

National Prohibitionist



Twenty-First Century Series

June 2026

Volume 16 #1

Prohibition Party Advances in 2026

The Prohibition Party has continued to move forward in 2026. We have made progress in state organizing efforts in Alaska and New Jersey. We have some members who have stepped forward to run as candidates for state and local offices.

Alaska Organizing

The Prohibition Party has been working to organize and gain ballot access in Alaska for the 2028 presidential election. In 2025, we contracted a ballot access worker to gather signatures for getting on the ballot in Alaska. They finished gathering over 5,000 signatures for the ballot access petition in July and the signatures were submitted to the state elections authority. In November 2025, the Prohibition Party gained recognition as a political group by the Alaska Division of Elections; allowing state voters to register as members of the party and requiring the Alaska Division of Elections to track its total registrations.

In March, the Alaska Division of Elections had finished counting petition signatures and determined that there were enough signatures. As a result, the party was granted limited party status in Alaska. An important step to securing ballot access in Alaska for the 2028 election. We will still need to find three qualified people to serve as electors for us in Alaska for the 2028 election.

New Jersey Organizing

State organizing efforts are advancing in New Jersey. Thomas Sorrentino was appointed as acting State Chairman for New Jersey in order to facilitate state-level organizing and the development of a state branch of the party. Mr. Sorrentino has experience in political organizing and campaigning in New Jersey.



Bruce Johnson for Dakota County Soil and Water Commissioner

We have a candidate running for local office in Minnesota. Bruce Johnson is running for Dakota County Soil and Water District 4 Supervisor. The race is non-partisan in the sense that candidates do not have party labels on the ballot, but parties may endorse candidates, and Mr. Johnson is running with the Prohibition Party's endorsement. The election will be this coming November. If Mr. Johnson wins the election, then this would be the first victory for a Prohibition Party candidate in a local election since Jim Hedges was reelected Thomson Township Assessor in 2005.

Speaking on his campaign, Mr. Johnson stated,

"My campaign is going well. I am talking to people about the campaign and will be putting up campaign signs in a few months. I also plan to go door to door handing out flyers. Shannon Wohlman is the candidate running against me. The best thing people can do to help my campaign is to like my facebook page; Bruce Johnson for Dakota County Soil and Water District 4 Supervisor."

"Law ought to be on the side of decency and order, and even though not completely successful in its enforcement it constitutes at least a declaration of the intelligence of the citizens as to what is decent and right." Charles Manierre



Jonathan Makeley for Governor of New York

Jonathan Makeley is running as the Prohibition Party Candidate for Governor of New York in the 2026 election. He is running to help advance the growth of the Prohibition Party in New York, to speak on the important issues facing the state, and to provide an option for voters looking for an alternative to the major parties. This includes advocating for policies to address alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs as public health problems, ending restrictive ballot access laws, combating corruption, improving education and economic development programs, and other important reforms. Given New York's restrictive ballot access laws, which make it almost impossible for alternative parties to get on the ballot, Makeley will be running as a write-in candidate. New Yorkers in November can vote for him using the write-in square in the governor section of the ballot.

Those interested in following the campaign can get more information on the New York Prohibition Party website and the Jonathan Makeley for Governor Facebook Page.

Let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen." Horace Mann

The National Prohibitionist

ISSN 1549-9251 D

Published at 4602 21st St #1852, Long Island City, NY 11101 by the Prohibition National Committee.

Editor: Jonathan Makeley
(585-386-9613)

prohibitionists@gmail.com

Contributed articles are welcome, but will not be acknowledged or returned unless a SASE is enclosed.

Support: Donations to help support the National Prohibitionist can be made to the Prohibition National Committee – make checks out to the Prohibition National Committee, memo "National Prohibitionist Fund," and mail to the address above.

Editorial material is not copyrighted and may be reproduced by anyone, with credit.



From Chairman's Corner: Prohibition 2.0: A Welcome Resurgence

The alcohol industry has invented a new boogeyman, and they have given it a name: "Prohibition 2.0." Their press releases and friendly columnists use the term as an insult, intended to remind readers of speakeasies, bathtub gin, and Al Capone. The label is supposed to make you laugh, or at least roll your eyes. But what is actually being described under that banner is a global, evidence-based public health movement that any honest observer should welcome. The momentum is real, the science is solid, and from Rio de Janeiro to a subway car in Brooklyn, the alcohol industry is right to be nervous.

A "Buzzkill" Worth Celebrating

On May 4, 2026, New York City's Department of Health launched "Buzzkill," the first major American city campaign to directly confront alcohol's role as a carcinogen. The advertisements, cosigned by Mayor Zohran Mamdani and Health Commissioner Dr. Alister Martin, ran throughout May on subways, in bars, on social media, on the radio, and in community publications. The central message is one that the alcohol industry has spent decades fighting to keep out of the public's mind: there is no safe level of alcohol consumption.

