

CHAPTER 3

Prohibition in the Indian Context

Introduction

On the agenda of making the Indian society liquor-free . .

“. . . There will be some who will continue to drink even though Swaraj is established. Those must be tackled after Swaraj . . .” **Mahatma Gandhi**, (15/10/1924).

On the issue of allowing individual liberty of choice whether to drink or not

“. . . But there is no moral justification for saying that if one man commits a vice, others also should do like wise, or may do likewise. Why should I tell a lie because tens of thousands of my neighbours may be telling lies? If thousands commit suicide, why should I commit suicide? And I want to say that taking intoxicating liquors is almost like committing suicide, because a man or a woman who takes intoxicating drinks and gets mad, kills his or her soul, for the time being. Surely death of the soul is worse than death of the body . . .”
Mahatma Gandhi, (18/2/1934).

Despite this Gandhian philosophy backed by the colossus of the Father of the Nation and the apprehension of the observed ill-effects of liquor consumption in the contemporary society, the hang-over of the British Raj and its customs including consumption of liquor as a social norm and an urge to achieve rapid development led to the draft of Article 38 (later 47), which implored the State to impose prohibition on intoxicating substances considered injurious to health, albeit with the exception of ‘medicinal purposes’.

The actual inclusion of this Article, however, did take its share of argument from both, the protagonists and the antagonists in the

then Constituent Assembly of the newly formed nation.

The Constituent Assembly Debate²⁴

The Lok Sabha Address of Shri Mahavir Tyagi proposing Amendment No. 999, to Draft Constitution Article 38, for the addition of the clause “. . . and shall endeavour to bring about the prohibition of the consumption of intoxicating drinks and drugs which are injurious to health”, after the existing draft of the Article, without such a provision, goes as follows :

“Sir, for this attempt of mine, I am conscious of the abuses that will be hurled on me by the dry mouths of those who have to stop drinking. I am also aware of the blessings that will be showered on me by the wives of those who will benefit from the removal of this evil. I should only wish ‘good luck’ to the country in case this amendment is accepted”.

The concern of the Parliamentarian for the well-being of the wives of drinkers is highly apparent from the address. The line also signifies the potential of the problem of alcohol abuse either prevailing at that time in society, or its prognosis as anticipated by the drafters of the Constitution as well as the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi.

The House was divided even then (as lobbies are today), on the issues of loss of revenue to the states, personal liberty and right to choose on the one hand and the ethical directives of Mahatma Gandhi, large scale ills of liquor consumption and the duty of the state to ensure the health and well-being of its subjects being argued on the other.

Shri Shibban Lal Saxena (United Provinces), in his address, had pointed out that the state would lose approximately Rs. 25 Crore (in those days) in revenue in case Prohibition was

²⁴ Article 38 : Draft Constitution, *Constituent Assembly Debates*, Session dated 23 November 1948, Pp. 555, obtained from the Parliament Library.

implemented and further would spend over a crore and half for enforcement of prohibition. However, he preferred it to the social loss which was pegged at approximately Rs. 100 Crore, since liquor targeted the mill-workers class en masse and led to a large number of domestic problems, loss of productivity, absenteeism, and frittering away of personal incomes on frivolous drinks.

A contrasting anti-prohibitionist view was put forth by **Shri B.G. Khandekar (Kolhapur)** quoting Harold Laski's '*Liberty in the Modern State*' and claiming that prohibition went against personal liberty and would lead to stunted growth in men. He expressed his concern over the killing of club life in the society, also claiming that club life was not necessarily linked with elitist living and concerned the common man as well. His insistence was also to cater for the hard worked mill workers who needed 'mirth' at the end of a tiring day. A relevant point raised by the parliamentarian was the need to differentiate between the 'drinker' and the 'drunkard' and that an estimate would show that not more than 10% people drank in India and only 10% of those who drank were drunkards, i.e. 1% of the population. He asserted that these 1% were the hopeless cases who would drink irrespective of whether the government implemented prohibition or not and, therefore, imposition of prohibition would unjustly deny the pleasure to the other majority for no logical reason. He also apprehended that the enforcement machinery was 'bribery-inclined' and would get one more handle to earn their extra money apart from giving rise to illicit brewing. Hence, his contention was that the state would be better off by earning revenue from liquor than prohibiting it altogether and face such ill effects. He also contended that Gods also drank '*sura*' and hence there was no religious taboo on alcohol.

