



## Health Nazis Are on the Warpath — but Some Vices Are More Equal Than Others

“Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive,” philosopher C.S. Lewis famously wrote. “It would be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies.”

Our busybodies are neither omnipotent nor moral, though they crave to be the former and fancy themselves the latter. But they sure do want to control us — for our own good, of course.

Though this phenomenon is confined to the West, it is West-wide because, as the Africans might say, at issue are “First World problems.” And the latest example is a story out of Britain titled “An alcohol ban is beginning to look inevitable.”

“Did anyone really think that the health police would be happy when smoking shrank to a few per cent of the population and a UK government promised to ban it for future generations altogether?” [asks Telegraph](#) writer Ross Clark. “Just try typing the phrase ‘worse than smoking’ into Google and you can see that the bandwagon has moved on. Now it is anything from processed foods to sunbeds to loneliness to the mere act of sitting down.”

Clark then warns of a new anti-alcohol activism, though the strategy its advocates employ has been applied to other man-on-the-street “vices” as well, from sodas to french fries.

The new busybodies, Clark points out, are not at all like the old temperance-movement types — the latter wore their banners openly. Rather, the new teetotalers use deception to get their way.

“It is possible that you visited a pub or restaurant in the summer of 2022 and tried to order a large glass of wine - an order rebuffed by the waiting staff who told you that only small and medium glasses were now on offer,” Clark writes. “If you did, it has now become clear that you were a human guinea pig in a University of Cambridge study to see whether we could be enticed into drinking less by being deprived of large measures.”

The study involved 21 pubs and bars, all of which nixed their large glasses of wine. As for the result, “The research, published in *Plos Medicine*, found that removing large wine glasses led to a drop in the amount of wine sold at pubs and bars of just under 8% on average,” [reports The Guardian](#).

“Taking into consideration factors such as day of the week and total revenue, taking away big glasses led to an average decrease of 420ml of wine sold per day per venue.”

Researchers “said this finding meant people could be ‘nudged’ into drinking less, which could have a positive effect on their bodies,” *The Guardian* also informed. “Furthermore, the study found no evidence



Diy13/iStock/Getty Images Plus



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 20, 2024

---

that people would make up for it by buying more beer or cider.”

“People tend to consume a specific number of units — in this case glasses — regardless of portion size,” the paper quotes study co-author Dr. Eleni Mantzari, from the University of Cambridge, as saying.

Yet there “is another possible explanation,” Clark asserts: “that customers couldn’t be doing [business] with an establishment which wasn’t satisfying them with what they wanted — and took their custom elsewhere.” But here’s what really irks Clark:

“Researchers found no evidence the move affected total profits, suggesting pubs and bars did not need to worry about losing money,” *The Guardian* further relates. “This was perhaps due to the higher profit margins of smaller serving sizes of wine, the experts suggested.”

Clark then writes:

That is the nanny state for you in a nutshell. It is an unholy alliance between idealists and graspers. What restaurant wouldn’t want to sell us less wine for the same money if it thought it could get away with it? It is the same with moves to cut portion sizes, banning “two for one” deals, “king size” chocolate bars and so on. It is all supposed to stop us over-indulging — but it just so happens that it also gives the food and drink industry an opportunity to squeeze a bit more profit out of us.

This is precisely why many cringe when they hear a Michelle Obama or Michael Bloomberg inveigh against portion sizes or salt intake: They know our food is about to be reduced in volume and value and become less tasty.

Remember McDonald’s supersize fries and drinks? They were phased out in 2004 in a climate of bad press over allegedly harming people’s health; the company was even subject to a supersizing lawsuit “brought on behalf of two obese children,” [reported](#) NPR in 2005.

But was McDonald’s complaining? “Supersized fries and drinks weren’t making them as much money as they hoped,” [wrote](#) *Reader’s Digest* in 2021. It’s a good bet they prefer selling the smaller portions.

Of course, you wouldn’t expect corporations to *really* care about our health. But is the government any different?

If our busybodies really worry so much about obesity and alcohol consumption, why during Covid did they try to keep people indoors and shutter gyms — while allowing liquor stores to remain open?

Moreover, if they really worried so much about Covid, why did Dr. Anthony Fauci first say he didn’t think people “should ever shake hands ever again,” but [a week later state](#) that it was okay to have sex with a stranger you meet via a dating app if “you’re willing to take a risk”?

And why is tobacco use framed as a dirty, disgusting habit while smoking pot is almost portrayed as an enlightened act worthy of a desert mystic?

Clearly, some vices are more equal than others. Rising above any vice, however, is the danger of a nanny state’s advice.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.