The campaign cites the seven cancers for which alcohol is now a recognized risk factor: breast, colorectal, esophageal, liver,

mouth, throat, and laryngeal. New York City alone averages roughly 3,400 new colorectal cancer cases, 1,000 new liver cancer cases, and more than 6,600 new female breast cancer cases per year, according to 2017 to 2021 data cited in the Health Department's launch materials. Nationally, the U.S. Surgeon General has linked alcohol to approximately 100,000 cancer cases and 20,000 cancer deaths annually. Yet only about half of American adults are even aware of the alcohol and cancer link.

Dr. Martin put it plainly: "New Yorkers deserve to know the truth about the risk of cancer when drinking alcohol. To some, our data may be a buzzkill, but it's actually their buzz that can kill." That is exactly the kind of clear, unapologetic public messaging the country has needed for decades.

Rio, the WHO, and a Coordinated Global Push

A continent away, the 8th Global Alcohol Policy Conference convened in Rio de Janeiro from April 8 to 10, with entire sessions dedicated to one of the most effective tools in the temperance toolbox: alcohol taxation. The conference, organized by the Global Alcohol Policy Alliance, brought together health ministers, researchers, and longtime advocacy groups, including Movendi International, the organization founded in 1851 as the International Order of Good Templars and rebranded in 2019.

This is the gathering the Daily Mail and beverage industry trade press have taken to calling "Prohibition 2.0." The label is meant as ridicule. It functions as confirmation.

The Rio conference dovetails with the World Health Organization's 3 by 35 Initiative, launched in 2025, which calls on every country to raise the real price of tobacco, alcohol, and sugary drinks by 2035. On January 13, 2026, WHO Director-General Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus presented a new global report finding that alcohol has grown more affordable in most countries because taxes are too low, poorly designed, and rarely adjusted for inflation. The report concluded that current tax systems "protect industry profits while shifting health and economic costs onto families, communities, and governments." That is as concise a summary of the alcohol industry's business model as anyone has put on paper.

Industry Pushback Shows the Movement is Working

Wine-Searcher recently ran a piece titled "The Right Rides to Wine's Defense," chronicling the political backlash against this coordinated public health push. The framing tells you everything. When an industry must call in political allies to defend a product because the underlying science has become impossible to dispute, the industry has already lost the argument. It is simply trying to delay the consequences.

We have seen this pattern before. Tobacco companies once funded their own "researchers" to muddy the waters on cigarettes and cancer. They sponsored sympathetic columnists. They argued that taxes were regressive, that warning labels were paternalistic, and that adults could make their own choices. Every one of those arguments lost, and public health was better for it. The alcohol industry is now running the same playbook, only with bigger lobbying budgets and a more polished public relations operation.

Closer to home, the MTA's June 2025 decision to partially reverse its 2018 alcohol advertising ban on New York City transit fits the same trend. Officials at the Health Department warned publicly that the move "sends the wrong signal." Advertising drives consumption, especially among the young, and a transit system that carries millions of school-age riders every weekday should not be in the business of selling them beer brands. The Buzzkill campaign is, in part, a corrective response.

Washington Quietly Removes the Numbers

While New York moves forward, Washington has been moving backward. The 2025 to 2030 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, released late last year, removed the long-standing recommended daily limits of two drinks for men and one for women. In their place is a vague suggestion to "consume less alcohol for overall better health." The American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases and other professional bodies have publicly objected, pointing out that removing concrete numbers leaves Americans with no benchmark by which to measure their own risk.

This change did not happen by accident, and it did not happen because the evidence got weaker. It happened because the industry got louder. The contrast with New York City could not be

sharper. One level of government is naming alcohol as a carcinogen on subway posters. Another level of government has just made it harder for citizens to know what a risky pour actually looks like.

The Road Ahead

The historical record is clear. The original Prohibition era of 1920 to 1933 cut American alcohol consumption by an estimated 30 to 50 percent, drove cirrhosis death rates down from 29.5 per 100,000 in 1911 to 10.7 per 100,000 in 1929, and cut admissions for alcohol-induced psychosis by more than half. Dry counties in Texas still post measurably better outcomes on liver disease and atrial fibrillation than their wet neighbors. The data has never stopped arriving. The only thing that has changed is that the modern temperance movement now has the WHO, leading oncologists, and a major American mayor on its side.

