

**Three Cheers for Three-Tiers?
Outdated and unfair laws have Craft Brewers Crying in Their Beers**



(Source: Flickr user James Lee, used by Williams)

Imagine you are going out for a nice dinner with your sweetheart. You like a hearty, hoppy ale like those you've heard about from one of the new local brewpubs in your area. You decide to try one of these quaint brewpubs that are so reminiscent of colonial taverns that were the mainstay of American communities for so long. You have a wonderful meal, which is complemented by the great ale you drank, so very different from traditional American beers typically carried in grocery stores today. In fact, you enjoyed the ale so much, you decide you'd like to purchase some to take home with you for a dinner party you are going to be having soon.

When your server brings your check to your table, you ask her about adding a 12-pack to go to your tab. She gives you a sad face and explains to you that state law forbids alcoholic beverage producers from also being retailers. Your understandable, incredulous reaction is: "Huh? Seriously? What kind of sense does that make?" She proceeds to give you a one-minute summary of how the 21st Amendment to the US Constitution, the Repeal of Prohibition, still affects the winery/brewing industry today, over 80 years later. She also informs you how lucky you are to live in a state that allows tasting rooms/brewpubs to exist at all, as there are still states that don't allow brewers to serve open alcohol, another factoid that has you scratching your head in wonder. (Aued; Watson)

The three-tier system of distribution that most states adopted to regulate the alcohol industry after Repeal was enacted is based on information provided from many sources, many of which were

greatly influenced by their own personal opinions regarding alcohol and also by highly paid lobbyists. Most states adopted some form of this tiered system, as well as enforcing the collection of the excessive excise taxes imposed on the purchase of alcohol.

The 21st Amendment to the US Constitution was signed into law by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who ran on a Repeal platform. Prohibition had been in effect from the 18th Amendment since 1920, and FDR proposed legalizing alcohol, then heavily taxing it to pay for his New Deal (Peck). By the time of his election, even the temperance supporters agreed that the only effect Prohibition had had was to turn the alcohol industry into a goldmine for organized crime. Bootleggers had no problem providing alcoholic drinks for a demanding public, although the supply was sporadic and those who turned their backs on the new law had no idea what they were actually drinking, and had no legal recourse if it made them sick, which happened a lot (Peck; Murphy 820).

The Repeal Amendment gave the authority for regulating alcohol to the individual states, thereby allowing states that wanted to stay “dry” the ability to do so. Legislators and industry insiders were not thrilled with the idea of a public with access to unregulated alcohol, as there was a lot of money at stake and a very healthy black market currently in control of the sales (Peck). Interested parties, including two of the richest men in America at the time, John D. Rockefeller and Pierre DuPont, worked together with elected leaders to come up with guidelines for the individual states to use in making their individual regulations. Rockefeller even paid for a study to be done, which was published in 1933 as a book titled *Toward Liquor Control*. The guidelines laid out in this book became the framework for the regulations adopted by many of the states who followed the three-tier system of distribution laid out therein.

Extensive research into the history behind Prohibition and Repeal, the three-tier system, and some of the varied and contradictory alcohol laws enacted by different states, shows that this law, as

well as the myriad state laws based upon it, need to be modified in order to reflect the market and cultural conditions in America today. There are issues that weren't even considered in the 1930s, such as internet sales, global and nationwide production and distribution companies, and brewpubs as a cultural phenomenon. They were concerned more with raising revenues through high taxes to help get the country out of the depression.

Interference by rich men and companies, as well as outright trickery and a huge lobby, ensured that unfair regulations and guidelines became the normally accepted practices of many states with regard to alcohol regulation. These laws need major modifications in order to come close to being fair and impartial to the majority of our citizens today, which is what the guidelines espoused for Repeal were supposedly meant to assure.

“Between 1865 and 1914, total industry production increased from 3.6 to 66.2 million barrels” of beer (Stack 422). Anheuser-Busch (AB) and Pabst were the giants at the time, and between 1877 and 1895, they grew at a much faster rate than the local breweries that didn't ship regionally or nationally. However, from 1895 until 1915, their sales fell off and the industry of local and regional brewers grew at a faster rate.

