



**The Borders of Booze Britain: Alcohol control and nationality**

Journal:	<i>21st Century Society</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Keywords:	Public discourse, Policy, Migration, Historical issues
Abstract:	This paper seeks to understand how United Kingdom alcohol control policies, historically and currently, are both informed by and seek to inform how we conceptualise the nation and nationality. Using the latest minimum price per unit of alcohol policy as a point of departure and setting it the context of over three hundred years of alcohol controls, this paper exposes how the internal contradictions inherent in alcohol regulation are obscured by the deployment of nationalism as a rhetorical device

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## The Borders of Booze Britain: Alcohol controls and nationality

### Abstract

This paper seeks to understand how United Kingdom alcohol control policies, historically and currently, are both informed by and seek to inform how we conceptualise the nation and nationality. Using the latest minimum price per unit of alcohol policy as a point of departure and setting it the context of over three hundred years of alcohol controls, this paper exposes how the internal contradictions inherent in alcohol regulation are obscured by the deployment of nationalism as a rhetorical device

### Keywords

Alcohol, nationality, border controls

## The borders of booze Britain

### Introduction

This paper argues that, both historically and in the current era, policies regarding the control of the sale and use of alcohol have as much to do with notions of nationality and the nation state as they do with public health, economy or crime and disorder.

The current UK coalition government has recently announced a policy of minimum price per unit for alcohol sales (Leicester & O'Connell, 2012). Although there is a chance that the European Union could overturn this policy under anti-competition laws, the policy raises many interesting questions of class and nationality as they relate to drinking. By setting a minimum price, this policy could be viewed as akin to a regressive taxation on drinkers, a sin tax to use John Stuart Mill's parlance (Mill, 1859), although clearly this is not a tax in the normative fiscal sense as no extra duties will be collected by the treasury. By setting the minimum price per unit of alcohol, prices of expensive, therefore exclusive, beverages will be unaffected, yet the cost of the cheapest supermarket and off-licence sold alcoholic drinks will increase. Therefore we can say without much doubt that the consumers of cheap drinks, and therefore most likely the poor, are to be greatest affected by minimum price setting. As the price is set per unit of alcohol contained in the drink and not by the overall volume of the beverage, the greatest increase in cost to the consumer will be those who consume cheap yet strong drinks. As others have observed, there is an element of class conceit to this policy (Brockley, 2012) as the stated aim is to reduce binge drinking, the thinking behind the policy must therefore assume that binge drinking is a malaise of the poor, that the better-off do not engage in such behaviour, or if they do, there are no negative

1  
2  
3 social or public health consequences of this behaviour. Thus, it is relatively straightforward  
4  
5 to argue that there is a class dimension to this policy; while this is clearly important for a  
6  
7 number of reasons, this paper will argue that there is also an issue of nationality that is  
8  
9 embedded in this policy, as there has been in many attempts to control the sale and  
10  
11 consumption of alcohol throughout the modern history of Britain. The conjecture of this  
12  
13 paper is that this latest attempt to manage alcohol use can be utilised to reinforce notions of  
14  
15 nationality and consequently has the potential to be used as leverage to reinforce national  
16  
17 border controls.  
18  
19

20  
21 This paper will first provide a distilled history of alcohol control policies in the UK to  
22  
23 illustrate how alcohol has been used historically to reinforce divisions of nationality and to  
24  
25 construct the other. As Holt observes;  
26  
27

28  
29 "Alcohol is a very useful lens through which to explore larger and more obvious  
30  
31 historical changes such as industrialisation and the rise of the state" (Holt, 2006, p.  
32  
33 1).  
34  
35

36  
37 Both processes (industrialisation and the rise of nation states) have, instrumentally or as a  
38  
39 consequence, created social divisions and had enduring implications for notions of culture  
40  
41 and identity. With industrialisation, there have been profound effects on the class structure  
42  
43 along the lines of the ownership of the means of production and the division of labour  
44  
45 (Marx, 1976). Others have argued that post-industrialisation also has an impact on class and  
46  
47 alcohol consumption (Haywood & Hobbs, 2007), with the growth of the night time economy  
48  
49 as a political and economic response to a post-Fordist paradigm. However, as stated, the  
50  
51 focus of this paper is not the relationship between alcohol consumption and social class,  
52  
53 however it is worth keeping in mind the how notions of social class, and certainly social  
54  
55 class deficit, inform debates and policies about the consumption of alcohol beverages.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Rather, the focus of this paper is to explore how alcohol controls relate to discourses of  
4  
5  
6 nationality.

