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Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony regarding underage drinking, the nation’s most costly and neglected youth drug problem. The Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI) commends the Committee for focusing much needed attention on this important public health issue, following this month’s release of two major reports to Congress from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), respectively.

The NAS report, “Underage Drinking: A Collective Responsibility,” starkly depicts the scope of the problem: Approximately 11 million American youth under the age of 21 drink alcohol, nearly half of them drink heavily (downing five or more per occasion). An estimated 3 million teenagers are full-blown alcoholics, and several million more have serious drinking problems. Alcohol kills six times more youth than all illicit drugs combined, and plays a substantial role in the top three causes of teen death (traffic crashes, murder, and suicide). Those who start drinking before the age of 21 are more likely to be involved in a fight, commit violent crimes, fail at school, use other drugs, experience verbal, physical, or sexual violence, drink and drive, and become alcohol dependent than those who wait to drink legally.

Like it or not, underage drinking represents an important current and future market for alcohol producers. Underage drinking accounts for up to 20% of the U.S. market, and spawns the future heavy and addicted drinking upon which the alcoholic beverage market so heavily depends. The top 20 percent of beer drinkers account for 80 percent of beer consumption, whereas the vast majority of drinkers, who consume alcohol minimally, only account for 20 percent of the market. Youth who drink before they turn 15 are four times more likely than those who start drinking at 21 to develop alcohol dependence and join the ranks of the industry’s
best customers. Compelled by its primary responsibility to stockholders, the alcoholic-beverage industry has an intrinsic vested interest in capturing and maintaining the youth market, and cultivating new and heavy drinkers.

Dating back to CSPI’s 1984 publication of “The Booze Merchants,” CSPI and other organizations have documented the alcoholic-beverage industry's consistent targeting of the underage market. From the Budweiser frogs, lizards, and ferrets, adored by small children, to Spuds Mackenzie with his strong teen appeal, to the catchy “Whassup?” ad campaign which quickly permeated the youth lexicon, alcohol advertisers have blatantly appealed to teenagers while hiding behind anemic “responsible advertising” codes. Under the guise of targeting a legal 20-something audience, the industry routinely reaches mass audiences of underage consumers through sports events and sponsorships, music and movie product placements, concerts, festivals and other promotions. And in recent years, the development of new, sweet soda-pop-flavored products that appeal directly to youth tastes (“alcopops” such as Smirnoff Ice, Bacardi Silver, and Doc Otis Hard Lemonade) has become another means of cultivating young drinkers.

For more than 20 years, CSPI’s Alcohol Policies Project has worked to prevent and reduce alcohol problems at the national, state and local levels, collaborating with thousands of organizations and individuals to promote a comprehensive, prevention-oriented policy strategy to improve public health and safety and help save young lives. During that time we have developed the strong conviction that federal efforts to prevent and reduce underage drinking have been sorely underfunded, woefully fragmented, fundamentally invisible and largely ineffective. Numerous obstacles have thwarted the creation of a comprehensive, highly focused, clearly identified, and hard-hitting federal effort to address underage drinking. We hope that the work of this Committee will begin to help overcome some of those long-standing barriers.

We would like first to review the legislative and policy context which gave rise to the National Academy of Sciences’ groundbreaking report. Second, we will address the absence of and need for stronger federal leadership in preventing underage drinking and its widespread public health and safety harms. Third, we will outline why a media and communications campaign to prevent underage drinking should be the centerpiece of a comprehensive, aggressive prevention-oriented public health and safety strategy. Finally, we will highlight two other priority recommendations for federal action to reduce underage drinking: tax increases and advertising reforms.

Legislative and Policy Context of Underage Drinking Prevention Efforts

CSPI was part of a broad coalition of national and local public health, safety, consumer, religious, and youth and family advocacy organizations (the Coalition for the Prevention of Alcohol Problems, or CPAP) that for two years supported Congressional efforts to include underage drinking prevention messages in the Office of National Drug Control Policy’s (ONDCP’s) billion-dollar Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. Although ultimately unsuccessful, efforts by Representatives Wolf and Roybal-Allard in the House and by Senator Frank Lautenberg in the Senate generated substantial support and stimulated heated debate on the issue.
Despite votes that excluded alcohol from ONDCP’s media campaign, Congressional debate on the issue strongly affirmed the need for a parallel national media campaign to prevent underage drinking. Numerous members of Congress recognized the incongruity of spending hundreds of millions of dollars to prevent illicit drug use, while ignoring underage alcohol use, widely recognized as the far more common and devastating drug problem for young Americans. Congressional debate reflected strong support for an underage drinking prevention campaign to raise awareness of the problems associated with underage drinking and deliver prevention messages to young people, parents, community leaders, and public health and safety officials.