The view was seconded by **Shri. Jaipal Singh (Bihar)** by bringing in the point of infringing on the religious rights of tribals, who, he said required alcohol for religious rituals. Citing the examples of Adivasis of Bihar, Bengal and Orissa who needed rice beer for rituals and Santhals who needed it as a stimulant for keeping themselves fit and worthy during transplantation of rice plants, he exalted the 'religious' veneration enjoyed by alcohol in these communities and considered it an infringement on their religious rights, which warranted pending the adoption of the Article until the recommendations from the Committees for SC/ST and Tribals were received.

The 'religious' connotation given to alcohol was, however, contested by **Shri V.I. Muniswamy (Madras)** stating that tribals such as the Todas of Nilgiris, Kotahs, Irulas, Paniyas, Kurumbas, Badagas had never protested that drink be given back to them. In fact, he asserted that they had greatly benefitted from prohibition. He also informed the House that the poor were unnecessarily spending on liquor and ignoring their families. Hence, even if prohibition meant a loss of Rs. 17 Crore to the state it would be preferred because the citizens would then lead a healthy and peaceful life.

Sardar Bhopinder Singh (East Punjab : Sikh) supported this view by citing the cases of Gonds and Bheels of Maharashtra who wanted prohibition, to avoid themselves getting 'enticed' by the shops if they existed anywhere near by, and had asked for their removal altogether. The Bheels had also abstained voluntarily and none considered alcohol as a religious right any more.

Shri B.G. Kher (Maharashtra) refuted most points against prohibition by stating that most Indian Provinces had already agreed to prohibition as they did not want their people to ruin their lives with liquor and drugs. He said that moral sense is essential

and so are material and intellectual progress. But liquor affected moral sense and hence can be treated similar to suicide, which is not a matter of individual liberty. He advised that we should rather teach people to abstain from liquor and drugs than collect large amounts against Excise Duties and then try to preach to them the remedies of the ill effects.

His caution to the House that Re. 1/- gained through Excise (on freely available alcohol) corresponded to Rs. 3/- lost due to the social costs of crime, disease and loss of efficiency (as already agreed by economists then), shows his deep appreciation and insight into the *idea of social cost* even then. The magnitude of the cost was also estimated to be roughly thrice the value of the Excise collectible from liquor. Refuting the claims of pro-alcoholists, he reiterated that medical research had given enough proof that spirituous drugs were injurious to health and it was a 'sin' or a 'vice' in most religions, and cautioned the House that there would be general deterioration if this substance was given respectability (which had already been done by the Europeans and we were blindly imitating them). Again, conveying to the House the relief and gratitude of the kith and kin of drinkers, he informed the House that family members of drinkers had already been writing to him thanking prohibition due to which their family heads were better off and had started earning more.

The religious colouration given to the discussion by Shri. Jaipal Singh was further attacked by **Shri L.N. Sahu (Orissa)** by once again confirming to the House that the Adivasis of Orissa themselves follow the principle that 'one who teaches or goes to school or reads must not drink'. He argued that just as we abolished several unacceptable religious customs like '*sati*' and '*human sacrifice*' we should have no hesitation in banning consumption of alcohol, even if alcohol was a part of some religious customs. *Bad*

customs must be abolished under changed circumstances and pressures of change.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, entrusted with the framing of the Constitution, then summarized the 'pro' and 'anti' prohibition arguments and sensitized the House that due to the varied nature of people in the country, the issue was included only under the Directive Principles and had been placed under the States List; thus there was no compulsion in adopting it. 'Whether and when to act', was left to the states' and public opinion. As far as tribals' traditions were concerned, he assured that Para 12, 6th Schedule of the Draft Constitution made ample room for safeguarding the position of the tribals on prohibition, since the law enacted by a state / province does not automatically apply to their areas unless the concerned Regional Councils gave their concurrence.

The motion for the inclusion of the Article 38 (now 47) including the words, ". . . and shall endeavour to bring about the prohibition of the consumption of intoxicating drinks and drugs which are injurious to health.." (Amendment 999), with an additional provision ". . . except for medicinal purposes" as proposed by Shri Shibban Lal Saxena (United Provinces) was passed.

Issues Needing Consideration

Two main questions arising from the proceedings prick my mind. These are discussed in the succeeding paragraphs in the backdrop of the duty of the state (centre) in policy making.