7  
8  
9 As recent as 2004 the then British Prime Minister Tony Blair gave a speech referring to  
10  
11 binge drinking as the “new British disease” (Rayner, 2004), as we will uncover; how and  
12  
13 how much the British drink has often been used to construct a sense of national pride and  
14  
15 deficit both for those identified as British and those identified as non-British. From the Irish  
16  
17 who “revels in drink to the point of the most bestial drunkenness” (Engels, 1993, p. 103) of  
18  
19 19<sup>th</sup> Century Manchester to the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century demonization of “lager louts” (Mares, 2001,  
20  
21 p. 153), alcohol has been used as a marker of nationality and national identity. Therefore  
22  
23 we will explore how the current policy paradigm of minimum alcohol unit price fixing  
24  
25 continues this tradition by looking at in whose interest this policy benefits. At this stage of  
26  
27 the analysis we will see that both the alcohol industry and the criminal fraternity are set to  
28  
29 profit from the policy. Given the commonly-perceived ideological standpoint of the current  
30  
31 UK coalition government, it may be obvious as to why they might wish to give support the  
32  
33 corporate brewing industry, it is well known that the alcohol industry is a great supporter  
34  
35 of the incumbent Conservative Party (Bower & Cox, 2010), what is initially less obvious is to  
36  
37 why the government would want to support organised crime, as a clear consequence of  
38  
39 minimum price setting is likely to be an increase in both the volume of alcohol smuggling  
40  
41 and in the profits to be made from such nefarious activities. As we will see, this policy gift to  
42  
43 those engaged in unlawful business could provide the subtext for further policy shifts in  
44  
45 relation to nationality and nationhood. Finally this paper will look at how the  
46  
47 implementation of the alcohol minimum price setting policy could be utilised to provide the  
48  
49 justification for enhanced border controls. For if increasing the price of legally available  
50  
51 alcohol does lead to an increase in contraband, then there may be calls to tighten UK border  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 controls, thus, in the final analysis, this paper is interested in the relationship between  
4  
5 'Booze Britain' and 'Fortress Britain'  
6  
7

8  
9 As this paper will explore, alcohol has for centuries defined who we are in terms of  
10  
11 nationality, as by extension, define who is the other or outsider. If this is framed as an issue  
12  
13 of nationality, then it must also be an issue of borders. For without borders, even if they  
14  
15 may be elastic and porous, it is challenging to either define the nation or any sense of  
16  
17 imagined community which may be corollary to the construction of nationality (Anderson,  
18  
19 1991). Historically, attempts to control the sale and consumption of alcohol have had some  
20  
21 effect on how the nation-state practices border controls (Ludington, 2006). This paper is  
22  
23 focused on the context of the United Kingdom, but we could also use the impact of the 18<sup>th</sup>  
24  
25 amendment to the US constitution as a comparative example. The prohibition of alcohol led  
26  
27 to a massive growth in illegal bootlegging, or alcohol smuggling. This in turn, provided the  
28  
29 US Coastguard Service with further policing roles in order to stem the supply of illegal  
30  
31 alcohol being imported into the United States of America.  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **A distilled historical context**

37  
38 In order to provide the historical context to the preposition of this paper, will involve the  
39  
40 analyse some key events of three historical epochs; The Act of Union with Scotland and  
41  
42 London's Gin Craze of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century; Irish immigration and industrialisation in the 19<sup>th</sup>  
43  
44 Century and binge drinking and the accession of eight Eastern European countries to the  
45  
46 European Union at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. As we will see, the relationship  
47  
48 between how we consume alcohol and how we conceptualise nationality is not new. This  
49  
50 section on the history of alcohol consumption in Western contexts is not exhaustive but  
51  
52 rather provides exemplars that according to Holt:  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 "[...] not even the commercial interests that control the production of alcohol can  
4  
5 totally regulate, much less control, either the meaning or myriad functions of alcohol  
6  
7 in Western life" (2006, p. 7).  
8  
9

10 The first era considered in this paper, the early to mid 18<sup>th</sup> Century, has two artefacts that  
11  
12 have a bearing on the relationship between alcohol control and the nationality. Edinburgh  
13  
14 is the epicentre for one series of events whereas London sets the scene for another set of  
15  
16 independent events, however both narratives evoke notions of national identity, and they  
17  
18 also both have a bearing on relations with the French.  
19  
20