In this context, on April 4, 2001, Representatives Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA) and Frank Wolf (R-VA) introduced legislation to establish a “National Media Campaign to Prevent Underage Drinking” (H.R. 1509). Shortly thereafter, Senators Harry Reid (D-NV) and John Warner (R-VA), and others, introduced companion legislation in the Senate (S. 866). The legislation proposed a discrete underage-drinking media campaign housed in the Department of Health and Human Services. These bills are backed by a broad array of public health and safety groups, including CSPI, the American Medical Association (AMA), Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), the Consumer Federation of America, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America (CADCA), the Latino Council on Alcohol & Tobacco, the Trauma Foundation, the Southern Baptist Ethic and Religious Liberty Commission, and the American Academy of Pediatrics, as well as by the Advertising Council and the National Partnership for a Drug-Free America. Countless local and statewide groups also support the measure. The bi-partisan bills have garnered 82 co-sponsors in the House and 18 in the Senate.

While the legislation was not enacted in the 107th Congress, report language in the FY 2002 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill represented an important first step in moving the media-campaign issue forward. With support from the National Beer Wholesalers Association and the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States, appropriations language provided $500,000 for the National Academy of Sciences and Institute of Medicine to develop a comprehensive strategy to combat underage drinking and its consequences, with emphasis on the role a media campaign could play in such a strategy.

The NAS Report’s Media Campaign Recommendations

Based on a review of available research, the NAS report strongly recommends that the federal government fund and actively support the development of a national media effort targeted at adults, as a major component of a broader campaign to reduce underage drinking. The goals of the national media campaign would include instilling a broad societal commitment to reduce underage drinking, increasing specific actions by adults that are meant to discourage or inhibit underage drinking, and decreasing adult conduct that tends to facilitate underage drinking.

The report also calls for intensive research and development for a youth-focused national media campaign relating to underage drinking. It stipulates that if this work yields promising results, the inclusion of a youth-focused campaign in the strategy should be considered.

These recommendations provide strong backing for efforts to pass federal legislation creating a national media campaign to prevent underage drinking. This goal has been a top alcohol-policy priority for public health, consumer, religious, and substance abuse prevention...
groups for several years, and a media campaign should be a top priority for legislative action flowing from the NAS report. CSPI strongly supports this recommendation and urges the committee to implement it.

The Glaring Absence of a Visible, Cohesive Federal Voice on Underage Drinking

For too long, the federal government has been virtually silent on underage drinking and the promise of many policy interventions and communications strategies to reduce problems that have devastating economic and public health and safety consequences. We believe that the longstanding absence of a visible, coordinated federal role in addressing underage drinking and its harms contributes to a social norm of acceptance, tolerance, and even accommodation of underage drinking.

Worse yet, this abdication of federal responsibility on underage drinking has left alcohol producers primarily in charge of educating young people and the public, both about alcohol use and about how to combat underage drinking. Despite exaggerated and self-serving self-congratulations, industry efforts to address underage drinking have been untested and generally ineffective. Industry investment in those messages – both financial and creative – pales in comparison with what it spends promoting drinking. For example, Anheuser-Busch, the world’s largest brewer, claims to have spent more than $350 million since 1982 on public awareness and social responsibility messages. That’s less than what the company spent in just one year (2002) on advertising.

The federal government’s lack of commitment to this issue is also reflected in the meager allocation of resources devoted to preventing alcohol problems among young people. A May 2001 report released by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), Underage Drinking: Information on Federal Funds Targeted at Prevention, concludes that only $71 million of the federal government’s fiscal year 2000 budget was allocated specifically to the prevention of underage drinking. This pitifully small allocation is dwarfed by the $18 billion our government spends on the drug war, the $53 billion in estimated societal costs of underage drinking, and the $4 billion alcohol producers spend per year on alcohol advertising and promotion. To make matters worse, these woefully inadequate resources are scattered among disparate federal agencies. Many disparate programs have been developed with little coordination among the agencies and no unifying vision or strategy.