1. Why was the issue of 'intoxicating drinks' left to be a State Subject and not a Union Subject, if it was viewed as an important one, and coming from the ethos of the Father of the Nation (not a mere regional figure)?

Was there no desire to implement the same state of well-being and health uniformly across the nation, keeping

due regard for the traditions and customs of specific societal groups, e.g. tribals, for whom the tribal advisory committees were to advise in any case? Or was the national legislature playing a non-committal safe hand in leaving the subject to the states and calling it merely a piece of advice by including it in the 'Directive Principles'? Or was the national legislature merely playing to the gallery, on the basis of a perceived popular demand for free alcohol? And in doing so, was it turning a deliberate deaf ear to the social costs and only looking at the revenue like an opportunist entrepreneur? Or was the legislature actually under a misconception cloud that the Indian Society after independence had actually reached a state of mature ability to decide for itself whether and how much to drink without causing its own degeneration?

The 'discretionary valve' in the Article was apparently left so that states could apply their respective discretions and enact their respective statutes to the degree of control they felt fit or necessary.

Since then, it has been a story of trial and error with the states. Varying degrees of restriction and control are found to be existing in the states of India. Depending upon the socio-economic and cultural background of the people of the state, suitable statutes have been enacted by the states, varying in the targets of restriction, processes, value of excise duties and punishments for offences under the Acts; e.g. The Bombay Prohibition Act – 1949, passed for the Bombay Province, now stands applicable to the states of Maharashtra and Gujarat, with respective modifications incorporated through amendments by their state legislatures. Most of the Indian states now allow the manufacture, transportation, storage, sale and consumption of liquor within their areas of

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
GIDBAP BASTHA ESTATE NEW DELHI-9

GR-18507 dt. 3-5-10

jurisdiction. Laws for import and export across customs borders are not subsumed under the state Acts.

The free availability of alcohol post independence, in the form of locally brewed liquors and also IMFL, which most states embraced in pursuit of revenue and apparent popular demand, soon started generating pockets of resistance due to the sufferings it caused to the kith and kin of the drinkers, who would spend most of their earnings in the local liquor outlet and render themselves useless for any productive work. In several places, anti-liquor movements and agitations erupted.

Kerala²⁵. Agitations started when the local government started allowing sale of arrack and IMFL which were banned in the state earlier. The representations came from all walks of life. Started by the Kerala Catholic Bishops' Council (KCBC), the agitation saw the political parties in the opposition (Congress), women's groups and village level development societies (viz. Neyyattinkara Integral Devp Society (NIDS)) joining the drive against the shops opened unscrupulously by the government and illicit brewers near places of worship and households. The KCBC Anti-Alcoholic Committee and the Kerala Madya Nirodhana Samithi (Anti Alcoholic organization) fought to form a liquor free society in Kerala.

Manipur²⁶. In a surprising initiative identifying with the cause of the well-being of the local society, the militant groups here banned use of liquor, zarda and other intoxicant substances and warned that if anyone found consuming these

²⁵ Report, Indo Asian News Service, 10 March, (On Line) Available at http://newshopper.sulekha.com/christian-body-launches-anti-liquor-campaign-in-kerala_news_1046048.htm , Accessed 01 Jan 2010.

²⁶ Report, One India Newspaper, 27 October, (On Line) Available at <http://living.oneindia.in/insync/against-drugs.html> , Accessed 04 Jan 2010.

would face severe punishment. The All Manipur Anti-Drug Association (AMADA), an NGO, initiated a state-wide campaign against abuse of drugs and ensuring total prohibition of liquor in the state. An AMADA diktat was also served on some people saying that those who were found drinking liquor or taking drugs would need to take a pledge through newspaper advertisements that they would never repeat the act or else face penalty. 'Nupi Lan', a women's association in Manipur, would maintain all-night vigils to prevent men succumbing to the temptation posed by the illegal rice liquor brewed as a traditional right by the Kabui Naga tribals. Thus, Manipur, which went dry in April 1991, was an instance of a people's movement resulting in prohibition. Subsequently, however, the government allowed opening of authorised liquor shops in five hill districts, under popular demand.

Andhra Pradesh. The Andhra Pradesh story is a 'mixed stakes response'; it is against alcoholism from the women folk, but it has been exploited by the government to sidetrack the issue and proliferate the IMFL shops by nudging out the arrack shops, for more revenue.