Although there were likely many reasons for this change, the large shipping brewers felt it was due to challenges they had in getting access to saloons. At this time in history, 85-90 percent of beer sales was in saloons, on tap from kegs (Stack 423). Local brewers gained control of saloons in their local areas, either by owning them or influencing their owners, a feat that was much easier for local companies than for shippers. Basically, with the majority of the beer market in keg beer, they didn't have a lot of hope to beat out the locals.

When AB and Pabst realized this, they started working with some temperance groups like the Anti-Saloon League and supported legislation requiring the separation of brewing and selling of

beer (Stack 423). Unfortunately for them, when the 18th Amendment passed in 1920, it prohibited all phases of the alcoholic beverage business, sales, distributing, and producing.

It didn't take very long for it to become apparent that Prohibition was not going to work as it was. The mega-brewers realized that there would be issues regarding regulation upon repeal and they lobbied during the 1920s to try to ensure the new regulations would prevent the brewer/distributor/retailer (called "tied houses") competition from continuing to be a problem after repeal.

August Busch wrote to the president to try to get Prohibition regulations changed. In addition, he wrote a pamphlet he made public in which he said "that 'the objectionable saloon' should be eliminated, that hotels and restaurants should sell only bottled beer, and that a strict separation of manufacturing and retailing would end the policy of tied houses" (Stack 423, qtd from AB Brewery).

There was no clear system of regulation in place upon Repeal in 1932, but brewers knew they'd have the chance to help create the new rules that would be put in place. Although Repeal seems like it would have helped all brewers, the regulations that emerged "favored the shipper over the local brewer, packaged beer over draught beer, and new retail outlets (such as grocery stores) over the traditional outlets such as bars" (Stack 423). These three regulations had a great effect on the brewing industry after Prohibition.

Public figures who were pro-Prohibition learned to hate its results, but they were actively interested in the regulations that would be made once it was repealed. Rockefeller, DuPont, and many others believed the liquor industry must be run by the government to prevent the chaos that reigned before Prohibition. The studies and "experts" agreed that beer and light wines were not a

problem, just hard liquor, and they even made a distinction between light and heavy beers, light being less than 3.2 percent alcohol.

Interested parties had meetings and debated possible regulations, and two sources emerged with information on the regulatory system that resulted. The Dept. of Agriculture published the *Code of Fair Competition* for the Brewing Industry in Dec. 1933 with a lot of input from the large brewers. *The Hearings, Marketing Agreements, Codes, Licenses and Processing Tax Matters of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration* was also published, and representatives from major breweries and trade associations contributed to the creation of their own draft *Code of Fair Competition*. The two drafts of the code were different, and the final adopted code had mostly the provisions from the industry version which was more favorable to the industry than the brewers. Significant in these regulations is the fact that it is very difficult for a brewer to change or fire their distributor. Rather than maintaining their business on the basis of providing good service, the suppliers are almost forced to keep one-sided contracts affording distributors termination protections that aren't working for them or lose a lot of money (Crisp; Kurtz and Clements 2).

The *Code* was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1935 but it still ended up being the framework most states used to create their individual regulations. Regulations enacted by most states followed five key aspects of the Brewing Code: Elimination of “unfair methods of competition”; relaxed licensing for retail outlets; implemented a three-tier industry structure; introduced self-regulation by the brewing industry; differentiated between beer and spirits. The effects of these five aspects were a rise in packaged sales and in off-premise sales (Stack 427).

These regulations changed how beer was retailed. By preventing breweries from retailing, they cut out the cost benefits for the small brewers who didn't have to pay for shipping. “The introduction of an additional layer of machinery into the workings of the brewing industry ... was

the consequence of intense lobbying by wholesales and shippers during the transitional period in which the country was preparing for the repeal of prohibition” (Stack 428).

Prohibition had already eliminated most of the small brewers from the playing field, and in the years following Repeal and the regulation changes it brought, the mega-brewers slowly increased their domination of the beer market. “From over 700 breweries in the mid-1930s, the total number of firms fell to 684 in 1940, 407 in 1950 ... and 101 in 1980” (Stack 428). To put it another way, “The five-firm concentration ratio was under 15 percent in the 1930s and early 1940s; ... over the next several decades concentration continued until this measure topped 75 percent in 1980” (Stack 428).

