

This Note seeks to explain the significance of *Sorrell* and evaluate its effect on the future of the commercial speech doctrine. Part I explores the winding and shaky history of commercial speech law in First Amendment jurisprudence, culminating in an evaluative test that has proven difficult to apply. Problems with the test have produced inconsistent holdings not only across the district and circuit courts, but also within the Supreme Court's own case law. The first Part of this Note examines those inconsistencies and highlights one facet of the test with which courts have had particular trouble. Part II describes the circuit split resulting from *Pitt News* and *Swecker* in order to illustrate the areas of *Central Hudson* that are sufficiently vague and unworkable to permit inconsistent holdings. Part III introduces and explains *Sorrell*, making careful note of the take-away lessons relevant to the commercial speech doctrine. Part IV applies the lessons from *Sorrell* to the alcohol advertisement bans in order to see the new rules in practice. Finally, this note concludes in Part V by taking stock of the newest developments in the commercial speech doctrine and highlighting the ends left loose by *Sorrell*.