Unlike with tobacco, for which the Department of Health and Human Services has been designated as the lead agency for the government’s efforts in the area of smoking and health (and chairs a statutorily established Inter-Agency Committee on Smoking and Health), there’s no lead agency for the development or implementation of a strategy to combat underage drinking or societal alcohol problems.

The Surgeon General has issued several widely publicized reports on the public health hazards of tobacco, and regularly issues reports on the marketing of tobacco products to young people. Despite numerous appeals over the years from an array of public health and safety groups, the Surgeon General has never held a single workshop or issued any report on underage drinking. In fact, the 1988 Surgeon General’s Workshop on Drunk Driving stands out as the Department’s sole high-visibility forum on alcohol, period.
The federal government’s efforts to combat the devastation of illicit drugs likewise involve a well-funded, cohesive, publicly articulated, national drug-control strategy. That strategy is coordinated by ONDCP, an executive-department agency that reports directly to the President. Since the mid-1990s, Congress has appropriated billions of dollars to that agency, including hundreds of millions of dollars for a national youth anti-drug media campaign.

Nothing remotely resembling such a concerted effort has ever existed to address underage drinking or alcohol abuse. Yet, according to DHHS, alcohol is the most costly of all drug problems, imposing economic costs of more than $185 billion on the nation each year and causing more than 100,000 deaths. Unlike tobacco, which kills its users in middle age and later, alcohol is a drug that actually kills thousands of young people each year, many more than die from the use of all other drugs combined.

The Need for a Media Campaign as the Centerpiece of Federal Efforts to Prevent Underage Drinking

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, prevention efforts are beginning to pay off in declining rates of teen smoking. However, in part due to the absence of comparable efforts to combat underage drinking, alcohol use and binge drinking among teens continue at alarmingly high rates. The latest National Household Survey data suggest that alcohol use among American youth has even increased. Ten million 12- to 20-year-olds reported drinking alcohol in the year prior to the survey, one fifth of them heavily. Among the 12- to 17-year-olds, 10.6% binge drink and 2.5% say they’re heavy drinkers. In fact, previous month alcohol use among 12- to 17-year-olds increased more than 5% since 2000; 17.3 percent reported alcohol use in the past month.

As a society, we have invested heavily in massive public awareness campaigns designed to deter young people from taking up smoking and experimenting with illicit drugs. Those campaigns have provided an effective backdrop for a myriad of revolutionary public and private reforms that range from the imposition of advertising restrictions on cigarettes to the prohibition – even in bars – of indoor tobacco use. There is little doubt that they have helped to change the social and political conversation about smoking and drugs, and have empowered citizens and communities to take effective action on behalf of young people and society.

Recently, it has become increasingly apparent that comprehensive communications programs have actually played an important role in steering young people away from tobacco use. Evidence from Florida, California, and Massachusetts demonstrates that reaching young people with the right messages can make a difference. Although perhaps more complicated to implement, a similarly aggressive media campaign to prevent and reduce underage drinking is imperative and long overdue. With the right planning, adequate resources, and continuous evaluation, equivalent results are also achievable.

Of course, not even the best media campaign would magically eradicate underage drinking any more than ONDCP’s campaign has eliminated youth drug use. Nor is it realistic to imagine that sufficient resources would be available for a media campaign that, independently, could compete with more than $4 billion dollars a year in aggressive alcohol advertising and
promotion, much of which appeals directly to underage youth. However, a highly visible media campaign that reaches mass – and target – audiences with consistent, powerful, credible, and persuasive messages on underage drinking can help in many ways. As the centerpiece of an integrated prevention strategy, it would:

- Provide a clear, consistent federal voice that would highlight government interest in, leadership for, and commitment to reducing the widespread harms of underage drinking.

- Focus public attention on underage drinking as a significant public health and safety issue and elevate it on the national and local public health and policy agenda. A well-financed and provocative media campaign can generate discussion and debate, challenge complacency, and prompt state and community action for needed policy and practice reforms. Media involvement will help motivate and bolster community members working to change those community norms that contribute to youth alcohol use.

