

Comments on the February 2019 revisions to Chapter 2

Responses to the examiners' feedback:

The changes you have made to this chapter are good but very minor relative to what the examiners ask you to do.

Yeah. This is because the examiners (1, particularly) do not accept the paradigm that I am working within. I am not going to change paradigms for them. I am not going to justify the paradigm that I am working within, either. It is so, supremely, unfortunate that instead of giving my thesis to someone broadly sympathetic to the paradigm (e.g., Kelsey or Rashbrooke) you decided to give it to someone who isn't broadly sympathetic, at all. This is where academic freedom kicks in.

I ran out of oomph towards the end of the chapter, because I seemed to be just repeating what Ex 1 said, which seems pointless – the chapter is substantially unchanged, and my feedback would be more useful later, after you've had a proper go at incorporating and responding to the examiners' feedback. Comments below, but they are not exhaustive: I think Ex 1's detailed feedback on 2.4 is right, and that you should work your way through rewriting in response to it.

- Beginning of chapter: suggest you consider Ex 1's suggestion that you start the chapter by discussing the relationship between equity and equality and why that relationship matters to the thesis, and then using that to guide the reader through the chapter. (Ex1 gives you a second option here, but this one seems to me the easier one to implement, and I think it would genuinely help with comprehension of what you're doing.) They do say these are only suggestions, so you can ignore them if you want, but I think it would be good to give the reader a better sense of what this chapter is doing and where it's going. The public health stuff in the last chapter now introduces inequality. At the start of this chapter I have added: 'In the last chapter we saw how a strand of public health recognised the socioeconomic gradient to health (that the worse health was associated with less wealth). In this chapter I will consider inequality between countries, and inequality within the country of New Zealand'.
- Ex 1's comment about selectiveness about sources: they are right, as you acknowledged in the document you sent me earlier, that you are being selective.
Did I? I don't remember. I don't think it is an issue of bias. I cannot reference what is not there and these issues have not been part of mainstream NZ agenda, especially under the more recent reign of the National Government where property prices were driven up for investors.
References for this chapter include:
The World Bank
The Commission on Social Determinants of Health Report
Kelsey
Rashbrooke
World Health Organisation regional Office for Europe
Bierre and Cunningham
Howen-Chapman, Bierre and Cunningham
Grant Thornton NZ Ltd
Haworth
Gould
Macfie
Akoorie and Wiggins

Taylor
State Services Commission
Signal Martin Cram and Robson
Register of Pecuniary and Other Specified Interests of Parliament
Hargreaves
Iles
Mila
Howden-Chapman and Bierre
Brawley
Matheson and Dew
Schmets Rajan and Kadandale

So it is not *just* Rashbrooke.

The Rashbrooke references are also references to an *Edited Collection* where he is summarising / incorporating a range of sources.

So it isn't just his opinion, either.

It is a statement about (the lack of) academic freedom that I need to turn to sources such as him (journalists) for a discussion of things that have been obvious to the UN and the WHO for quite some time. Kelsey is helpful because she is a well-respected law scholar who has also been banging on about such things for some time, now. Phillipa Howden-Chapman on ill health and housing in inequality / inequity.

- You gave a justification of it in those comments, but you haven't included it here. At the very least you should do that. [Though I'm not sure that will be enough – I don't see why it's okay to present only a biased selection of the evidence and of the available interpretations of the evidence, even if you're painting a picture rather than giving an argument – you still need your reader to think the picture is accurate. In other words, why does such a partial view tell us anything that we need to pay attention to?
- I don't think I am presenting a view that is either biased or partial. What is this extensive literature saying something opposite that you think I am missing? The 'we don't know how lucky we are we are doing so much better than Tonga' literature??
- You can see how considering both sides of a question and then saying why you are choosing one of them rather than the other is going to bring your readers along with you more successfully than just asserting a bunch of stuff. Adding Kelsey helps a bit, but not a lot, since it just adds weight of numbers given that her view is the same as Rashbrooke's.]
- I don't know why you say that Kelsey's view is the same as Rashbrooke's. Rashbrooke doesn't have anything to say about insurance or legislation. Kelsey does.
- DONE P28: I think you've fixed the problem with the Rashbrooke quote/paraphrase.
- The bit before that: you have improved the "Sometimes people try to obscure things..." line, but I think you should cut that sentence out altogether (why *would* anyone say that generations of further research need to be done? To justify the inter-generational research study that Dunedin is world-famous for. I have a reference to a recent article on narratives and also refer back to precisely this later in the Chapter.
- It seems a really stupid thing to say, so if you can't find anyone saying it, leave it out! It reads like gratuitous snarkiness.) Instead, just "It seems intuitively obvious that poor health and poverty are mutually reinforcing." And then on to the Rashbrooke quote. There are references to these kinds of studies later the chapter (e.g., measuring mould and asthma). There are still numerous studies one on the relationship between poor quality housing and

various health conditions (where those studies involve observing - and not at all intervening – on the appalling conditions that were fairly obviously unhealthy to all concerned from the get-go. There is also much trying to obscure relationships in public health. People have vested interests in trying to obscure relationships between things like smoking or vape-ing and poor health (for sales); exposure to unhealthy working environments (e.g., road tar or asbestos or benzene rings or coal dust); exposure to unhealthy substances (e.g., found in cheap foods and cosmetics and toiletries); and unhealthy homes (for increased rental prices). I think it is rather polite of me not to name studies, and not to name names. I have similarly tried not to name particular people (or much in the way of particular positions) when we look at where all the money goes (so there isn't enough money left for concrete interventions / heat pumps / doctors / medical treatments and the like).