21  
22 Starting in Scotland, Ludington (2006), examines how French claret wine became the  
23  
24 preferred drink of the Scots around the time of the Act of Union. Before the Act of Union,  
25  
26 claret was popular in Scotland whereas it was not so in England, this could be due to  
27  
28 differences in taxation and duty regimes. However the Act of Union and equalisation of  
29  
30 duties dramatically raised the cost of imported claret in Scotland, for English duties on  
31  
32 French wine were more costly. Instead of having the effect of reducing claret consumption  
33  
34 in Scotland, the increase in duty, according to Ludington's research, only served to increase  
35  
36 the illegal importation of claret. At least part of the evidence for the popularity of claret in  
37  
38 Scotland before the Act of Union was the Wine Act of 1703, which according to Ludington,  
39  
40 "established claret as a symbol of Scottish independence and as a commodity to  
41  
42 symbolically defy the English" (2006, p. 167). England was at war with France and  
43  
44 therefore the drinking of French wine could be viewed as an act of defiance. Furthermore,  
45  
46 the English duties on imported alcohol, which were relevantly steep compared to those of  
47  
48 the pre-Union Scots, were in part to pay for the war against France. Thus the act of drinking  
49  
50 French claret had a twofold influence on the Scots relationship with the English; firstly as a  
51  
52 symbol of defiance and secondly by being financially able to enjoy more luxurious wine.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Thus, through this period, we can observe how the consumption of a certain alcoholic  
4 beverage, namely claret, was used to both define and reinforce Scottish nationality as  
5 superior to that of the imperialistic English. As the Scot William Clelland, wrote from  
6 London in 1705,  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12  
13 “All the wine here is poison’d and all the women pox’t at least I would fain fancie so  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
whylst I have no monie.” (Ludington, 2006, p. 169)

18 However, if we take Ludington’s treatise beyond the Act of Union of 1707, which lead to the  
19 equalisation of alcohol duties on French wine between Scotland and England, we see that  
20 claret consumption in Scotland did not necessarily reduce; rather, it propagated the illegal  
21 importation of claret as a further act of defiance. This increase in claret smuggling, thus  
22 served two purposes; it increased the profit from importation of wine, as no duty was being  
23 paid, and it reinforced the popular opposition to the new customs and duties (Ludington,  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
2006, p. 172)

34 At the same time as the Scottish were imbibing claret as a symbol of opposition to English  
35 imperialism, London was experiencing a alcohol consumption frenzy popularly referred to  
36 as the ‘gin craze’. As exemplified by Hogarth’s 1751 print ‘Gin Lane’ with its depiction of  
37 morally deficient behaviour brought on by the overconsumption of gin. Much has been  
38 written about the impact and the attempts to control Londoners’ taste for gin in the 18<sup>th</sup>  
39 Century; however, in thinking about nationality we need to look at the causes of the gin  
40 epidemic.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

51 Gin was first popularised amongst the English at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century by  
52 soldiers returning from the continent from involvement in the war of Spanish succession  
53 (Maples, 2012). At that time, the most popular alcoholic beverage in England was beer.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
However the distillation and production of gin was vigorous promoted by the English

1  
2  
3 government. The perceived rationale for this was twofold; firstly to boost the rural  
4  
5 economy by creating a new market for grain producers and secondly, to create a domestic  
6  
7 challenge to foreign imports, particularly French brandy (Holt, 2006). The French at this  
8  
9 point were in hostilities with the English. In order to achieve these aims, the importation of  
10  
11 spirits from foreign countries was duly banned and no licence was required for the  
12  
13 production of gin, unlike alehouses (Maples, 2012). Therefore gin was cheap and plentiful  
14  
15 with few obvious competitors. These conditions lead to the extreme consumption of gin by  
16  
17 the poor of London, seemingly a cheap and available distraction from the harsh conditions  
18  
19 of living in London at that time. At the height of the 'gin craze' Londoners were consuming  
20  
21 over 11 million gallons of gin a year (Maples, 2012). It is worth bearing in mind that at this  
22  
23 time London's population was between one and one and a half million, which gives some  
24  
25 idea of the vast quantity of gin the populace of the capital were consuming. The social  
26  
27 impact of this gin epidemic is well documented (Maples, 2012), including increased  
28  
29 mortality, crime, disorder and child mortality. Yet given the unprecedented detriment to  
30  
31 health and social wellbeing, it took the British authorities nearly 50 years to get on top of  
32  
33 the problem after a succession of botched legislation (Maples, 2012).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 So, the gin craze of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century had its roots in both economic policy and through the  
40  
41 process of defining and reinforcing the nation-state. As the Scots were consuming claret to  
42  
43 define and reinforce their sense of national identity also Londoners were doing as a  
44  
45 response to a series of policies to promote the English economy and English independence  
46  
47 in a hostile European context. Thus by looking at the historical context of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century,  
48  
49 we see that some of the themes that underscore our contemporary concerns regarding  
50  
51 'booze Britain' and Blair's new British disease of binge drinking have some echoes down the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1  
2  
3 If we look at some features of 19<sup>th</sup> Century England, we can identify further themes that  
4  
5 have some contemporary resonance. As we saw before it was an Act of Union with Scotland  
6  
7 in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century that had an effect on popular practices and rituals around alcohol. Thus  
8  
9 the Act of Union of 1801 with Ireland must also have some bearing on how we came to view  
10  
11 the Irish, as a problematic drinker in the context of industrial England. Taking Engels  
12  
13 famous description of the Irish in Manchester in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century as a point of  
14  
15 departure;  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 “And since the poor devil must have one enjoyment, and society has shut him out of  
21  
22 all others, he betakes himself to the drinking of spirits. Drink is the only thing which  
23  
24 makes the Irishman's life worth having, drink and his cheery care-free  
25  
26 temperament; so he revels in drink to the point of the most bestial drunkenness.  
27