- Communicate highly visible, culturally imbedded media messages that (when effectively crafted and delivered) can help shift attitudes, shape perceptions, and change the national conversation about underage drinking, both among youth and adults. Administered effectively, a national media campaign would put to good use the enormous creativity and talent of willing participants in the media and advertising industries. Those professionals pride themselves on their prowess in influencing youths’ attitudes and behaviors.

For too long, the absence of cohesive, well-researched, coordinated, and aggressively promoted prevention messages has allowed alcohol producers free reign to poison the airwaves, both with seductive product appeals and with ineffective, vague, and self-serving “social responsibility” public-relations pitches. Those generally untested and unevaluated messages serve more to inoculate alcohol marketers from potential legal liability and Congressional and regulatory scrutiny than they do to promote real prevention.

Despite our reservations about industry’s public awareness campaigns, we would not expect a national, government-sponsored media campaign on underage drinking to supplant those messages. Industry efforts would and should continue, given the alcoholic-beverage industry’s undeniable responsibility to discourage the misuse of its products. However, just as we would never delegate the responsibility for youth smoking prevention efforts primarily to cigarette companies, we should not continue to allow vested interests in the alcoholic-beverage industry to have the principal voice when it comes to communicating with young people and adults about preventing underage drinking.

If the alcoholic-beverage industry were sincere in its commitment to prevent underage drinking, it would have little to fear by embracing public efforts to educate adults and young people about alcohol. A media campaign on underage drinking will not be about prohibition. It would not be about stigmatizing drinkers or alcohol producers. It would not, we would hope, be about communicating simplistic and self-defeating messages that heighten youth rebellion and interest in alcohol. It should be about ending our national denial of underage drinking as a major public health and safety issue and instilling a broad societal commitment to preventing and reducing it. A national media campaign would help increase public awareness and
understanding of the destructive role of alcohol in young people’s lives, and it would strengthen community resolve and capacity to take effective action to reduce and prevent underage drinking and its myriad harms.

Other Key Priorities for Federal Action on Underage Drinking: Taxes and Advertising

Among the NAS report’s many worthy recommendations, those concerning taxation and advertising deserve brief mention.

1. Alcohol Taxes: In keeping with its charge to examine scientifically supported strategies to reduce underage drinking, the NAS report recommends that Congress and state legislatures raise excise taxes, both to reduce underage consumption and raise additional revenues for prevention programs. The report cites three arguments for higher taxes to combat underage drinking:

   - “First, underage drinking imposes particularly high average social costs….”;
   - “Second, raising excise tax rates…is a strategy that has strong and well-documented prevention effects on underage drinking”;  
   - “Third, a designated portion of the funds generated by the taxes can be earmarked for preventing and reducing underage drinking.”

   The NAS report further recommends indexing alcohol taxes to the consumer price index to keep pace with inflation. Federal excise taxes on beer have increased only once (in 1991) since 1951. Due to their failure to keep pace with inflation, the relative value of beer taxes has declined by 75%. As a result, the relative price of beer (and other alcoholic beverages) has declined dramatically, promoting greater consumption, particularly among young people.

   At the federal level, this recommendation sends a clear message to lawmakers that – at the very least – lowering federal excise taxes on alcoholic-beverages (in particular, beer – the primary alcoholic drink of choice for young people) is a bad idea. Supporters of legislation to reduce the federal excise tax on beer and other alcoholic beverages now have a clear choice between protecting young people’s health and safety or padding the bottom line of a politically connected industry.

   At the state level, the NAS report’s tax recommendations firmly support and provide fresh impetus for long overdue state initiatives to raise excise taxes on alcoholic-beverages to reduce underage drinking and raise revenues for prevention and treatment.

2. Alcohol Advertising: The NAS report urged the alcohol industry to strengthen its current voluntary advertising codes, refrain from marketing practices that have substantial appeal to youth, and be more careful to place ads to reduce youthful exposure. Even though the NAS report acknowledged the lack of direct evidence for a causal link between advertising and alcohol consumption, it supported better industry self-regulation and recommended that Congress appropriate necessary funding for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to monitor underage exposure to alcohol advertising on a continuing basis and to report periodically to Congress and the public. It also urged that the DHHS’s principle annual survey
on youth substance use be amended to include the collection of data on underage drinkers' product and brand choices.