The Prohibition Party has long argued that the alcohol industry profits by exporting the costs of its product onto families, communities, and the public health system. Buzzkill says so on a poster in Times Square. The WHO says so in a global report. A conference in Rio says so on the world stage. The momentum is moving in one direction, and it has been a long time coming.

If the industry wants to call this Prohibition 2.0, so be it. The first round did more good than its critics have ever been willing to admit. There is no reason to expect the second round to disappoint.

"America's first federal prohibition came not with the Volstead Act in 1920, but in 1802, when — at the behest of Chief Little Turtle of the Miami tribe — President Thomas Jefferson urged Congress to pass a prohibition against selling, bartering or trading liquor to Native Americans" Mark Lawrence Schrad

The Tribes That Chose Dry

By: Carl Moore

Deep in the northern woodlands of Minnesota, the Red Lake Nation continues to forbid the sale of alcohol upon their own lands. A long afterthought for Minnesotans, a state which maintains no county-wide restrictions since the 1930s. Beltrami and Clearwater counties fall within the reservation, and have shockingly remained dry by tribal ordinance. The choice stands within a longer and widely overlooked history. Federal law itself prohibited the sale of alcohol to Native Americans until 1953, and when that measure ended, several

tribes elected to keep the prohibition in force on their reservations. The Oglala Sioux on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota is another example, who maintained their own version of the previous laws on the grounds of maintaining public health and community safety.

One observes the pattern that follows when access remains open. On reservations where alcohol has entered freely from adjacent areas, it has been linked to the greater part of recorded offenses; on Pine Ridge, tribal court data once placed the figure near ninety percent of cases. Broader justice statistics show violent crime rates on many reservations running more than two and a half times the national average, with alcohol appearing repeatedly as a contributing factor in domestic violence, accidents, and health complications, including elevated rates of fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. In contrast, jurisdictions that have limited availability report measurable differences. In one remote northern community that moved from partial to full restriction, alcohol-related outpatient visits fell by roughly eighty-five percent. Studies of dry counties in Kentucky have likewise recorded lower rates of alcohol-related traffic incidents and DUI arrests than in neighboring wet counties.

The Red Lake Nation permits alcohol service in at least one tribally owned establishment outside its core lands while maintaining the prohibition at home. Similar local decisions appear in parts of Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Texas. Those who live directly with the results appear, in these instances, to have judged that a deliberate limit upon ready access serves the steadier conduct of life and the reduction of preventable harms - results that could prove promising if implemented elsewhere.

Alcohol Study Suppressed by HHS Officials Published in Scientific Journal

A study on the risks and harms of alcohol that was previously suppressed by HHS officials has now been published in a scientific journal. Last year, officials at the Department of Health and Human Services caved to demands of the alcohol industry, its lobbyists, and pro-alcohol politicians in Congress: retracting the 2025 Alcohol Intake and Health Study and denying it from receiving full publication.

The 2025 Alcohol Intake and Health Study was produced by researchers

working with the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, as part of work to help inform possible updates to the U.S. Dietary Guidelines. This study pointed out that consuming as little as one drink a day increased risks for various illnesses and injuries and presented risks of leading to alcohol related death. It acknowledged that drinking alcohol at any level increases risks for seven types of cancer.

The HHS would then cave again to alcohol industry influence and diluted its health and nutrition guidelines for alcohol. The 2025-2030 U.S. Dietary Guidelines removed any recommended limits on drinking and replaced them with a vague statement about drinking less, without any guidance as to the amount to reduce it by. They also removed the language stating that those who do not drink should not start for any reason and removed any language detailing the negative effects that alcohol can have on health. These changes contradicted the recommendations of health experts, who recommended setting lower recommended limits on alcohol consumption, to reflect growing research that even light drinking has detrimental effects on health, and recommended increased information on alcohol's health risks, such as its role in causing cancer.

Scientists involved with producing the 2025 Alcohol Intake and Health Study remained persistent in insisting on the importance of this research. Robert Vincent, a former SAMSA administrator, who helped oversee the study, stated that, "These findings are not radical. They are rigorous — and commercially threatening."

This year, a group of several scientists involved with the study worked to publish an article in the Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, describing the results of their research. The article is titled, "Alcohol Intake and Health Study: No Protective Effect at Low Levels, With Mortality Increasing to 1 in 25 at 14 Drinks Per Week". It reports their findings that there is no safe level of alcohol consumption, even 'moderate' alcohol consumption increases mortality and morbidity risks, that alcohol use increases cancer and cardiovascular risks, and these findings support changing U.S. Dietary Guidelines to recommend that current adult drinkers consume no more than one drink per day.

