End the Nanny State to win

Telling people what to do is not good politics or good policy, says Christian Kerr.

Abbott is at an advantage. He has already shored up his own base with his opposition to the carbon tax, while Labor’s primary vote seems stuck in the high 20s. He could cement his grip on disgruntled Labor voters with a clear-cut commitment to getting government out of the faces—and pockets—of voters by dismantling the wasteful, moralising and ultimately socially divisive apparatus of the Nanny State.

The man in charge of Coalition policy has already identified it as an issue.

Andrew Robb is doing more than assembling a platform. He is attempting to foster a philosophy that will serve as both a unifying force and a source of discipline for the Liberals, while also having clear electoral appeal.

‘We have reached a point in Australian governance where philosophy really does matter,’ Robb says.

He believes that instead of little separating the two sides of politics, there are fundamental differences between the Coalition and the ALP. ‘It is the difference between a Nanny State “government knows best” approach compared with the personal dignity and control that comes from the freedom to make your own choices while taking responsibility for those choices,’ Robb explains.

Under the respective leaderships of Rudd and Gillard we have seen the greatest growth of government in our lives, notwithstanding the chaotic Whitlam years.’

He cites the re-regulation of the labour market, the renationalisation of telecommunications under the NBN and the overnight shutting-down of the live cattle export trade by ministerial fiat, despite its implications for northern communities and relations with Indonesia.

Robb points to the now-abandoned internet filtering plans, the original resources super-profits tax—the failed attempt to nationalise 40 per cent of the mining industry—and the carbon tax, which he slams as ‘the highest taxing, most bureaucratic and interventionist model imaginable,’ coming ‘at the worst possible time for industry and jobs.

To complement his policy work Robb has formulated four key principles he believes reflect the Coalition’s core values, but also serve to illustrate the fundamental differences with the government ‘regardless of who is leading it’.

The principles are living within our means, reversing the Nanny State, backing our strengths, and restoring a sense of personal responsibility.

‘It is true that in isolation these sound like little more than slogans, ’ Robb admits, ‘but in combination they present a powerful set of markers, the ballast of which guide the direction a Coalition government would take the country.’

‘They reflect our policy priorities of reducing and removing taxes, debt and deficit and unwinding the welter of red tape and regulation which is the product of big government.

‘We want to back people, businesses and organisations to get on with what they do best, without
the reach of government constantly interfering in their concerns.’

In an opinion piece in *The Australian* late last year where he first publicly aired his four principles, Robb offered a broad definition of the Nanny State.

He called reversing its grip a ‘philosophical shift from “government knows best” to one where government involvement in business and people’s lives is minimised.’

Robb said, ‘Getting rid of productivity-sapping reporting requirements across sectors, adding flexibility to the labour market and providing greater autonomy are all powerful ways of reversing government’s reach.’

He is right, but a focus on the more traditional interpretation of the Nanny State is a smart political strategy to give the Coalition a boost.

Not only will it help attract and hold the blue collar, traditionally Labor-voting demographic that is disillusioned with the ALP such a strategy may also help broaden and extend the group.

It only rated a brief mention at the start of the 2010 Victorian state election campaign, but a leaked Labor strategy document revealed fears the party was vulnerable to a backlash on Nanny State issues.

‘White males aged between 30 and 50’, along with farmers and regional city residents—the voters who so unexpectedly tipped Jeff Kennett out in 1999—were angry at speed camera fines and a perception that they lived under excessive government regulation.

Galaxy polling taken for the Institute of Public Affairs last year found a majority of Australians—55 per cent—believe the country is becoming a Nanny State with too much government intervention and control of people’s day to day lives. The figure was unchanged from 18 months before, when the question had last been asked.

What had changed, however, was the vehemence with which voters agreed with the proposition. ‘In the latest study, 29 per cent strongly agreed that Australia is becoming a Nanny State, up from 24 per cent last year,’ Galaxy reported.

The increase appeared to reflect policy debates over tobacco plain packaging, alcopops and plain packaging, alcopops and

**YET THE COALITION HAS IGNORED THESE PUBLIC CONCERNS. IT HAS BEEN SILENT, OR WORSE, ACQUIESCENT, ON NANNY STATE POLICY**

The Coalition has been silent on Nanny State policy. The Ipsos research found that 26 per cent agreed that the country is becoming a Nanny State, up from 24 per cent last year.

Yet other than Robb’s broad remarks—governments should get involved in reducing consumption of cigarettes, little different to fast food (68 per cent) and alcohol (74 per cent)—the Coalition has been silent overall. Labor-voting demographic that is disillusioned with the ALP such a strategy may also help broaden and extend the group.

It only rated a brief mention at the start of the 2010 Victorian state election campaign, but a leaked Labor strategy document revealed fears the party was vulnerable to a backlash on Nanny State issues.

‘White males aged between 30 and 50’, along with farmers and regional city residents—the voters who so unexpectedly tipped Jeff Kennett out in 1999—were angry at speed camera fines and a perception that they lived under excessive government regulation.

Galaxy polling taken for the Institute of Public Affairs last year found a majority of Australians—55 per cent—believe the country is becoming a Nanny State with too much government intervention and control of people’s day to day lives. The figure was unchanged from 18 months before, when the question had last been asked.

What had changed, however, was the vehemence with which voters agreed with the proposition. ‘In the latest study, 29 per cent strongly agreed that Australia is becoming a Nanny State, up from 24 per cent last year,’ Galaxy reported.