I go into this detail on the history of Repeal because of the legal climate for brewers today. As stated by Stack and Gartland in their conclusion, “The post-prohibition regulatory environment was neither a random process nor an historical accident: its design and implementation reflected the interests of a handful of large, nationally oriented firms that sought to alter some of the basic competitive rules in this industry” (Stack 428).

The people who advocate for the three-tier system believe that the independent distributor (middleman) between the brewer and retailer is still the best way of regulating the industry so that we don't return to the disorderly chaos of the saloon days pre-Prohibition. Some of the regulations, such as preventing retailers from charging slotting fees for prime locations to shelve beer, make sense; they harm no one and make things better for the small brewers who may not get a chance in a new market. They believe the system provides “unparalleled choice and variety of beer” (December) and “creates a clear chain of custody and provides transparency, accountability and traceability” (December).

Others say, “This three-tier system is acclaimed by public health experts worldwide. It ... has helped to prevent deaths from counterfeit alcohol and overconsumption relative to many nations” (Beer). Larry Del Papa, Chairman of the National Beer Wholesales Association, claims “that the three-tier system provides social value” and calls it “the most successful alcohol distribution model the world has ever known” (NBWA).

Another good regulation is the prevention of gift-giving by brewers, which was a huge problem in the pre-prohibition days (Grossman 94). These laws help to level the playing field for small brewers to be able to compete in the marketplace, and they provide for a greater selection of goods. Most of the industry experts say that the three-tier system has worked well for over 80 years and should therefore be kept in place, citing fears of devolving into the dance-hall/saloon days.

Advocates of the tiered system also cite protection of the public as part of their rationale for keeping these laws, claiming that relaxing the laws encourages abuse of alcohol, and allowing internet sales, a hugely growing marketing trend, allows for accidental sales to minors. The Center for Alcohol Policy (CAP) has even gotten permission and republished the book *Toward Liquor Control* commissioned by Rockefeller, because they believe its “content is just as important today as when it was written” (Oliver qtd. in The Center) and provides us with “an understanding of why the system remains important today” (The Center).

The Repeal regulations were meant to protect consumers from the monopolies that were in place before Prohibition as well as to protect the public from “Fake Alcohol” which killed many people during Prohibition (Tobiassen 3; Torres B1). However, as the history I uncovered revealed, the three-tier laws were “set up to protect big beer distribution companies” (Feinberg A13) and the “maze of antiquated and burdensome laws at the national, state, and local levels protects special interests and the status quo at the expense of brewers and consumers” (Feinberg A13). Under the

guise of greater good, the big breweries that survived Prohibition and the big distributors that wanted to protect their own incomes unfairly influenced policy and lawmakers.

Pierre DuPont didn't care about temperance like Rockefeller did, but he hated the new income tax that had been instituted and tried his best to get the alcohol industry taxed so highly that he wouldn't have to pay those taxes any longer (Peck). Currently, the five largest brewers control 80 percent of the world's beer market, and the two largest, Anheuser-Busch InBev (now owned by Belgians) and MillerCoors, are not even US companies any longer. Many states allow these mega-corporations to buy up distributors, essentially giving them control of two of the three tiers. They have even started to buy up some of the larger craft breweries.

The distributors have consolidated just as much in recent years, and a large portion of what used to be locally owned businesses are now mega-corporations. This consolidation in the industry has the large brewers and distributors fighting amongst themselves, but it hasn't taken their eyes off the craft brew industry (Sterrett 3; Cahill 4). Their lobby is the third largest in the country (TIME) and "these big businesses lobby Congress and their state legislatures to maintain their monopolies. Politicians who benefit from their campaign contributions are all too willing to play along, young entrepreneurs and consumers be damned" (Feinberg A13).

The lobbyists for the mega-brewers and distributors are working very hard to keep the myriad laws providing for unfair taxation and distribution systems in place in order to prevent the small brewers from growing and taking more of the market share of the industry (Watson D2). But, as Senator Frank Ginn from Georgia said, "The public doesn't care about the three-tier system. They want to make sure when they go to take a tour of a brewery or distillery that they can have an educational tour, they can have a tasting tour and they can leave with the product" (qtd from Torres B1).