28  
29 The southern facile character of the Irishman, his crudity, which places him but little  
30  
31 above the savage, his contempt for all humane enjoyments, in which his very  
32  
33 crudeness makes him incapable of sharing, his filth and poverty, all favour  
34  
35 drunkenness. The temptation is great, he cannot resist it, and so when he has money  
36  
37 he gets rid of it down his throat. What else should he do? How can society blame him  
38  
39 when it places him in a position in which he almost of necessity becomes a  
40  
41 drunkard; when it leaves him to himself, to his savagery?” (Engels, 1993, pp. 103-  
42  
43 104)  
44  
45

46  
47 Engels classic ethnography describes the Irish immigrants of Manchester in less than  
48  
49 favourable terms. However it must be noted that Engel's thesis was to document the  
50  
51 alienation of Manchester's working class during the industrial revolution. Although Engel's  
52  
53 identifies the Irish as almost savage in nature and divisive to working class solidarity by  
54  
55 providing a wage drag, or even through the importation of scab labour, we could interpret  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Engel's description as symptomatic of the lumpenproletariat, Marx's reserve army of labour  
4  
5 (Marx, 1976). Indeed, a close reading of the Engels passage alludes to some sympathy for  
6  
7 the plight of the Irish worker,  
8  
9

10  
11 "How can society blame him when it places him in a position in which he almost of  
12  
13 necessity becomes a drunkard; when it leaves him to himself, to his savagery?"  
14  
15 (Engels, 1993, p. 104)  
16

17  
18 However we choose to read this passage, it is self-evident that Engel's identifies the Irish  
19  
20 with drunkenness. However, citing *The Report on the State of the Irish Poor in Great Britain*,  
21  
22 E.P. Thompson contextualises the drinking behaviour of the Irish in manufacturing England:  
23  
24

25  
26 "On the Saturday night, when they receive their wages, they first pay the score at the  
27  
28 shop... and their rent... and when their debts are paid, they go drinking spirits as  
29  
30 long as the remnant of their wages holds out. On the Monday morning they are  
31  
32 penniless." (Thompson, 1963, p. 476)  
33  
34

35  
36 So, depending on one's reading of Engels and Thompson, it can be implied that excessive  
37  
38 drinking with which the Irish poor appear to be associated with, can be viewed as either a  
39  
40 moral deficit of nationality or as a solace from exploitation, poverty, discrimination and  
41  
42 dislocation.  
43  
44

45  
46 As both authors observe, the plight of the Irish working poor in England in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century  
47  
48 is an amalgam of the effects of war, famine, unskilled work, low wages and Diaspora.

49  
50 Nevertheless, as Thompson notes, "[...] Irish labour was essential for the Industrial  
51  
52 Revolution [...]" (1963, p. 473) as their labour was cheap, relative to English workers, and  
53  
54 they were demoralised to the point that they would undertake the "most disagreeable kind  
55  
56 of course labour" (Ibid.).  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Thus by constructing the Irish immigrant of industrial England as having the character of  
4  
5 “most bestial drunkenness” (Engels, 1993, p. 103) enabled the further exploitation by the  
6  
7 industrial bourgeoisie in the accumulation of capital and the suppression of workers’ wages.  
8  
9  
10 So our evidence of the relationship between notions of nationality and the consumption of  
11  
12 alcohol continue to have resonance from the 18<sup>th</sup> Century and into the 19<sup>th</sup> Century.  
13