The increase appeared to reflect policy debates over tobacco plain packaging, alcopops and

**ESSENTIAL HAVE OBVIOUSLY FORGOTTEN MARY POPPINS—LITERALLY—SORAOED ABOVE HORSES OF FAR MORE ORDINARY NANNIES. SHE WAS THE EXCEPTION**

Mary Poppins, Photo by Jef Kratschel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NANNY STATE PROPOSED PLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Plain packaging of tobacco products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Alcopops tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ A license to smoke?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Mandatory pre-commitment for electronic gaming machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Banning solariums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END THE NANNY STATE TO WIN**

- Mandatory pre-commitment
- Plain packaging of tobacco
- Alcopops tax
- A license to smoke?
- Plain packaging of tobacco products from 2014.
- Other states, NSW has banned all tanning units from 2014.

The federal government fears that colours and symbols on cigarette packets are so powerful that individuals cannot resist them. So they will be banned.

The Ipsos research found that 26 per cent agreed that the country is becoming a Nanny State, up from 24 per cent last year.

In a move that may be followed by other states, NSW has banned all tanning units from 2014.

In a move that may be followed by other states, NSW has banned all tanning units from 2014.

It has been late recognising the free speech implications of the Andrew Bolt case and insufficiently strident on the threats to media freedom contained in the Finkelstein report.

‘These findings expose the disconnect between the Nanny State rhetoric and the attitudes of the public whose activities are being regulated,’ Essential claimed.

They saw a conspiracy of ‘business and industry lobby groups who oppose public health and safety measures on commercial groups but invoke the “nanny” as a rhetorical device’ and ‘right-wing think tanks.’

Essential insisted ‘At the end of the day, most of us quite like the idea of a nanny—someone to anticipate danger and intervene if we are walking into it...wet much rather have Mary Poppins than Lord of the Flies.’

Essential have obviously forgotten Mary Poppins—literally—soared above horses of far more ordinary nannies. She was the exception.

The question they asked their sample groups was neutral, as politicians’ questions should be, but was probably too sweeping and general. And their findings contradicted international Ipsos research released weeks earlier that showed one in two Australians rejected the idea that governments should get involved in what they choose to eat.

That found 57 per cent of Australians opposed a fat tax to fight obesity and 41 per cent said governments should not get involved in people’s decisions to smoke.

The Ipsos research pointed to a possible cultural element to Australians’ attitudes, politicians should note. It found that citizens of countries with less easy-going mores, such as Japan, South Korea, Saudi Arabia and China, tended to be more likely to support bans on smoking and unhealthy food.

This explains other studies that reflect the Ipsos rather than the Essential findings.

Liquor industry research that leaked in the wake of the release of the National Preventative Health Taskforce report—the report that recommended, in all seriousness, the creation of a body called the National Prevention Agency—in 2009 found that Australians were overwhelmingly opposed to government plans to tell them to drink and smoke less and cut down on junk food.

Monitoring of calls to talkback radio, letters to the editor and comments on news websites shows ordinary people reacted overwhelmingly against the taskforce’s recommendations.

Seventy-seven per cent of recorded comments were negative. Further quantitative research found 60 per cent of Australians regarded the report’s recommendations as attacks on their lifestyles, civil liberties, and the way they operated businesses—while 57 per cent were concerned about its implications for social engineering.

Fifty-four per cent of respondents said there were problems with obesity, smoking and alcohol, but added ‘this report is not about targeting them’. Instead, more than half were concerned that the report...
was a political document ‘intent on overturning much of the way we choose to live.’

At the time, a prominent social trends researcher revealed the government was taking the wrong approach. ‘Anything that can be seen as a criticism of people’s own behaviour is immediately discounted and responded to quite angrily,’ Neer Korn said.

‘The idea of the Nanny State really hits home with people,’ he continued. ‘People just don’t want outsiders to interfere, particularly government or corporations, in their own private lives. They’re very sensitive. You can’t tell people anything negative.’

He warned campaigns designed to stamp out smoking, drinking, obesity and smoking were not going to work, calling for an end to Nanny State efforts that ‘generate widespread community hostility and seek to control the bulk of moderate consumers of alcohol as if they were people with significant alcohol problems.’

He pointed out ridicule heaped on draft guidelines issued by the National Health and Medical Research Council in 2008, which said that more than four standard drinks a day constituted a binge.

‘There are alternatives available which treat people as citizens capable of changing behaviour without draconian regulation and punitive taxation,’ Turnbull said.

‘We’re not going to solve social problems purely and simply by regulating them out of existence,’ he continued. ‘It’s no good telling people this is the wrong thing to do. Long-term solutions are about building social capital and people’s own capacity to change.’

He cited research into a Howard government campaign on youth drinking that showed young people vomiting and falling about. ‘A significant response was “that’s like the sort of thing, like, part of the territory,”’ he said.

Yet the Commonwealth Department of Health alone spent just under $40 million last financial year attempting to change our behaviour. The day in early March when the first report came through in Geneva that an official objection was about to be lodged in the World Trade Organisation against the new tobacco plain packaging regime, health spokesman Peter Dutton had appeared not just meek, but weak.

‘There is a tacit admission in the Commonwealth’s lack of a response that they never bothered to tackle the bossy-boots in the Howard years. But the Howard years are gone. The Coalition has to set new directions—and find major savings.

‘To put this amount into perspective,’ Novak observes, ‘there is about that is still Australian response of “Fair go, mate”—meaning “You’re joking,” “Come off it” or “Leave it alone!”

That is how we respond to the Nanny State. The Coalition can win the workers if it captures this mood.

But the Howard years are gone. The Coalition has to set new directions—and find major savings.

They may want to avoid talking specifics at the moment, but they cannot stay silent on the principles.

Robb’s work is an excellent starting point. So is legal affairs spokesman George Brandis’ awakening to the implications of the