The study can be found here: <https://www.jsad.com/doi/10.15288/jsad.25-00435>



Understanding Freedom

By Jonathan Makeley

Throughout our country, we find people of all sorts who espouse a belief in the value of freedom and a free society. Folks from all kinds of different political groups and ideologies proclaim their belief in freedom and that their political positions are in line with the principles of a free society. But an investigation of the details of such beliefs soon finds that different people often mean different things by the word freedom; with such differences at times being significant and incompatible.

It reminds of the words of Abraham Lincoln, who said, "We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing... The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as a liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act as the destroyer of liberty".

In present times, we see problems with those who promote warped ideas of freedom. Those who have taken naive concepts of freedom and twisted them to negative extremes. To where license is proclaimed as liberty and decentralized tyranny is painted as freedom. Those who support the ability of individuals and private entities to harm, exploit, and kill people on their own whims, and support the degradation of human beings, under the name of freedom. Who oppose laws to protect the lives and rights of people; proclaiming them to be infringements on freedom.

The common, simple notion of freedom often describes freedom as meaning that people can do what they want. But this notion isn't quite right. If a man decided on a whim that they wanted to chop up their neighbor with an axe, that wouldn't be freedom; that would be murder. It would deprive another of their right to live and their freedom. This points to the reality that not all actions that one may wish to do are legitimate acts of freedom. There are limits that are proper in a free society and understanding those limits is important. There are responsibilities that people have. Additionally, if you have a

man who was reduced to acting upon compulsive desires and could not use their rational will to control their actions, such a person would not be free in an internal sense. And if people live in an environment where they are under continuous threat of being exploited, harmed, and killed by others, then such a condition would impair their ability to freely pursue their potential.

To help advance an understanding of freedom, it is important to provide a concise description of freedom that can account for these aspects and present a positive understanding of freedom on an individual and interpersonal level.

After putting great consideration into the matter, the following is offered as a concise description of freedom.

Defining Freedom

Freedom involves a condition allowing for human actualization on the individual and interpersonal levels, where human action may be guided by the intelligent will, where liberty may be brought in harmony with responsibility, where the exercise of power is limited by merit of justification and respect for the rights of mankind, where there can be mutual protection of people's lives and rights, and where the community may be organized towards these ends.

Tyranny Vs. A Free Society

With this description of freedom offered, we should consider what tyranny consists of and how it contrasts with a free society.

Tyranny exists in the unbounded and unjustified exercise of power. Someone who could do absolutely whatever they please, without regard for reason, morality, or the effects of their actions on people, is not free. They are a tyrant, whose actions pose a threat to the freedom of those around them. People cannot live freely in a condition where they are under constant threat of being exploited, degraded, harmed, and killed by those acting upon their own capricious whims. This is the case whether that abuse of power is exercised by a government, private group, or individual. The dictator, the robber baron, the gangster, the murderer, the rapist; all are tyrants in different forms, acting on different levels to trample people in service to their own selfish ends.

To have freedom in society, the exercise of power must be limited. There must be rules that limit the exercise of power to forms and purposes which are justified

and which respect the rights of people. Thus, when people come together to establish laws which limit actions for the purpose of protecting the lives, rights, and vital wellbeing of people, they are working to build a free society. In a society where the exercise of power at all levels is limited by merit of justification and the lives, rights, and vital wellbeing of people are protected from abuse, people can have the freedom to live their lives more fully and pursue their potential.



Applebee in 1884

In 1884, the Allegany County Prohibition Party nominated Andrew J. Applebee as its candidate for New York State Assembly. Andrew J. Applebee (1835-1912) was an experienced merchant and businessman who lived in Wellsville, NY. He had experience running various stores and businesses across several towns, including Scio, NY, Wellsville, NY, Allentown, NY, Bradford, PA, Rexford, PA, and Duke Centre, PA. He was president of the local St. John and Daniel Club in Wellsville, which campaigned in favor of the Prohibition Party's 1884 presidential ticket (John St. John for President and William Daniel for Vice President).

Andrew J. Applebee ran against Republican candidate William R. McEwen, Democratic candidate Seth H. Tracy, and Greenback candidate J.B. Bradley. During the campaign, Applebee campaigned in favor of prohibition policies and sought to reach out to voters who typically voted for other parties to build a broad base of support for challenging the Republican frontrunner.

Applebee would end up receiving 2,151 votes (17.48%) and coming in a strong third place behind McEwen and Tracy. He won in the towns of Alma and Almond, came in 2nd place in the towns of Alfred, New Hudson, Scio, and Wirt, and tied for 2nd in the towns of Clarksville and Genesee. Applebee was the Prohibition Party's strongest performing candidate for NY State Assembly in 1884 in terms of total number of votes and second strongest in terms of vote percentage.