14  
15 If we take this notion of the impoverished, hardworking and drunk Irish immigrant forward  
16  
17 over one hundred years to the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and replace ‘Irish’ with ‘East  
18  
19 European’, the similarity of popular discourse in the United Kingdom is startling. While we  
20  
21 could frame the popular notion of the bestially drunk Irish migrant as part of the  
22  
23 lumpenproletariat of the Industrial Revolution, we can view the popular image of heavy  
24  
25 drinking East European migrants as part of the precariat of our current epoch (Standing,  
26  
27 2011).  
28  
29

30  
31 The accession of the eight east European countries (Cyrus, Czech Republic, Estonia,  
32  
33 Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia – collectively known as the  
34  
35 A8 countries) to the European Union in 2004 resulted in the UK Government putting into  
36  
37 place:  
38  
39

40  
41 “[...] transitional measures to regulate A8 nationals’ access the labour market (via  
42  
43 the Worker Registration Scheme) and to restrict access to benefits.” (Mills, Knight, &  
44  
45 Green, 2007, p. 4)  
46  
47

48  
49 However, as Standing notes, when it comes to economic immigration, governments often  
50  
51 claim, “[...] they are limiting migration while facilitating the growth of a low-wage  
52  
53 disposable labour supply.” (Standing, 2011, p. 91). Whereas the Irish in 19<sup>th</sup> Century  
54  
55 England provided the “course labour” (Thompson, 1963, p. 476) for the Industrial  
56  
57 Revolution, A8 immigration provides a similar role in advanced capitalism of the reserve  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
army of labour by responding to the needs of flexibilised labour markets, becoming part of a  
high risk, low wage, insecure labouring class Standing refers to as the precariat (Standing,  
2011).

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
As stated at the beginning of this paper, social class is an important aspect of alcohol policy  
but for the purposes of this argument we need to put this to one side, as nationality is our  
focus. This is not to deny that that there are important, valid and relevant intersections  
between class and nationality, however let us not confound the argument.

## 20 21 Discussion

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
So our brief journey through some key eras of British history reveals that at times the  
Scottish, the English, the Irish and the Polish (for the Polish are the largest nationality to  
move to the UK following the A8 accession (Mills et al., 2007)) have all been, and to varying  
degrees still are, defined and identified in terms of their approach to the drinking of  
alcoholic beverages. Many of these often played out in stereotypes of popular culture. The  
question remains, how did problematic, excessive, heavy or binge drinking become an issue  
so seemingly entwined with Britishness? From 'booze Britain' to Blair's new British disease  
to Brits abroad, the popular notion seems to be of the behaviour of the British is rather  
unpleasantly alcohol-fuelled. Furthermore, what ideological function does this notion the  
excessively-imbibing Brit perform? For it must be ideological as the evidence suggests that  
despite the hype and the hyperbole, British alcohol consumption has been falling for several  
years (Morgan, 2011). Furthermore, the apparatus of alcohol regulation, as Valverde  
observes, "[...] does not seek to maximize health but rather to organize and regulate  
consumption, producing ordered, disciplined drinkers" (1998, p. 144). She goes on to state:

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
"Liquor licensing and control systems, whatever their particularities, all share the  
difficult position of having the regulation of personal consumption as their objective

1  
2  
3 – an objective rather out of keeping with the logic of liberalism” (Valverde, 1998, p.  
4  
5 145).

6  
7  
8 This gives us a useful lens to develop conjecture to understanding the rhetoric of ‘British’  
9  
10 problem drinking. By utilising the ideologies of the nation and nationality as a framework  
11  
12 for advocating controls and regulation of alcohol consumption, policy-makers, and those  
13  
14 who seek to influence them, can neatly sidestep this internal contradiction. Foregrounding  
15  
16 a perceived national problem of disordered drinking and therefore rallying behind the flag  
17  
18 of the health of the nation, allows governments to enforce regulation without appearing at  
19  
20 odds with the underlying political ideology of deregulation and laissez-faire policies.  
21  
22 Furthermore, by acknowledging the post-Fordist night time economy agenda of  
23  
24 contemporary post-industrial Britain, one could deduce that using the proxies of both  
25  
26 public health and law and order to regulate alcohol consumption, enables the continued  
27  
28 development and investment in an economically-potent alcohol industry while appearing to  
29  
30 pour scorn on its social consequences. By deploying the evocative ideology of nationality,  
31  
32 which as Anderson notes is so powerful as a rhetorical device that citizens will wilfully die  
33  
34 for its cause (Anderson, 1991), governments can scaffold policies for the regulation of  
35  
36 individual behaviour while seemingly appear not at odds with the underlying political  
37  
38 doctrine of deregulation and reification of markets. This prioritising of the needs of the  
39  
40 market, as Adorno opines, leads to the dominance of the exchange-value of commodities,  
41  
42 this dominance obscures the original use-value allowing the commodity to take on a new  
43  
44 use-value that can be any number of cultural associations and assumptions (Adorno, 1991).  
45  
46 Alcohol is one such commodity whereby the new use-value contains cultural associations  
47  
48 and assumptions we could package as nationality or nationalism.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## The New policy agenda