Protests began in Dubagunta in Nellore district, a nondescript village with a population of 1,200, involved mainly in cultivating chilli and tobacco when two adult literacy programme employees in Dubagunta were abused by a couple of drunken villagers. The incident outraged the women attending the literacy classes, who, then descended on the village arrack shop, armed with broomsticks, chilli powder and sticks, and forced it to shut down. Motivated by the Dubagunta example, women throughout Nellore joined the anti-liquor movement. With arrack vends shutting down

in village after village, the state government finally took heed and the then chief minister K Vijayabhaskara Reddy announced an immediate ban on arrack in Nellore district and throughout the entire state. (*His order excluded Indian-made foreign liquor (IMFL), whose wholesale trade was slated to be taken over by the government*). The Jana Vignyana Vedika (JVV), a voluntary organisation, made sure that the police and the excise department did not soft-pedal the issue. The threat of fines and social boycotts were expected to deter the men folk from hitting the bottle again. Some organisations also started de-addiction programmes and more than 1,000 village workers were trained in rehabilitation.

The ban on alcohol meant a revenue loss for Andhra Pradesh and for the arrack contractors. There were fears also that about 50,000 toddy-tappers in Nellore district alone would be without jobs. However, the movement pressurised the government to create conditions that would enable them to carry on their traditional occupation by exploiting palmyra trees for other products such as neera, a highly nutritious non-alcoholic drink prepared from palm juice, which can be made a profitable venture. However, the entrepreneurs were discouraged because the state government considered neera an alcoholic beverage, which it is not, as long as it is consumed before its fermentation.

Haryana. The protests against liquor shops in the state began when a five year old girl was raped by a 30 year old alcoholic. Their protests took different forms. With retired IAS officer Vijay Kumar, Swami Agnivesh of the Bandhua Mukti Morcha and Sister Cecil in the lead, torchlight processions were held and round-the-clock

dharnas staged outside liquor vends. All political parties except the then ruling Congress party supported the agitation. In some villages, the anti-liquor drive was spearheaded by the biradari (community) panchayat. The local 'theka' of Pawanawa village closed under pressure on 01 April 1993. Other village panchayats followed suit, with a Sarvakhap Panchayat (traditional meeting of all communities) having been held at Sisana village in Sonapat district and a decision taken to impose a fine of Rs 1 lakh on village panchayats that allowed liquor vends to open. But a more effective protest was one in Keorak village in Kaithal district, involving the use of ghagris (skirts), which alcoholics were forced to wear by the village women. Later, some men made garlands of discarded slippers for the tipplers. Some villagers even paraded alcoholics on donkeys, as in Manipur.

Dwindling Trend in Movements / Agitations. However, in most cases, where the state government was interested in gaining more revenue for the state, the representations of the prohibitionist groups have systematically been made to dwindle. Either states have themselves got into the business of selling liquor – giving it a façade of 'legitimate supply' or issuing licenses to private parties who managed to have their way with the governments with money power.

Wherever there was absence of an institutional approach and support to the prohibitionist agitations, these have dwindled, with occasional outbursts of violent reaction from an affected section for some time.

Model Success. There is at least one instance when prohibitionists have been successful. In Ralegan Siddhi in Ahmednagar district of Maharashtra, illicit liquor breweries

thrived until 1972, when Anna Hazare came on the scene and had illicit still owners tied to lamp-posts and whipped. Freeing the village from alcohol, says Hazare, "was not my goal. You cannot organise people for short-term objectives because once the objective is attained, the organisation collapses and drinking returns, perhaps with a vengeance. Instead, I decided to organise the people to respect themselves and lead a meaningful life. They set their own goals and worked out means to attain them. Naturally, alcohol was the first thing they attacked." Nobody drinks in Ralegan Siddhi now. So, surely, what the villagers achieved there, can be a goal for others elsewhere.

2. The second question that arises from the framing of Article 38 (now 47) is ***'Whether the ambiguous qualifying phrase 'which are injurious to health' was meant to berate the entire genre of intoxicating drinks and drugs as 'injurious to health' with this all-encompassing qualification, or was the 'which' in the phrase intended to imply the discretionary powers of the legislature to decide as to which intoxicants are injurious to health and which are not, on a case to case basis?'***

Though the more noble intention appears to be the former, one does find the Bombay Prohibition Act, 1949 giving specific powers to the Bombay Province to declare which substances are to be categorized as 'injurious to health'. Similarly, the status of some drinks (*neera*, for example) is dichotomous between states; in most states, it being a normal beverage, while in Andhra, it being considered 'alcoholic'. The non-standard definition of intoxicating drinks and drugs lets unwarranted leeway to the states in making laws, which, many times do not appear to be based on sound medical or consistent policy logic. It, therefore, results in becoming a tool of leverage available with the state to suit policy stances with the opportunity at hand. However, used with sincerity of purpose

addressing the public good and well-being, the clause leaves enough functional scope for every state to target the region-specific brews (which are actually a large variety in India) judiciously.