Essentially, the very conditions these laws were set up to protect the public and the small businessman from have now come to pass as a result of these laws due to the interference of big business and dirty politicians. In reality, August Busch helped to set up the three-tier system requiring producers to be independent from distributors, yet his company is now buying up all the distributors they can and is actually involved in lawsuits with distributors who are trying to prevent AB getting more than they already have (Beer).

The only commercial product with two of its own constitutional amendments is alcohol (America's). The number of local, state and federal laws regulating alcohol in some way, including taxation, is mind-boggling. I checked congress.gov and searched for bills related to "beer" and found that almost every year there were at least two proposed bills requesting the lowering of taxes on beer, and in the years right after tax increases, those numbers skyrocketed. In the 1950s, the early 1970s and again in 1990, Congress passed bills raising taxes on alcohol, among other things (75 Years). In 1990, they doubled the excise tax. In the 1973-34 congressional period, I counted 22 House bills proposed, one a week for several months, and another 12 submitted in the '75-'76 period. There have been at least two bills every year since to reduce taxes, and only two that I found passed.

HR 11 in the 102nd Congress had some amendments to the taxes passed in 1990, but in reading the summary, they only allowed imported beer to be transferred from customs to brewers tax-free, allowed beer exporters tax refunds on what left the country, and gave tax-free beer to officials of foreign governments and their families and public international organizations (Rostenkowski). These changes scream special interest big brewers, and did nothing to help the small brewers, family-owned local distributors, or the general public.

Taxes on beer constitute over 40 percent of the price of a beer, and the only people that is hurting is the small business owners and the consumers. Some bureaucrats are looking at raising taxes even more and have “proposed enforcing a tax on the spent grain that brewers often donate to local hog and cattle farms” (Feinberg A13), which would only harm farmers. Even more crazy is legislation being pushed in some local and state governments “requiring brewers to sell their products to a distributor and then buy it back at a mark-up in order to sell it themselves—even though the beer didn’t leave the brewery” (Feinberg A13). We’ve all heard the term “sin tax” but there are extremes that are just counter-productive to the good of our country.

In recent court cases challenging these regulations, they have affirmed the fact that states are supposed to be using “the 21st Amendment power to ‘promote temperance,’ and ‘prevent suppliers from abusing their economic power,’ that is, keep the trade free of the gangsterism” (Westerman) pre-Prohibition. The current market of consolidation and control by a select few mega distributors and brewers is not a balance of power in the beer industry (Murphy 821).

Beer is as American as apple pie and baseball (cite) and the craft brewing industry is about more than “just enjoying good beer” (Feinberg; Williams). “Our Founding Fathers debated their declaration over local beer in Philadelphia’s taverns” (EDITORIAL). This small-town, personal type service is a lot of the charm (Big five). Industry insider “Bob Pease said...(T)he American beer drinker ‘is not going to go back to just drinking an exclusively light lager’” (Pease, qtd in Soch).

The craft brewing industry has exploded in the last 15-20 years, and it is estimated that there are over 2 million people employed in the industry in the US, mostly jobs that are filled by younger workers. The Director of the Arkansas Alcoholic Beverage control Division relates that in his state alone, “it has grown about 500 percent in the last four years” (Cottingham). Even with all the red tape there is to wade through, “over 400 breweries opened in the United States in 2013” (Feinberg

A13). The Brewers Association reports that even though there has been relatively flat overall growth in the beer industry recently, “craft beer sales grew 17 percent in 2013 and accounted for 7.8 percent of the beer market” (Big five). Bob Pease, the CEO of the Brewers Association, says that “...the wider variety of options available to consumers will only continue to increase” and believes “that small craft brewers...could eventually increase (market share) to as much as 30 percent” (Soch).

Statistics prove that pricing has no bearing on abuse, that the laws, agreements, or where beer is stored have no bearing on abuse, and that debates over it “do not focus on the three-tier system but on education and economics, particularly pricing and taxation” (Westerman).

Courts have agreed with economists and “now demand that regulations be tested in terms of consumer benefits: do they promote efficiency and assure the lowest possible price?” (Westerman). The effect of the current three-tier system is that access to and participation in the market is restricted for many start-up brewers, effectively giving the giants a monopoly, the very result it was meant to prevent.