Some industry representatives have alleged that the Federal Trade Commission’s (FTC’s) recent report to Congress, “makes the NAS report moot” on alcohol advertising. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Although the FTC’s report is quick to congratulate the alcoholic-beverage industry’s promised voluntary adoption of a “70% adult audience” placement standard (up from 50%), the practical effects of this change will be minimal. The revised standard essentially mirrors what the industry is already doing. In fact, several years ago, when NBC considered running liquor ads using an even higher 85% adult-audience placement standard, advertising trade professionals pointed out that the seemingly stricter benchmark would be virtually meaningless. Nearly every NBC show airing at the time would have qualified (given that 72% of the U.S. population is 21 or older). In short, the cosmetic shift to a 70% threshold will afford no real reduction in the extent of youth exposure to alcohol advertising.

The FTC’s report also virtually ignores the critical issue of “spillover” – the practical impossibility of designing ads that appeal to 21-year-olds, but not to younger persons as well. The FTC’s failure on this point (other than its curiously offhand acknowledgements that ads reach significant numbers of underage persons and appeal to them) reflects an underlying conclusion that industry’s right to target legal-age consumers trumps society’s responsibility to protect children and adolescents.

We think industry can do better: by eliminating youthful themes, concepts, and characters; by imposing stricter placement standards; and by more prominently promoting only the moderate use of its products. It is worth noting that some stores that sell alcohol exercise extra caution, for example, by checking identification of everyone who looks younger than thirty. Advertisers could do likewise by designing ads that skew “age-upwards” in appeal, rather than “age-downwards.” Advertising content issues present challenging legal and business questions, but need to be addressed more seriously by producers than they have in the past.

The FTC’s report also fails to respond to Congress’ specific request to examine the impact on underage persons of expanded broadcast advertising of liquor-branded “alcopops” (such as Smirnoff Ice, Bacardi Silver, and Skyy Blue). The report instead blandly states that “there is no information to show the extent to which teens drink these beverages,” and proceeds to base its conclusions primarily on a review of industry-supplied marketing materials. That is simply not good enough.

Since 2000, CSPI and other public health and consumer groups have expressed numerous concerns about the introduction and marketing of “alcopops.” Our concerns include: the products’ accessibility to minors; product composition and labeling that attract underage drinkers; and the misleading and confusing nature of the products’ names, labeling, and advertising.
Based on those concerns, CSPI commissioned two nationally representative telephone polls in May 2001: one survey polled six hundred teenagers ranging in age from 14 to 18 and the other collected responses from five hundred adults 21 and older. Among other objectives, the surveys sought to measure the awareness and usage of “alcopops” among minors and adults and to explore the opinions and attitudes of the general public about the marketing of “alcopops” to underage people. The major conclusions of the surveys include:

- Both teens and adults believe that liquor and beer companies target young people with their advertising and that this contributes to underage drinking. Eighty-one percent (81%) of teenagers and fifty-seven percent (57%) of adults believe that beer and liquor companies target minors through advertising. Seventy-eight percent (78%) of teenagers and sixty-five percent (65%) of adults believe that alcohol advertising contributes to underage drinking.

- “Alcopops” are much more popular among minors than among adults. Teenagers are three times as likely to be aware of “alcopop” beverages and almost twice as likely to have tried them. Sixty-four percent (64%) of teenagers, compared to only twenty-one percent (21%) of adults report having seen, heard or read about “alcopops.” Forty-one percent (41%) of teenagers, compared to twenty-four (24%) of adults, report having tried “alcopops.” Of those surveyed, fifty-one percent (51%) of the teenagers aged 17 and 18 and thirty-five percent (35%) of teenagers aged 14 to 16 had tried the products.

