Equality a moral realistic view

©1998 Copyright S. F. Hartkamp
Lutkenieuwstraatje 34-36
9712 AZ Groningen
email: hartkamp@inn.nl

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the author.

CIP-GEGEVENS KONINKLIJKE BIBLIOTHEEK, DEN HAAG
Hartkamp, Steven Frederik

Equality; a realistic view. Towards a simple measure of inequality.
Thesis Groningen. - Includes bibliography - Includes index - Includes Dutch summary
ISBN 90-9012254-0
NUGI 611

Cover: Rum, Scotland, 1996
Photography by G.C. Verduyn
Printed by Krips b.v., Meppel

RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT GRONINGEN

Equality; a moral realistic view
(Towards a simple measure of inequality)

Proefschrift
ter verkrijging van het doctoraat in de
Wijsbegeerte
aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
op gezag van de
Rector Magnificus, dr. D.F.J. Bosscher,
in het openbaar te verdedigen op
donderdag 15 april 1999
om 14.15 uur

door:
Steven Frederik Hartkamp
geboren op 4 april 1957
te Meppel

Promotores: Prof. dr. J.W. de Beus
Prof. dr. G.E. Lock

Contents

Acknowledgements ix
List of symbols xi

1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Purpose of the study 1
1.2 The traditional background assumptions of the modern political ideal of equality. 3
1.3 Overview 11

I A new framework for equality **15**

2 Moral universalism **17**
2.1 Introduction 17
2.2 Why moral universalism? 20
2.2.1 The use of moral universalism 20
2.2.2 Arguments for moral universalism, and moral particularism 31
2.3 Moral realism 36
2.3.1 Davidson's radical interpretation 36
2.3.2 The relation between moral beliefs and actions. . . . 38
2.3.3 Why follow particular moral reasons rather than prudential reasons? 42
2.3.4 Justification of moral beliefs 44
2.4 Moral realism, its particularism and equality 53
2.5 Summary 56
2.6 Appendix 1 59

3 Volitional individualism **63**
3.1 Introduction . . . 63
3.2 The problem of interpersonal comparisons . . . 65
3.2.1 Necessity of interpersonal comparisons . . . 65
3.2.2 Impossibility of interpersonal comparisons . . . 67
3.3 Necessity challenged . . . 70
3.3.1 External effects as reasons for redistribution . . . 70
3.3.2 Non-envy analysis . . . 74
3.4 Impossibility rejected; realistic individualism . . . 100
3.5 Summary . . . 105
3.6 Appendix 1 . . . 108
3.7 Appendix 2 . . . 110
3.8 Appendix 3 . . . 111
3.9 Appendix 4 . . . 112

4 Moral value monism **115**
4.1 Introduction . . . 115
4.2 Monism versus pluralism . . . 116
4.2.1 Reasons for value monism . . . 116
4.2.2 Reasons for moral pluralism . . . 126
4.3 Equalisanda instead of one equalisandum . . . 135
4.3.1 Subjective welfare as equalisandum . . . 136
4.3.2 Offensive and expensive tastes excluded by social ideals 137
4.3.3 Objective welfare as equalisandum . . . 139
4.3.4 Resources as equalisandum . . . 141
4.3.5 Access to advantages as equalisandum . . . 143
4.3.6 Equalisanda . . . 146
4.4 Summary . . . 151

5 The new framework and its criticisms **153**
5.1 Introduction . . . 153
5.2 Conservatism . . . 156
5.3 Imperialism . . . 163
5.4 Quasi-realism . . . 167
5.5 Disagreement . . . 173
5.6 Summary . . . 179

II Equality **181**

6 The meaning of the ideal of equality **183**
6.1 Introduction . . . 183
6.2 Arguments an ideal of equality has to answer . . . 185
6.3 The levelling down objection . . . 188
6.4 Person affectingness . . . 192
6.5 The meaning of equality . . . 197
6.6 The reference . . . 201
6.7 The other views revisited . . . 210
6.8 Summary . . . 211

7 Measures of inequality **213**
7.1 Introduction . . . 213
7.2 Lorenz dominance . . . 215
7.3 Incompleteness . . . 220
7.3.1 Extensions of Lorenz dominance . . . 221
7.3.2 Acceptance of incompleteness and its explanation . . . 228
7.4 Properties of Lorenz dominance revisited . . . 233
7.5 Properties of a measure of inequality . . . 237
7.6 Summary . . . 239
7.7 Appendix 1 . . . 242

8 A simple measure of inequality **243**
8.1 Introduction . . . 243
8.2 The construction of a simple measure . . . 245
8.2.1 The measure of equalisanda . . . 245
8.2.2 Independence . . . 247
8.2.3 Euclidean distance as basis . . . 254
8.3 The arguments for complexity revisited . . . 257
8.4 Specificity and aggregation . . . 261
8.5 Summary . . . 263
8.6 Appendix 1 . . . 266

