

Essay: Should the state intervene to change health-related behaviours?

The Covid-19 lockdown was an extreme case of state intervention, and many critics argued that governments were **infringing upon** individual liberties. The state enforces rules and aims to protect its population. Its intervention is often necessary to maintain order and security. But how far should it intervene?

The state needs to intervene in public health. **The welfare states** that developed after WWII embody this ideal of protecting the most vulnerable. This is when public, universal health coverage was developed, guaranteeing healthcare for all. This is a noble vision of the state's role and should be **embraced**. The welfare state alleviates issues linked to poverty. Its intervention against **harmful** behaviours such as smoking, drinking, and excessive sugar **consumption** is necessary to ensure public health, as the risks are too significant for society.

Yet excessive intervention can encroach on individual liberties. China restricts video games for children, and New Zealand banned cigarettes (even though the policy has since been rolled back). While both governments aim to protect their population, limits should be set with public consent, or people may feel oppressed and adopt **harmful habits** anyway. **The Prohibition** clearly illustrates that when the state exerts too much control, it is ineffective. In such cases, **awareness campaigns** may be more effective.

To conclude, while the state must intervene to protect public health, lifestyles and consumer habits may not fall into that category. Having public support is of paramount importance. 236 words

Essay: Should the state intervene to change health-related behaviours?

The Covid-19 lockdown was an extreme case of state intervention, and many critics argued that governments were **infringing upon** individual liberties. The state enforces rules and aims to protect its population. Its intervention is often necessary to maintain order and security. But how far should it intervene?

The state needs to intervene in public health. **The welfare states** that developed after WWII embody this ideal of protecting the most vulnerable. This is when public, universal health coverage was developed, guaranteeing healthcare for all. This is a noble vision of the state's role and should be **embraced**. The welfare state alleviates issues linked to poverty. Its intervention against **harmful** behaviours such as smoking, drinking, and excessive sugar **consumption** is necessary to ensure public health, as the risks are too significant for society.

Yet excessive intervention can encroach on individual liberties. China restricts video games for children, and New Zealand banned cigarettes (even though the policy has since been rolled back). While both governments aim to protect their population, limits should be set with public consent, or people may feel oppressed and adopt **harmful habits** anyway. **The Prohibition** clearly illustrates that when the state exerts too much control, it is ineffective. In such cases, **awareness campaigns** may be more effective.

To conclude, while the state must intervene to protect public health, lifestyles and consumer habits may not fall into that category. Having public support is of paramount importance. 236 words