Reforming the pub

The temperance movement successfully focused attention on the number and management of public houses. Various models of licensing reform had emerged by the end of the 19th century.

The United Kingdom Alliance, formed in 1853, agitated for the government to restrict the supply of alcohol. It repeatedly asked Parliament to consider proposals for a ‘local option’ in licensing, which would have given ratepayers a vote to close public houses in their areas. Other proposals involved setting some ratio of pubs to the number of people in an area, according to the imagined needs of local communities.

Debates about restriction directed attention to the economic value of pubs. As the possession of a licence inflated a property’s value, there was money to make from buying and selling pubs. Temperance campaigners argued that any value derived from the possession of a licence was properly the property of the people: publicans should not assume that their licences were always to be renewed. The trade countered that forcibly closing public houses threatened livelihoods and the rights of consumers.

The 1904 Licensing Act introduced a levy on the trade to provide a compensation fund for publicans and owners should magistrates cancel their licences. Brewers nationwide surrendered poorly performing city centre pubs – no doubt hoping magistrates would then look favourably on applications for new licences in expanding suburbs.

Public-House Trust companies promoted temperance by removing profit motives from the drink trade. Trusts bought up pubs and employed managers with fixed salaries rather than performance-related pay pegged to the sale of alcohol. Instead, they promoted the sale of food and temperance drinks. The state would adapt this model in the First World War, taking control of the trade in a limited number of military and munitions areas. Elsewhere, drinkers had to pay more for weakened beer, but pubs proved themselves valuable social spaces.