As stated in *Toward Liquor Control*, the document upon which most of these laws were based, “*In the last analysis, there is but one fundamental rule to be followed-and all other rules are corollaries: If the new system is not rooted in what the people of each state sincerely desire at this moment, it makes no difference how logical and complete it may appear as a statute – it cannot succeed*” (Fosdick ix).

The facts show that many new small brewers cannot afford to pay distributors. Business fairness and common sense say they should not be required to do so. Industry expert Mark Rodman from Beverage Distribution Consultants has stated, there are a few giant players who now have the power “to squash their competitors in all retail channels and stymie and squelch the ambitions and efficient market access of hundreds and hundreds of small brewers” (An Industry).

When this industry expert was asked how he saw the results coming down, his response was: “... in my professional opinion, the 21st Amendment Enforcement Act, is flawed beyond belief conceptually and in pragmatic terms” (An Industry). He echoed my sentiments that the entire industry, full of companies vying to be the leader, should let the marketplace decide if three-tiers is the best way. The fact that there are now four or five companies producing over 90 percent of US beer sales, and that in several states 8 of every 10 beer cases sold come from two mega-brewers proves its failure (An Industry; Kurtz and Clements 2).

In his book *Beyond the Pale*, one of the founders of Sierra Nevada Brewing explains very simply the benefits of both self-distribution and outside distributors, and admits his company has used both routes (Grossman). The marketing expertise of an established beer distribution company could be invaluable to a new brewer in getting their product to the public, of course depending on the company. Be that as it may, it should not be mandated by law but left up to individual business owners to decide what is best for their company.

To get to the bottom line, “This is really about marketing and tourism ... It’s going to add tax revenue, it’s going to add manufacturing jobs” (Palmer qtd. in Torres and Sheinin). It’s good for the economy, both large scale and local, and that, after all, is what is most important.

Works Cited

- “75 Years of Industry Leadership.” *Beverage Dynamics* July/Aug 2009: 23-41.
digitalmagazinetechology.com. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- “An Industry Caught In The Net, Part II.” *Modern Brewery Age* 11 Sept. 2000: 22. *General OneFile*.
Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- Aued, Blake. "Lawmakers Loosen Up." *Flagpole* 22 May 2013: 7. *ProQuest*. Web. 07 Mar. 2015.
- “Beer Distributors Unite to Support Sale of Chesbay Distributing to Reyes Holdings, Oppose
Online Alcohol Sales.” *PR Newswire* 27 Sept. 2012. *Infotrac Newsstand*. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- “Big five drawing eyes of big beer.” *Denver Post* [Denver, CO] 22 Feb. 2015: 1K. *Infotrac Newsstand*.
Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- Cahill, Joe. “Goliath vs. Goliath.” *Crain’s Chicago Business* 11 June 2012: 0004. *General OneFile*. Web 16
Mar. 2015.
- “Center for Alcohol Policy Marks Anniversary of 21st Amendment.” *Center for Alcohol Policy*.
Centerforalcoholpolicy.org. n. d. Web. 13 Mar. 2015.
- Cottingham, Jan. "Craft brewers' growth spurs look at rules." *Arkansas Business* 12 Jan. 2015: 20.
General OneFile. Web. 07 Mar. 2015.
- Crisp, Elizabeth. “Missouri lawmakers advance liquor, homebrewed beer legislation.” *St. Louis Post-
Dispatch* 08 May, 2013. *Stltoday.com*. Web. 13 Mar. 2015.
- "December 5, 2008, Marks 75th Anniversary of Prohibition Repeal." *US Newswire* 04 Dec. 2008.
Infotrac Newsstand. Web. 13 Mar. 2015.
- "EDITORIAL: Small beer could be bigger." *Philadelphia Inquirer* 25 July 2013. *Infotrac Newsstand*.
Web. 13 Mar. 2015.