The Situation in Indian States Today

In India, as on date, every state has by and large accepted the free availability of alcohol within its respective jurisdiction. However, the states retain control through policy interventions towards quality and taxation.

Gujarat and Mizoram are the only two states which have total prohibition, although the basis for the two is different. While Mizoram had to respect the sentiment of the local women organisations and the Christian Church which strongly represented against liquor, Gujarat has the legacy of the Mahatma to guard as also the middle class Gujarati psyche which, in general, appears to observe abstinence and support prohibition.

Mizoram has lifted the ban on only wine in 2007.

Haryana, which imposed prohibition because of the agitations, lifted the ban under public pressure in just 21 months of a new government coming to power.

Assam bans only substances like ganja, bhang and opium.

Manipur, which had imposed prohibition in 1991, acceding to the demand of the RPF militants, reopened liquor shops in 2003.

Kerala and Tamil Nadu allow controlled supply of all types of alcoholic beverages except arrack.

Sporadic demands for imposing prohibition have been made by the opposition parties / citizen's organisations in Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab (1997 – women's demand), Meghalaya (1978). Karnataka bans only country liquor.

Prohibition or no prohibition, illicit brewing and trade do continue in most states to meet the increasing demand for low cost liquor and to evade excise duties. States such as Karnataka, Maharashtra, Delhi, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and several others have opened up State shops selling liquor variants to ensure standardised legal products being made available in the market. Maharashtra and Delhi have also licensed private vendors in addition to the state shops to market the same brands.

Though non-enforcement of the controls laid down by the states does take adverse criticism in most states, measures to make the same more efficient and widespread are constantly being made by the states and their enforcement agencies; e.g. Tamil Nadu has instituted a system of handsome awards for the enforcement personnel for efficient carrying out of their jobs as incentives.

Inferences from History

The cyclic change in the policy towards liquor prohibition visible in most of the nations of the world (as well as the Indian States) appears to have arisen out of the need of the contemporary times, cultural and religious beliefs / obligations and rationality.

Modern technology facilitated the large scale manufacture of alcohol, which, in any case, was a drink of personal enjoyment more than the ritualistic religious or customary hospitalistic. Drunkenness and deviant behaviour were not things that were loathed in the early days. So, when large scale production was marketed with large scale distribution, easy availability and public nature of consumption emerged. Modernisation led to mechanization and factories being set up, demanding rigorous work from the employees, who had but no diversion other than a near by saloon / pub where to down a few drinks and feel relaxed. So the

consumption proliferated. But with it increased the incidence and degree of offensive behaviour, crime, and accidents, apart from fast fragmenting family ethos. It was this degeneration that forced many organizations and governments to adopt the policy of prohibition. Just as the attacks by women of the Temperance Movement on local saloons in the USA were an expression of public sentiment abroad, agitations by women of Andhra Pradesh, Manipur and Kerala in India were testimony to this general feeling. Thus, when the ill effects of liquor consumption went beyond the tolerance level of the society, representation against liquor took roots and gained momentum.

Prohibition imposed under such conditions, however, was not enforced to the degree necessary to take effect. Al Capone²⁷ grew everywhere abroad as well as in India and the clientele for liquor only spread and grew, despite the well known ill effects. It is here, that, perhaps a certain addictive nature of liquor, a sense of bravado attached with defying regulation and peer pressure on the part of the drinker, and the ever-readiness to supply liquor to make profits on the part of the entrepreneur took the better of the good sense that had brought in prohibition.

When the population of drinkers and pro-alcoholists swelled to such large numbers as to outnumber the ones opposing liquor, demands for doing away with prohibition started being raised louder, more frequently and in many more places. When the intensity of demands went beyond the capability of the governments to either handle with force or alter with preaching of good sense, governments had to relent. In Indian states, Governments appear to have found it convenient to relent, merely

²⁷ **Alphonse Gabriel "Al" Capone** (January 17, 1899 – January 25, 1947) was an American gangster who led a crime syndicate dedicated to smuggling and bootlegging of liquor and other illegal activities during the Prohibition Era of the 1920s and 1930s.

to cash in on the revenues and left the sufferers to fend for themselves.

