly and Annual Historical Records. Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/517448/Mar16_Receipts_NS_Bulletin_final.pdf (accessed 21 April 2016).

HM Revenue and Customs (2016b) Alcohol Bulletin February 2016. Available at: <https://www.uktradeinfo.com/Statistics/Pages/TaxAndDutybulletins.aspx> (accessed 21 April 2016).

Hobbs D, Hadfield P, Lister S, Winlow S (2003) *Bouncers: Violence and Governance in the Night-Time Economy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hoffer AJ, Shughart WF and Thomas MD (2014) Sin Taxes: Revenue, Paternalism and Political Interest. *The Independent Review* 19 (1), 47-64.

Home Office (2012) A Minimum Unit Price for Alcohol. Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/157763/ia-minimum-unit-pricing.pdf (accessed 28 August 2015).

- Hopkins M, Sparrow P (2006) Sobering up: Arrest referrals and brief intervention for alcohol users in the custody suite. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 6 (4), 389-410.
- Howlett M (2011) *Designing Public Policies: Principles and Instruments*. Routledge, Abingdon.
- Hunter J (2002) English Inns, Taverns, Alehouses and Brandy Shops: The Legislative Framework, 1495-1797. In Kümin B, Tlustý TA (eds) *The World of the Tavern*, pp.65-82. Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Ireland Department of Health (2015) Press release: statement by Minister for Health Leo Varadkar on minimum unit pricing. Available at: <http://health.gov.ie/blog/press-release/statement-by-minister-for-health-leo-varadkar-on-minimum-unit-pricing/> (accessed 15 April 2016).
- Kaplow L, Shavell S (2002) On the Superiority of Corrective Taxes to Quantity Regulation. *American Law and Economics Review* 4 (1), 1.17.
- Katikireddi SV, Hilton S, Bonnell C, Bond L (2014) Understanding the development of minimum unit pricing of alcohol in Scotland: A qualitative study of the policy process. *PLoS One* 9 (3), pp.1-10.
- Leicester A (2011) *Alcohol Pricing and Taxation Policies*. Institute for Fiscal Studies, London.
- Leviner, S (2008) An overview of tax enforcement – from “Big Stick” to Responsive Regulation. *Regulation and Governance* 2, pp.360-380.
- Lorenzi P (2004) Sin taxes. *Society* 41 (3), 59-65.
- Lorenzi P (2010) Taxing antisocial behavior for the common good. *Society* 47 (4), 328-332.

Makela P, Bloomfield K, Gustafson N, Huhtanen Pet, Room R (2007) Changes in volume of drinking after changes in alcohol taxes and travellers' allowances: results from a panel study. *Addiction* 103, 181-191.

McCambridge J (2012) A user's guide to the 2012 Alcohol Strategy for England and Wales: A commentary on the commentaries. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 19 (5), 377-378.

McSweeney T (2015) Calling time on alcohol-related crime? Examining the impact of court-mandated alcohol treatment on offenders using propensity score matching. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 15 (4), 464-483.

Measham F, Brain K (2005) Binge drinking, British alcohol policy and the new culture of intoxication. *Crime, Media, Culture* 1 (3), 262-283.

Meier P, Booth A, Stockwell T et al (2008) *Independent Review of the Effects of Alcohol Pricing and Promotion*. University of Sheffield, Sheffield.

Miller P and Rose N (2008) *Governing the Present*. Polity, Cambridge.

Nicholls J (2009) *The Politics of Alcohol*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Nicholls J (2012) The Government Alcohol Strategy 2012: Alcohol policy at a turning point? *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 19 (5), 355-359.

Nicholls J, Greenaway J (2014) What is the problem? Evidence, politics and alcohol policy in England, 2010-2014. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 22 (2), 135-142.

Ogus A (1998) Corrective taxes and financial impositions as regulatory instruments. *Modern Law Review* 61 (6), 767-788.

Ogus A (1999) Nudging and rectifying: The use of fiscal instruments for regulatory purposes. *Legal Studies* 19 (2), 245-266.

Office for National Statistics (2014) Crime in England and Wales – year ending September 2013. Available at: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/crime-stats/crime-statistics/year-ending-september-2014/stb-crime-in-england-and-wales--year-ending-september-2014.html#tab-Anti-social-behaviour> (accessed 15 August 2015).