III A practical consequence **269**

9 Equality of health **271**
9.1 Introduction 271
9.2 Macro level decisions 272
9.2.1 Socio-economic related differences in health 273
9.2.2 Choices in health care policies 279
9.3 Micro level decisions 280
9.3.1 Maximising qalys, hyes and lyars 282
9.3.2 Are qalys, hyes and lyars proper equalisanda? 285
9.4 Equality of health in medical practice 290
9.4.1 What if there is no cure? 292
9.4.2 The general practitioner in an egalitarian perspective 296
9.5 Summary 299

Bibliography 303
Index 319
Samenvatting I

Acknowledgements

Writing a thesis seems to be possible while accepting solipsism, however the fact is that it owes a lot to others and it shows that solipsism is false.

This thesis is the result of a research project which was initiated by the Department of Political Science of the Catholic University of Nijmegen on the measurement of inequality. I thank the members of the Department of Political Science for their hospitality.

I am indebted to all who made this thesis possible. In particular I am indebted to Trudy van Asperen, by whom my interest in moral philosophy was awakened by her way of teaching moral philosophy. It is sad that although I could show her the outline of the thesis, I could not show her the result because she unfortunately died in 1993.

I owe much to my two promotores, Grahame Lock who introduced me to the project and who let me work in freedom and Jos de Beus who helped me to look critically at my own ideas in a way that stimulated me to explain them in a more clear way. They did their best, the remaining mistakes in reasoning which will be discovered, are mine.

Also I owe much to Wim Fiévez with whom I followed the first courses in philosophy, he convinced me that Davidson's approach to language and interpretation could not be circumvented. In writing I was assisted by Frans Wiersma, who also accompanied my first courses in philosophy, he explained to me which rules for clear writing I have shown to have forgotten.

In writing this thesis I realised more and more that it was inspired by the people of Schiermonnikoog who trusted me to share their experiences on important aspects of their life, while I was working on their island as a general practitioner. Without them this thesis would have been different.

Finally, I thank my family and friends, especially my mother who let her son follow the courses in philosophy and supported it, and Ineke who bore the underestimated costs of enduring my involvation in the project and the restless and desperate attempts to deal with the unpredictable results of a laptop with a full harddisc with system failures.

Groningen, April 1998

List of symbols

The following list contains the most important symbols which are used in this study.

a, a^k,b: goods, distribuenda

a_i^k: a distribuendum of type a^k belonging to person i

$\vec{a}$, $\vec{a}^k$: an allocation $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_i, \ldots, a_n)$, or $(a_1^k, a_2^k, \ldots, a_i^k, \ldots, a_n^k)$, of the distribuendum a, or a^k, among persons $1, \ldots, n$

A, B: allocations of goods a^k, a^l etc., or b^k, b^l etc., among persons $1, \ldots, n$

$\sum A$: summation of the elements of the rows of the matrix matrix $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^k$

$\sum A \geq \sum B$: all the values of the summation of the elements of the rows of A are equal or greater than the values of the summation of the elements of the rows of B

α: descriptions of actions

C: conditions of situations

i, j: persons

$I()$: index representing the seriousness of inequality

l: the amount of leisure

$min\{\ ,\ \}$: the minimum of the set $\{\ ,\ \}$

$M()$: monotone increasing transformation function

$\vec{p}$: price vector, or probability vector[1]

[1] It will be clear from the context what is meant.

r_i: the amount of time spent by person i to work

$R_i(a_j)$: the amount of time needed for i to produce a_j

π: permutation of persons

$\vec{u}$: $(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$

$w_i()$: well-being of person i

$\frac{dw_i(a)}{da}$: derivative of w_i with respect to a, sometimes represented by $w'()$

$W()$: social welfare function

x, y: goods, equalisanda[2]

$\vec{x}$: an allocation $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_n)$ of equalisandum x among persons $1, \ldots, n$

x_{ref}: the allocation in which all persons are equally well off with respect to the equalisandum x due to a (re)distribution of the available distribuenda

$\succ$: better 'all things considered'

$\succ_I$: worse regarding inequality

$\succ_{LD}$: better regarding the Lorenzcurve, 'the Lorenzcurve lies above'

$\forall$: for all

$\exists$: there exists

$\wedge$: and

$\vee$: or/and

$\models$: is satisfied in those models in which the premises are satisfied

$\equiv$: material equivalence

[2]sometimes x and y represent a variable in logical formulas, for example in the appendix 1 of chapter 2. The context will make clear what is meant.