In the Indian situational context, a high degree of moralistic fervour (a projection of guilt and fears of the proponents of prohibition onto alcohol use), aspects of break up of the conservative family ethos, domestic financial ruin and violence leading to desperation among the victims (women) are the driving forces behind the prohibition protagonist. Contrastingly, aspects of culture conflict between the affluent westernized class and the rural middle class, opposing group interests (the entrepreneur versus the affected consumer / his dependents) and the policies of the government in power in the state are the factors that drive the liberal.

Has prohibition worked or not worked?²⁸

Considering the effects all over the world from Chapter 2 and in the Indian context from this Chapter, the answer could well be **'both'**.

It worked when it was most needed. Prohibition was imposed in most countries due to the overwhelming demand for its adoption from the society (or some section of the society in a localized situation in Indian states) because the society needed it. At that point in time the opposition to prohibition was but from the entrepreneur who had invested in the stills to brew liquor and the hard core drinker, both of whom were in minority. Statistics show that figures for crime and alcohol related offences suddenly dropped whenever prohibition was introduced. This was due to the

²⁸ Author's View : Several studies on the case of prohibition in Europe and USA consider the resurgence of alcoholic beverages in society after a brief spell of prohibition as a case of failed attempt at prohibition. However, such policy changes are to be seen in the context of a continuum of the changing societal demands and policy frameworks, to provide to the society what is perceived as the 'best for the most'. Effectiveness of prohibition at the point of time of its application should be the criterion to judge its success or failure.

deterrence of punishment and taboo associated with enacted laws that forced a normal law-abiding citizen to abandon drink. It did not really matter to him whether he drank or not; i.e. he formed a part of the neutral class. Enforcement was, therefore, automatic, and can be said to have '**worked**'.

When complacency and corruption (motivated by the entrepreneur and propped by the incorrigible addict) set in, liquor started becoming available with a little extra below the table and with a fair chance of not being punished. Liquor consumption obviously flourished, mainly because the average citizen, who could have otherwise done without a drink, was now tempted into risking an illegal swig. This apparently caused the neutral population to swing towards liquor and support demands for lifting of prohibition. Figures also show that concomitant with this swing, the incidences of crime and alcohol abuse increased. So, prohibition **started failing**.

It has been recorded that though the crime rate went on increasing after lifting of prohibition, it never went to the magnitude which was prevalent before prohibition. This clearly shows that prohibition had prevented more ill effects than its removal could even match by resurgence.

What needs to be derived from the above experience is that prohibition is not a matter of only enacting a law and expecting the people to follow it. There is a need for constant vigil and honest and sincere policing to back up the law. A larger section of the society may have been made happier by lifting prohibition when it demanded so, but the section of society that was yet mourning the lifting of the ban had also grown in size, but went unheard. The question is, are the costs being borne by this unheard voice so inconsequential that policies on liquor turn a blind eye or are the policies already taking care to the extent possible.

Summary

The policy towards use / prohibition of liquor has seen severe extremes. It has turned a full circle from rapid growth in production, sale and consumption; then faced regulation and prohibition in the very same societies that cherished it; and yet again, in most parts of the world and India, seen a come-back under public demand and pressure on the Governments.

Governments have often relented to these demands and probably ignored the equally swelling demand of the adversely affected citizens to curb the use of this substance.

The stakes of each player in the issue of prohibition are examined and compared in the next chapter to get an insight into the reason for such policy stances / changes.

Before an analysis of the stakes of each is attempted it is necessary to define the 'pro' and 'anti' - alcohol views, so that the rationality in the stakes is justified.

Defining the 'Pro-Alcohol View. By 'Pro-Alcohol View' it is meant to convey the general acceptability of any policy that allows liquor to be made available in the open market without any restrictions on its manufacture (barring quality), transportation, possession, use and consumption. This acceptability may or may not take into account the fact that alcohol has both, negative as well as positive effects. The view is primarily based on the notion of the liberty of the individual to choose whether or not to produce, transport, store or consume alcohol, with or without the complete knowledge of its effects - good or bad. This view rests on three fundamental perceptions, viz individual liberty of choice, ability of the developed human being to self regulate and the futility of prohibition as an implementable policy.