Office for National Statistics (2015) Focus on violent and sexual offences 2013-2014. Available at: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/crime-stats/crime-statistics/focus-on-violent-crime-and-sexual-offences--2013-14/rpt-about-this-release.html#tab-conclusions> (accessed 15 August 2015).

Osterberg EL (2011) Alcohol tax changes and the use of alcohol in Europe. *Drug and Alcohol Review* 30, 124-129.

Pigou AC (1960 [1920]) *The Economics of Welfare*. Macmillan: London.

Richardson G (2006) Taxation determinants of fiscal corruption: Evidence across countries. *Journal of Financial Crime* 13 (2), 323-338.

Rose N, Miller P (1992) Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology* 43 (2), 173-205.

Seely A (2014) Beer taxation and the pub trade (SN1373). House of Commons Library. Available at

<http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN01373>

(accessed 1/10/15).

Scottish Government (2015) Minimum Unit Pricing. Scottish Government: Newsroom, 6 May. Available at: <http://news.scotland.gov.uk/News/Minimum-unit-pricing-18a4.aspx> (accessed 28 September 2015).

Shughart WF (1997a) Introduction and Overview. In Shughart WF (ed) *Taxing Choice: The Predatory Politics of Fiscal Discrimination*, pp.1-9. Transaction, London.

Shughart WF (1997b) The Economics of the Nanny State. In Shughart WF (ed) *Taxing Choice: The Predatory Politics of Fiscal Discrimination*, pp.13-29. Transaction, London.

Skellington Orr K, McAuley A, Graham L, McCoard S (2013) Applying an alcohol brief intervention (ABI) model to the community justice setting: learning from a pilot project. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 15 (1), 83-101.

Smith G, Seddon T, Quirk H (2010) Introduction. In Quirk H, Seddon T and Smith G (eds) *Regulation and Criminal Justice: Developing a New Framework for Research and Policy Development*, pp.1-24. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stockwell T, Zhao J, Marzell M, Gruenewald PJ, Macdonald S, Ponicki WR, Martin G (2015) Relationship between minimum alcohol pricing and crime during the partial privatization of a Canadian Government alcohol policy. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs* 76 (4), 628-634.

Thaler R (1980) Towards a Positive Theory of Consumer Choice. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 1, 39-60.

Thaler R, Sunstein C (2008) *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness*. Yale University Press, London.

Thom, Betsy (1999) *Dealing With Drink*. Free Association, London.

- Thompson EP (1991) *Customs in Common*. Penguin, London.
- UK Government (2012) *The Government's Alcohol Strategy*. Home Office, London.
- Valverde M (1998) *Diseases of the Will: Alcohol and the Dilemmas of Freedom*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Valverde M (2003) Police science, British style: Pub licensing and knowledges of urban disorder. *Economy and Society* 32 (2), 234-252.
- Vanderberg B, Sharma A (2014) Alcohol tax reform: a minimum price is in the public interest. *The Conversation*, 2 May. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/alcohol-tax-reform-a-minimum-price-is-in-the-public-interest-26164> (accessed 15 April 2016).
- Von Tigerstrom, B (2012) Taxing sweetened beverages for public health: legal and policy issues in Canada. *Alberta Law Review* 50 (1), 37-64.
- Wagenaar AC, Matthew JS, Komro KA (2009) Effects of beverage alcohol taxes and prices on drinking: A meta-analysis of 1003 estimates from 112 studies. *Addiction* 104 (2), 179-190.
- Warner J, Her M, Gmel G, Rehm J (2001) Can Legislation Prevent Debauchery? Mother Gin and Public Health in 18th Century England. *American Journal of Public Health* 91 (3), 375-384.
- Warner J (2004) *Craze: Gin and Debauchery in an Age of Reason*. Profile, London.
- Wilson G (1940) *Alcohol and the Nation*. Nicholson and Wilson, London.
- World Health Organization (2014) *European status report on alcohol and health 2014: Pricing policies*. Available at:

http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/244902/Pricing-policies.pdf

(accessed 15 April 2016).

Yelvington B (1997) Excise Taxes in Historical Perspective. In Shugart WF (ed) *Taxing Choice: The Predatory Politics of Fiscal Discrimination*, pp.31-56. Transaction, London.