The current UK government's recent policy announcement regarding alcohol minimum price setting seemingly has two groups of clear beneficiaries and one group of losers. The losers are those who buy cheap alcoholic beverages, as the policy will increase the cost of drinking regressively to the poorest. The potential winners from this policy are primarily the alcoholic beverage industry and secondly those involved in the illegal importation of alcohol. According to the Institute for Fiscal Studies fixing the price per unit at 40p (which is the government's proposal) would lead to transfers of revenues of up to £850 million per year to the alcohol industry (Leicester & O'Connell, 2012), although this figure does not account for any behaviour changes as a result of the policy, it clearly demonstrates the potential benefit to the alcohol industry. Also, as this policy does not constitute a duty, there will be no increase in revenue to the treasury. Potentially the opposite is true, if the policy has its stated desired effect of reducing alcohol consumption, then the treasury is going to lose income from alcohol duties. This policy seems to lack coherence in terms of political philosophy, as British Prime Minister David Cameron stated, "This is a national problem and it needs a government to focus on it", words that would have John Stuart Mill inebriated with fury, yet this is a government which has set about the retrenchment of social policy like none before. As Valverde observes (1998), all attempts at alcohol control have a poor logical 'fit' with liberalism. Licensing laws, controls on sales and consumption, and prohibition all create impediments to free markets, yet states that enact extreme forms of controls, for example some Islamic states, to not experience a crisis of legitimacy. This then raises the question of how the state, any state not just theocracies; can have systems that control alcohol at all. By raising the spectre of the nation-state and applying it to notions of national deficiency, enables the State to differentiate alcohol as distinct from other forms of beverage in special need of control and management. Evoking the mantra of

1  
2  
3 'booze Britain' as a national deficiency, enables the furthering of controls on the sale of  
4 alcohol, seemingly without contradiction, in the context of (neo-) liberalism.  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 The raising of the price of low cost alcoholic beverages in the UK could have a significant  
10 impact on the frequency and profitability of alcohol smuggling. According to the figures  
11 from HM Revenues and Customs (UK Government agency tasked with both collecting duties  
12 and enforcing borders), the alcohol smuggling industry costs the exchequer £1.2 billion per  
13 year in unpaid duties (Norman, 2012) and that much of the business of alcohol trafficking is  
14 controlled by "organised criminals" (HMSO, 2010). As with the Scottish consumption of  
15 claret with the equalisation of duties and tariffs after the Act of Union had an effect on the  
16 quantity and profitability of illegal alcohol smuggling in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, it would be  
17 foolhardy to believe that increasing the minimum price per unit of alcohol will not have an  
18 effect on the illegal alcohol trade. This thought exposes another internal contradiction of  
19 the minimum alcohol price policy. On one hand the policy evokes the idea of nationality as a  
20 vehicle to deploy regulation of individuals within the nation, yet on the other hand, it  
21 provides the incentive for increasing criminal activities at the borders of the nation. As  
22 previously stated, nationalism requires a nation and the nation requires boundaries,  
23 although these boundaries may be both elastic and porous, thus if the boundaries of the  
24 nation in some way define nationality. Therefore, there is a significant poverty of logic with  
25 the policy itself. For it would appear contradictory to deploy the nation as a rhetorical  
26 device while seemingly setting the scene for increasing strain on the national borders which  
27 increased illegal smuggling will inevitably create. Yet maintaining or indeed strengthening  
28 national borders is one area of policy that the current UK government seems keen to  
29 develop. However, border control is an area of public policy which in itself is fraught with  
30 contradictions. Politicians of many persuasions wish to be seen to highly manage and  
31 regulate border controls to counterbalance popular fears regarding immigration and its  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 perceived strain on social provision, housing stock and employment opportunities; yet to  
5  
6 over-control borders would have profound effects on the economic wellbeing of the  
7  
8 country, as global capital flows require, to some degree, the freedom of movement of  
9  
10 peoples and commodities. Thus for those invested with making border control policy, this  
11  
12 requires both a balancing act and a range of policy and rhetorical devices to retool the  
13  
14 balance from time-to-time. The conjecture of this paper is that the alcohol minimum price  
15  
16 per unit of alcohol policy has the potential to be deployed, in the future, as one of these  
17  
18 devises. If we consider hypothetically that at some point in the future there is a perceived  
19  
20 need to reinforce border controls, for example an increase in people entering the UK to seek  
21  
22 asylum, then evidence of increased alcohol smuggling could provide the basis for the  
23  
24 securing of border controls. Thus fears about loss of revenue, increasing crime and  
25  
26 continued access to cheap alcohol beverages could be used as a precursor to shoring up the  
27  
28 border of fortress Britain. In the masquerade of border control policy, any increase in  
29  
30 smuggling as a result of the minimum alcohol pricing policy is a useful disguise with which  
31  
32 to protect the nation.  
33  
34  
35

