

REPORT OF THE OVERSEAS EXAMINER

1. I am very unimpressed that it took 14 weeks (3 1/2 months) for the overseas examiners report to make it's way to me after my submission. The examiner provides some evidence that they made it to the end of Chapter 2 of a 5 Chapter thesis and one or two quotes picked out of the last Chapter.

2. The examiner states that there are 'three main issues'.

2a) The first issue is that I do not define 'discrimination'.

The examiner notes that 'discrimination is typically considered immoral if it tracks a non-relevant characteristic'. In response I say: Yes, it is this common-sense notion that I am working with, so I don't need to define it.

2b) The examiner states that there are a number of unsupported empirical claims (mostly in Chapter 2).

The thesis is a philosophy thesis (conceptual rather than empirical focus). There are a number of unsupported empirical claims in Chapter 2 – but there are a number of supported empirical claims in Chapter 2 as well and this Chapter is (in fact) one of the most heavily referenced Chapters.

In response to the examples the examiner points out:

- The first is an assumption of economic theory (finite resources thus competition)
- The second is a fact about the student accommodation high rises that have gone up in Auckland in recent years – I don't believe anyone would question it
- NZ has in fact less legislation than other nations (see the reference I provided on how NZ is the best place in the world to do business (at the expense of the socio-political development of it's peoples).

Even if these particular instances turn out to be false (and they are mixture of common-knowledge and conceptual claim) it wouldn't undermine the Chapter. There are plenty of very well referenced claims in this Chapter. It is good enough.

2c) The examiner states that the final major issue is that I am not charitable.

The examiner does not provide an example of what charity would look like, however, so the objection is merely an assertion / calling of names.

The examiner accuses me of false-dichotomy style of argument.

- The first of these I am not offering an argument. I am offering an empirical claim of how people who are in fact on welfare need to borrow money from the government in order to purchase things like necessary household items and that the government will only allow the people on welfare to buy the cheapest possible option, oftentimes. It is an empirical fact that people on welfare are forced to buy the cheapest possible vacuum cleaner and pot set and so on. This is common knowledge. It is common knowledge NZ is the end of the shipping supply chain.

- The second is based on how the rest of the developed world accepts the relationship between lack of anti-biotic intervention and rheumatic fever. Only in NZ is there a serious effort to publish things to the effect that we should withhold anti-biotics from some peoples (typically poor and / or Maaori) in order to see what happens (e.g., due to an apparent 'over-prescription'). It is common-knowledge that much research in NZ is observational (of the 'do not treat' variety). NZ is renowned for the 'Dunedin Study' which is several generations of observation with no intervention.

- There is a failure to understand what I was doing with the immunisation section. I was clear that the NZ government thought that higher rates of immunisation for Maaori was an example of equity for... Some unspecified party. I was arguing against this line was all.

- The statistics on vaccination rates does not track information on informed consent because 100 per cent of people may have made an informed decision about whether or

not to have their child immunised, but only 50 per cent of the children may be immunised. This is because people can make an informed consent decision NOT to have their child immunised. Similarly, people may be bullied into having their children immunised either by withholding the relevant information from them or by putting undue pressure on them to have their child immunised (e.g., by withholding family benefit payments or refusing to enrol their child in school while making school attendance a legal requirement).

The examiner states there are typos etc but unfortunately does not take the time to identify them to help me fix them up.

REPORT OF THE NEW ZEALAND EXAMINER:

The examiner seems more interested in getting me to supply the University of Waikato with another 6 months worth of fees payment than anything else. The grounds for my effectively being failed for half a years worth of work strike me as very thin, indeed. While I understand the examiner would prefer me to dump part of the thesis and to write new sections of the thesis this would be making a different (and not necessarily better) thesis than the one that I have in fact written.

The examiner accused me of not referencing enough – but again picks out the Chapter that is the most heavily referenced Chapter. Both examiners seem to be having the most difficulty coming to terms with the Chapter on Inequality that has been extensively written about (and referenced, by me) with respect to the World Health Organisation Reports, New Zealand Government Reports (e.g., by Stats NZ, e.g., by information about how much people are paid in NZ), by 2 edited collections on inequality and health that have been published in NZ in recent years. This work isn't science where I have 3 or 4 references at the end of every sentence. I have over 70 references. This project is a 120 point project that represents 1 years worth of work. There is no reason why I should be required to write a whole thesis to argue for Chapter 2 when the sources I do in fact reference all come to similar conclusions that I do.

The examiner accuses me of trying to do a very technical style of analytic philosophy that employs a certain style of argumentation – and doing it badly. This is not that kind of a thesis, however.

The thesis is more in the spirit of Socrates who was a critic and conscience of society (particularly with respect to sophistry). It is my understanding that philosophical research of precisely this variety is what distinguishes an academic university from a teaching focused community college. It would be disingenuous to disallow this style of philosophy in academic research.

In other words, it is important to see that I am telling a story or painting a picture more than attempting to argue (and arguing badly).

I am not arguing for anything in particular about immunisation rates. I am only arguing that presently the NZ Ministry of health considers higher rates of immunisation for Maaori to be something that is equitable. I pointed out that it is really unclear (I can not see) how it is that higher rates of immunisation for Maaori would be something that was more equitable for Maaori. That was all. It seems much more likely to profit non-Maaori at their expense.

I will fix up the typos as best I can...

I have spent more than 27 weeks working on this project, already. Under the guidance of my supervisor. I have done everything she asked me to do (except not submitted late).

Examiners reports took more than 3 months to come back to me and the SGR still hasn't informed me that my thesis has been accepted (subject to minor alterations).

If there was going to be more time for me to make more substantive revisions in light of the examiners reports then either:

a) It would have needed to have been submitted in softcopy in August (but my supervisor did not want it to be submitted in time enough for me to make major alterations in response to examiners reports) and / or

b) Examiners need to be faster with the amount of time they take to get their reports back to candidates.

Honours year is 27 teaching and study weeks. The examination (often external) is only 1 months (4 weeks).

This is a 120 point program of study just the same as honours.

I am sad that people didn't help me more with fixing up my typos (given that I spend several hundreds of dollars printing off however many paper copies nobody bothered to circle all typos they found as they were reading and nobody bothered to ship these items back to me).

This is my 2018 years worth of work. I have other things to be getting on with in 2019.

The MPhil was not supposed to be a summer school enrolment program (at either end).

Enrolment was supposed to happen within 1 month (and there was no reason why it could not have been expediated instead of delayed until May).

I will submit the hardcopy in a few weeks.

I don't believe it is at all reasonable to have expected anything more of me.

There is no reason, at all, why Waikato people could not have worked to December 7th deadline – as I planned for all year. I am very angry that Waikato people tried to stabotage me (waste a whole other year of my time) when I was honest with Waikato people (instead of starting out pretending to do a PhD, taking the scholarship money, then stealth submitting an MPhil). I didn't waste your time – please don't waste mine.
Kelly Roe.