- P30: “It is rather surprisingly common...”: Ex 1 asks for evidence/references – it would be good to provide some. Reference provided.
- FIXED (genuine mistake – good find) P32: As Ex 1 says, no reference is given for the quote that begins “[A]ppalling rates...”
- 2.2. Future inequality. Ex 1 asks you to explain why you're talking about this. You haven't added anything in response. This is another instance of the general thought that it would be good if this chapter had a clearer trajectory. The clear trajectory is found in the toc. There is inequality. The inequality is increasing. Inequalities that extreme (where some have significantly more than what they need and use that as leverage to make even more and more and more while others don't have the basic things they need – is unjust / inequitable. Then moving into equity and equity group targets).
- “If people only want to take on high level positions in our government, universities, and hospitals because of the remuneration - or, what the job can do for them - then they probably are not the best people for those jobs. It is implausible to think that, in the majority of cases, the people filling those positions are taking personal financial hits to fill those positions. It is far more plausible to think that, in the majority of cases, these individuals are simply pursuing the best financial package they can, for themselves, which (given current pay structures) has them placed in the positions they are in. If politicians were paid less, for example, then we would have the opportunity to see more people take those roles who are interested in them not for what the roles can do for them, but more for what they can do for those roles. Providing a financial incentive for those roles is the most effective way of crowding out people who aren't driven by financial remuneration.”
You haven't changed this paragraph, despite problems pointed out by Ex 1 and in some cases earlier by me. Re sentence 1: seems plausible that if the remuneration is *all* they're interested in, they're not the best person for the job. But nothing follows – especially, it doesn't follow that good people for the job won't be *at all* interested in remuneration.

Second sentence: why is this relevant? (I commented on this back in the draft stage.) Third sentence: evidence for this? It doesn't seem particularly plausible to me. Last sentence: evidence? It doesn't seem plausible to me. See Ex1's comments about unsupported claims. I think the false dichotomy they are referring to may be the assumption that people are either entirely driven by remuneration or entirely driven by desire to do good.

Okay, the above two. Firstly, I am not offering an argument. I do not claim that the sentences follow one after the other in a logical succession. My idea, here, is that it is rather common to hear that the reason why our top government chief executives need to earn so very very very very much is because if they did not earn so very very very very very much

they would be off to the private sector where they would be earning that amount. My claim is that it is implausible that they would earn that much in the private sector. Some people do earn that much in the private sector, but not typically the people who would work in the public sector. It isn't about the money. There are people in the private sector (e.g., Taylor) who I quoted who take pay caps – until everyone in the company is earning more of an approximation of a living wage than many people do in the public sector. The public sector employees often do not have private sector alternatives. They are in the public sector... Pursuing the best financial package they can for themselves.

- Pp40-41: I agree with Ex1 (and have said before) that it isn't obvious why the latter two meanings of equity are relevant – I think you could omit them from the whole thesis without loss, but if you don't want to, then I think you should make something of them. Yes. I see this. I will try and make more of them in Chapter 5. And that you should make more (perhaps at the beginning of this chapter) of the notion of equity that is relevant. The other notions are relevant for Chapter 5, particularly.
- P41: "There is an extensive literature..." – I agree with Ex1 that if you're going to say this, you need to cite some of it. But you could try rephrasing it away. Likewise "It is often described." 'The first notion of equity as fairness or justice is a topic within moral and political philosophy...' I mean, there are shelves of books on it. Or there used to be when there were books on library shelves.
- "This is something that appears to be lacking in many people. If people think they can get away with taking more than their fair share they think they would be foolish for passing up the opportunity."
I don't think your fix here does enough – it remains an unsubstantiated claim. I said about the undergrads... How many of them thought to abuse the ring of Gyges. There it was apparently anecdote that did no work. Now you want evidence for same.
- Suggest omit the law and financial contexts, or reference them as suggested by Ex1.
- 2.4. I think this is the biggest problem - lots of emotive language and insinuation, not much in the way of reasons to believe what you say – see Ex 's comments about unsupported claims. I don't think your added bit on pp44-45 "I am not making a factual claim..." helps much. If you don't have a factual claim to make, why are you talking about MPs at all? "We are not told..." suggests that something important is being concealed from us, but what reason is there to think so? This is what Ex 1 means by "argument by insinuation". The parallel added bit on p46 seems to me to work better, because that section is less emotive. Try to write more like a researcher and less like a polemicist, is part of what Ex 1 is getting at. 'Argument by insinuation' I see... I do not see how this is being at all charitable to me. I claim an association – without committing to a mechanism. One thing philosophy teaches people to do is to ask questions. Part of academic freedom is the freedom to ask questions. I am not insinuating anything. That is (as examiner one would like to say) in the examiners imagination.
- DONE You've dealt with Ex 2's comments on p47.
- Ex 2's comment on p52 (now 51), which is also made by Ex 1, has not been dealt with.
- DONE P46: If Karlo is her first name, say "Karlo Mila" instead, as suggested by Ex1.
- P53: "In NZ we may wonder..." – unless you have some evidence that Maori and PI have been targeted in this way," you should leave this out. I can't see how it begins to be okay to

insinuate things like this without providing any evidence. Again, it's a question. I am asking a question. We like to do experiments on poor people. On poor people's houses. On poor people's working conditions. We like to tell poor people that their data is being collected and what we are going to do with it (e.g., that housing needs assessments collected by Dunedin WINZ will be given to researchers from the University of Otago – not informed consent. Just informing the poor people about what will happen with their data if they like it or not. This is all common-sense daily experience for many New Zealanders.

Typo:

P36: delete apostrophe from "New Zealander's". I can't find this, now.

I have deleted the paragraph on tourists and toned down some of the questions asked in the last section.