Cases Cited

Scotch Whisky Association v. the Lord Advocate and The Advocate General for Scotland (Case 333/14 [2015] ECJ)

Laws Cited

Assize of Bread and Ale 1266

An Ordinance for the speedy raising and levying of moneys 1643

Excise Act 1671

Gin Act 1729

Gin Act 1736

Beer Act 1830

Alcohol (Minimum Pricing) (Scotland) Act 2012

ⁱ See Katikireddi et al (2014) for a fuller account of the evolution of minimum unit pricing as a policy proposal.

ⁱⁱ Indeed, the novelty of a price floor seemed to be reflected in the European Court of Justice's ruling on the legality of Scotland's MUP legislation. See: *Scotch Whisky Association v. the Lord Advocate and The Advocate General for Scotland* (2015).

ⁱⁱⁱ For example, see: Howlett (2011: 101-114), Cnossen (2011) and Babor et al (2010).

^{iv} For example, a search for 'taxation AND regulation' on Web of Science produced 1346 hits. This is a large number and consideration was given to the first 100 hits by relevance, the first 100 hits by date (newest) and the first 100 most cited. By each means of sorting, the quantity of results which actually examined taxation and regulation simultaneously, and in any depth, was very small.

^v This broad definition of regulation also corresponds to the third definition of regulation identified by Baldwin et al (1998) as all mechanisms of social control. It also echoes Black's statement that "regulation is the sustained and focused attempt to alter the behaviour of others according to the defined standards or purposes with the intention of producing a broadly defined outcome or outcomes" (cited in Smith et al 1992, p.26).

^{vi} Interestingly, Ogus (1998) is sceptical about the practicalities of implementing a tax which is pegged to the cost of externalities. Administrative costs, weak accountability and the difficulty of calculating externalities are identified as problems. Others authors have expanded on the latter problem (e.g. Kaplow & Shavell 2002).

^{vii} It is worth adding that there was no settled comprehension of 'alcoholic drinks' as a category of beverages until at least the nineteenth century. In this sense also, beer and other drinks we now understand as alcoholic were not being treated as a defined category of commodities requiring of special regulation.

^{viii} Similarly, the early history of federal excise taxes in the USA was dominated by attempts to use such taxes to raise money to fund military activities (see Yelvington 1997).

^{ix} There were regular communications between excise officers and the Treasury on the topic of adulteration in the 1820s and 1830s. For example, in December 1829, a group of excise officers informed the Treasury that, of every ten brewers, six to eight were adulterating porter (TNA CUST 119/368).

^x Thaler and Sunstein define a nudge as "any aspect of the choice architecture that alters people's in a predictable way without forbidding any options or significantly changing their economic incentives" (2008, p.6). Consistent with the findings presented here, they specifically associate taxes designed to change behaviour with the vision of human beings as rational actors and separate them from nudging which, in their argument, is underpinned by a non-rational conception of human agency (2008, pp.6-8 especially).

^{xi} These dual purposes were neatly expressed by Gladstone when, in 1880, he explained that the objective of spirits taxes was not to eradicate consumption but "to bring it to what would be the minimum compatible with the collection of the Revenue" (House of Commons 24 June 1880).

^{xii} Again, see Yelvington (1997) for information on the interesting and parallel decline in the fiscal importance of excise taxes in the USA across the twentieth century.

^{xiii} Indeed, a number of criminological studies have raised the idea that the relaxation of various licensing rules in the 1990s and 2000s actively contributed to an increase in drunkenness (e.g. Measham & Brain 2005; Hadfield 2006; Hayward & Hobbs 2007).

^{xiv} The form of change described here might be characterised as, using Peter Hall's (1993) famous schema, a second order policy change rather than a paradigm shift. Applying Hall, this would be to suggest that the goals of the policy remain the same (reducing alcohol-related social problems) but the instruments used to achieve these goals are different (MUP versus taxation as governance through choice). While such a characterisation might be tenable, it is also important to recognise that both MUP and alcohol taxation as governance through choice belong to the same family of price-based interventions and are used (or proposed for use) alongside other regulatory measures, such as licensing and education. These points do not sit as comfortably within Hall's schema for analysing policy change.