### 36 37 **Last Orders (Conclusions)** 38

39  
40 As we have seen, how we use alcohol and how the state attempts to regulate the use of  
41  
42 alcohol has long been tied to notions of nationality and nationalism. The current policy  
43  
44 agenda of minimum price per unit fixing continues this tradition. It is somewhat ironic that  
45  
46 the policy is likely to be challenged by the European Union, because as we have seen  
47  
48 Britain's relationship with other European nations has often been the catalyst for alcohol  
49  
50 control policies.  
51  
52

53  
54 The argument that the state's dealings with alcohol have had a long association with  
55  
56 understand the nation and nationality is compelling, however the potential to use this  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 policy as a precursor to strengthening or reinforcing national borders is somewhat  
4  
5 worrying as it suggests a degree of premeditated deceit. This argument is purely  
6  
7 conjecture, but there seem few other reasons for the UK coalition government to pursue a  
8  
9 policy which has significant advantages for organised criminals.  
10  
11

12  
13 From the historical analysis it is striking how pervasive alcohol has been, and continues to  
14  
15 be, as a lens to view nationality, particularly as a deficit. From the gin craze of 18<sup>th</sup> century  
16  
17 London, via the bestially drunk Irish of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the street drinking Accession  
18  
19 Eight nations of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, alcohol has continued to provide a prism to view the  
20  
21 shortcomings of national characteristics.  
22  
23

24  
25 Furthermore, alcohol control policies have a long history of both influencing and being  
26  
27 influenced by how national borders are understood and operated. From 18<sup>th</sup> century duties  
28  
29 on imported French brandy to the development of the powers and responsibilities of the US  
30  
31 Coastguard Service during the period of national prohibition. In all cases of attempts to  
32  
33 control the importation of alcoholic drinks has lead to the development of smuggling to  
34  
35 either avoid law enforcement or customs and duties.  
36  
37

38  
39 It would be easy to reduce these challenges and contradictions of alcohol controls to an  
40  
41 economic imperative. The UK alcohol industry is powerful, both economically and  
42  
43 politically, but commercial interest, in and of itself, cannot account for cultural  
44  
45 understandings of alcohol as they relate to nationality and borders. Neither can a class  
46  
47 analysis, although there are class dimensions to both popular ideas about alcohol  
48  
49 consumption and policies to control its consumption. The evidence from 18<sup>th</sup> century  
50  
51 Scotland demonstrates this well. The fact that the Scots continued to imbibe claret after the  
52  
53 Act of Union has little to with commercial imperative and not much to do with class  
54  
55 antagonisms. Rather it was symbolic of Scottish independence and defiance of the English.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Again, if we consider London's 18<sup>th</sup> century gin craze, commercial interest and class analysis  
4 do not tell the whole story. Although there was an economic interest in promoting gin as a  
5 popular beverage, and its effects were, on the whole, felt by the poor, it was as much to do  
6 with England's relationship, or rather lack of relationship, with the French that gave rise to  
7 the chronic use of gin in 18<sup>th</sup> century London. If we look forward from the 18<sup>th</sup> century,  
8 through the 19<sup>th</sup> century into our current time, how we understand the nation and  
9 nationality continues to inform our understand of alcohol and its control.  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 The popular notion of booze Britain continues this tradition of conflating commercial  
21 interests, notions of class deficit and nationality. This is somewhat symptomatic of the  
22 internal contradictions of alcohol control policies. These policies are supposed to  
23 objectively regulate consumption but this does not fit well in the context of the current  
24 dominant political ideology. By foregrounding issues of nationality, policy-makers can at  
25 the very least attempt to obscure this profound contradiction. It is this reification of the  
26 nation state and nationality that enables the differentiation of alcohol from other  
27 consumable commodities as distinct and in need of control.  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 Another contradiction involves the impact of the alcohol minimum pricing policy on the  
39 government of the British nation. If the impact of the policy is that the consumption of  
40 legally available alcohol reduces and the consumption of illegally imported alcohol  
41 increases, then this will inevitably result in reduced revenues for the UK treasury.  
42  
43