- “Great taste” was cited by eighty-six percent (86%) of the teenagers surveyed as an important reason to decide to try an “alcopop” beverage. Other leading reasons included: “they taste like soda or lemonade” (80%) and “they have a sweet taste” (79%). When asked what one type of alcoholic drink they would most prefer to drink, thirty percent (30%) of teenagers responded they would drink the “alcopop” product, compared to sixteen percent (16%) who chose beer and sixteen percent (16%) who chose mixed drinks. Fifty-two percent (52%) of teenagers think that product attributes of “alcopops” are important reasons why teenagers choose them over beer or liquor. Teenagers cite “the sweet taste” (25%), “hide the taste of alcohol” (17%), and “easy to drink” (10%) as appealing product characteristics.

- A second survey conducted for CSPI among 500 adults in October 2002 concerned misleading and/or confusing advertising. This survey indicated that adults were more likely to believe that liquor-branded “alcopops” were liquor products than other alcoholic beverages. Forty-nine percent (49%) of adults believed that Bacardi Silver was more like liquor than beer (nine percent) with 38% unsure; and forty-seven percent (47%) of adults believed Smirnoff Ice was more like liquor than beer (fourteen percent) with 29% unsure.

- Sixty-four percent (64%) of adults believe that Smirnoff introduced Smirnoff Ice so that underage drinkers will become familiar with their brand name and then move on to trying Smirnoff Vodka.

“Alcopop” producers openly acknowledge that their products are specifically aimed at “entry level” drinkers, and that the use of liquor brand names on these products is aimed at
drawing young drinkers to the parent brands of hard liquor. The FTC’s failure to examine seriously the appeal of such products to underage consumers underscores the need to implement the NAS recommendation that the DHHS’s principle annual survey on youth substance use be amended to include the collection of data on underage drinkers’ product and brand choices. The availability of such data is essential to understanding whether the new products and their advertising campaigns have an impact on young people.

There are many things Congress can do to help combat underage drinking by reducing the appeal of alcohol advertising to underage consumers. CSPI urges Congress to implement the NAS report’s recommendations to:

- Encourage alcohol producers to further strengthen their voluntary advertising placement standards;
- Require regular federal monitoring of and reporting on the impact of alcohol advertising on underage consumers;
- Require the DHHS to amend its annual national survey on youth substance use (known as the “Monitoring the Future” Survey) to include the collection of data on underage drinkers’ product and brand choices, and;
- Establish a national media campaign on the risks and harms of underage drinking to balance the messages parents and young people receive from alcohol advertising.

We further urge Congress to consider measures to:

- Study ways to improve the FTC’s recommended third-party review mechanism to ensure that it is responsive to consumer concerns and that it carries meaningful sanctions for violations of industry’s self-imposed responsibility codes;
- Require health risk warnings to appear in alcohol advertisements, such as prescribed in the Dewine/Kennedy tobacco bills. Under such a measure, magazine ads would feature a “health warning” that would occupy 20% of its area and be featured at the top of ad. Television and radio ads would feature a “health warning” that would occupy 20% of its length and be featured at the end of the ad. This series of rotating warnings with voice-over should provide young people with basic health information about consequences of alcohol use, as well as discouragement of underage drinking.

We thank the Committee for its consideration of our views, and would be pleased to assist its efforts in any way we can.

#####
4 Congressional Record, Volume 145, July 1, 1999 (Senate) [Page S7987-S8010], Floor debate on Lautenberg Amendment No. 1214 to S. 1282 (FY2000 Treasury Postal Appropriations bill).
5 This is illustrated by just a few of many similar direct quotes on “alcopops” from industry sources:

- “The beauty of this category is that it brings in new drinkers, people who really don’t like the taste of beer,” said Marlene Coulis, A-B’s director of new products. *Advertising Age*, April 22, 2002.

- “With younger drinkers, their palates haven’t quite matured yet to drinks like bourbon. Malternatives are a sweeter drink, they’re easier to drink and it takes less time to mature to the taste.” – Trish Rohrer, Brand Development manager for Boston Beer Company in “Malternative Universe,” *Restaurants USA*, May 2002.

- “This is the perfect ‘bridging beverage,’” said Terry Hopper, national sales manager for Sublime Hard Lemonade, commentating on the similarities between carbonated fruit juices, such as Snapple and Nantucket Nectars, and the new hard lemonades. – “New Kick on the Block: Will Spike Lemonades Pick Up Where Wine Coolers Left Off?” *Washington Post*, September 13, 2000.