- Fosdick, Raymond B. and Scott, Albert L. *Toward Liquor Control: Introduction*. (Reprinted with Permission) 13 June 2011. Advisory Council, Center for Alcohol Policy. Web. 14 Mar. 2015.
- “Ippolito Christon echoes BCG analysis of 3-tier.” *Modern Brewery Age* 30 June 2014: 1. *General OneFile*. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- Kurtz, Barry, and Bryan H. Clements. "Beer Distribution Law as Compared to Traditional Franchise Law." *Franchise Law Journal* 33.3 (2014): 397-409. *ProQuest Business Collection*. Web. 07 Mar. 2015.
- Markey, Betsy. *H.Res.1297 – Supporting the goals and ideals of American Craft Beer Week*. U.S. House of Representatives, 22 Apr. 2010. *Government Printing Office*. Congress.gov. n. d. Web. 27 Mar. 2015.
- Murphy, Amy. “Discarding the North Dakota Dictum: An Argument for Strict Scrutiny of the Three-Tier Distribution System.” *Michigan Law Review* 2012; 110; 5; 819-846. repository.law.umich.edu. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- “NBWA leaders pledge resolute defense of the three-tier system.” *Modern Brewery Age* 08 Oct. 2010: 5+. *General OneFile*. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- Panetta, Leon. *H.R.5835 – Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990; Subtitle B: Excise Taxes - Part I: Taxes Related to Health and the Environment*. U.S. House of Representatives, 15 Oct. 1990. *Government Printing Office*. Congress.gov. n. d. Web. 27 Mar. 2015.
- Peck, Garrett. "How not to legalize a drug: yanking alcohol back out of the black market left America with a wicked Prohibition hangover." *Reason* July 2014: 42+. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 07 Mar. 2015.

Marianne McCreight ~ ENGL 121—TR3:30, Prof. Arrington
Writing Project 3 — 3/30/2015

- Rostenkowski, Dan. *H.R.11 - Revenue Act of 1992; Part II: Provisions Related to Distilled Spirits, Wines, and Beer*. U.S. House of Representatives 03 Jan. 1991. *Government Printing Office*. Congress.gov. n.d. Web. 27 Mar. 2015.
- Soch, Jonathan. "Craft beer brewers gear up for battle on Capitol Hill." *The Washington Times, LLC*. 25 Feb 2015. *WashingtonTimes.com*. Web. 01 Mar. 2015.
- Stack, Martin, and Gartland, Myles P. "The Repeal of Prohibition and the Resurgence of the National Breweries: Productive Efficiency or Path Creation?" *Management Decision* 43, 3 (2005): 420-32. *ProQuest*. Web. 13 Mar. 2015.
- Sterrett, David. "Fight brews over state booze law; Bud's distribution move seen as threat to wholesale empires." *Crain's Chicago Business* 08 Mar. 2010: 3. *General OneFile*. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- "The Center for Alcohol Policy Republishes Toward Liquor Control." *Food and Beverage Close – Up* 09 June 2011. *ProQuest*. Web. 13 Mar. 2015.
- "TIME TO CUT OUT THE MIDDLE-MAN IN BEER SALES." *States News Service* 3 June 2013. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.
- Tobiassen, Robert M. *The "Fake Alcohol" Situation in the United States: The Impact of Culture, Market Economics, and the Current Regulatory Systems*. Falls Church, VA: Center for Alcohol Policy, 2014. Print.
- Torres, Kristina. "CRAFT BEER SALES: Compromise may be near on beer bill: Changing Ga.'s alcohol delivery system proves tricky for lawmakers." *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* [Atlanta, GA] 4 Mar. 2015: B1. *Infotrac Newsstand*. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.

Torres, Kristina, and Aaron Gould Sheinin. "AJC AT THE GOLD DOME: Beer battle brews in the Legislature: In-house sales by craft breweries at issue." *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*

[Atlanta, GA] 31 Jan. 2015: A1. *Infotrac Newsstand*. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.

Watson, Jon. "COMMENTARY: Getting a craft beer to go in the works: Assembly considers retail beer sales from brew pubs." *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* [Atlanta, GA] 27 Feb. 2013: D2.

Infotrac Newsstand. Web. 16 Mar. 2015.

Westerman, Marty. "Brewing a new three-tier system." *Modern Brewery Age* 11 Mar. 1991: S32+.

General OneFile. Web 16, Mar. 2015.

Williams, Sean. "*When It Comes to Beer, Americans Prefer This Brand Above All Others.*" The Motley Fool.

Fool.com, 14 Mar. 2015. Web. 15 Mar. 2015.