44  
45  
46  
47 Furthermore, the potential increased strain on controlling the national border could create  
48 further expenditure for the UK government.  
49  
50

51  
52 To conclude, this latest policy agenda, of minimum price setting per unit of alcohol, could be  
53 viewed as a response to a popular discourse on the state of the nation commonly referred to  
54 as 'booze Britain'. This notion of national deficit has been employed as a rhetorical device in  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 order to impose regulation on the drinkers of Britain. This policy, in turn, has significant  
4 potential consequences for how the British state operates its border controls. Any changes  
5 to the operation of national borders have consequences for conceptualising the nation and  
6 therefore the notion of nationality. So, the debate come round full circle, a policy which has  
7 been informed by a popular discourse of nationality has the potential to then either shift or  
8 reinforce the notion of the nation and nationality.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## List of references

Adorno, T. W. (1991). *The Culture Industry: Selected essays on mass culture*. London: Routledge.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Bower, J., & Cox, H. (2010). *Political influence and hostile bids: How Scottish & Newcastle became the UK's largest brewer* Paper presented at the 14th Annual Conference of the European Business History Association, University of Glasgow.

Brockley, B. (2012). Drunkenness is a right not a privilege. Retrieved from <http://brockley.blogspot.co.uk/2012/02/drunkenness-is-right-not-privilege.html>

Engels, F. (1993). *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haywood, K., & Hobbs, D. (2007). Beyond the binge in 'booze Britain': market-led liminalization and the spectacle of binge drinking. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 58(3), 437-456.

HMSO. (2010). *Renewal of the 'Tackling Alcohol Fraud' strategy*. Retrieved from [http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?\\_nfpb=true&\\_pageLabel=pageExcise\\_ShowContent&id=HMCE\\_PROD1\\_030554&propertyType=document](http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=pageExcise_ShowContent&id=HMCE_PROD1_030554&propertyType=document).

Holt, M. (Ed.). (2006). *Alcohol: A Social and Cultural History*. Oxford: Berg.

Leicester, A., & O'Connell, M. (2012). How significant is a minimum unit price for alcohol of 40p: Institute for Fiscal Studies.

Ludington, C. (2006). "To the King o'er the Water" Scotland and Claret, c. 1660-1763. In M. Holt (Ed.), *Alcohol: A Social and Cultural History*. Oxford: Berg.

Maples, T. (2012). Gin and Georgian London. *Last Orders: A social history of drinking*(Chapter 4).

- 1  
2  
3 Mares, D. (2001). Gangstas or lager louts? Working class street gangs in Manchester. In M. Klein,  
4  
5 H. Kerner, C. Maxson & E. Weitekamp (Eds.), *The Eurogang Paradox: Street gangs and*  
6  
7 *youth groups in the US and Europe* (pp. 153-164). London: Kluwer Academic.  
8  
9  
10 Marx, K. (1976). *Capital* (Vol. 1). London: Penguin.  
11  
12 Mill, J. S. (1859). *On Liberty*. London: Longman, Roberts and Green.  
13  
14 Mills, K., Knight, T., & Green, R. (2007). Beyond Boundaries: offering substance misuse services  
15  
16 to new migrants in London. London: Centre for Community Research, University of  
17  
18 Hertfordshire.  
19  
20  
21 Morgan, J. (2011). Why is alcohol consumption falling? Retrieved 24th April, 2012, from  
22  
23 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-12397254>  
24  
25  
26 Norman, J. (2012). *Illegal Alcohol and Tobacco Sales*. London: Hansard Retrieved from  
27  
28 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmtoday/cmwhall/01.htm>.  
29  
30  
31 Rayner, J. (2004). On the streets of binge Britain Retrieved 27th March, 2012, from  
32  
33 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/travel/2004/sep/05/restaurants>  
34  
35  
36 Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury.  
37  
38 Thompson, E. P. (1963). *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Penguin.  
39  
40 Valverde, M. (1998). *Diseases of the Will: Alcohol and the dilemmas of freedom*. Cambridge:  
41  
42 Cambridge University Press.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60