

Equality: Allocation, Access & Benefit

ECED7002

Session 4b

Associate Professor Caroline Lohmann-Hancock

Proviso's & Caveats

- This presentation is designed to instigate debate.
- I does not necessarily reflect the views of the lecturer.
- The purpose of this lecture is to raise questions that enable learners to:
 - Establish their initial views, opinions and standpoints
 - Explore the views of others and to reconsider their original position
- The debate excludes the provision of benefit to people affected by physical or mental health challenges and or 'Brute Bad Luck'
- (Smit, 2016, p34)

Allocation of Resources

- Smit (2016, p34-37) citing Anderson (1999), Rawls (1993), Dworkin (2001, p1) and Cohen (1989, 2004) identifies the issues associated within the 'fair and equal' debate of welfare and benefits allocation.
- Equal Allocation of Resources
- Equal Access to Resources
- Grateful Recipient of Benefits

Example & Discussion

- Q: Why are Local Authority Residential Care Home budgets insufficient to provide a higher level of welfare to its residents?
- Considerations:
 - EU, UK & Wales budget allocations, priorities, legislation, minimum standards, staff training, qualification level of management teams.
 - Multi-disciplinary Team Around Care provision
 - Local Manager allocated budget: Restraints, compliance and austerity
 - Combined impact on Practitioner/Care Home Manager
 - Conflicts where MDT partners have differing priorities (H&SC)

Practitioner's Role

- Links to wider MDT
- Conflicts of interest
- Focus on differing priorities
- Confusion
- Repeat Requests for the same client/patient information
- Lack of clarity in purpose (PCC)

Effects

- Service User
- MDT
- Achievement of Standards (Minimum Standards)
- Austerity measures and budget cuts and constraints

Esteem, Prestige and Perceptions

- Perception of Caring Job Role
- Low Qualification Expectation
- Undervalued work/employee
- Training of senior managers, manager and staff
- Resulting in (potentially)
 - Poor Care Experience for many
 - Person Centred Care
 - Service user needs

Wales: Budget & Spending Allocations

- Population UK (2018) Calculate that the population of Wales 2018 = 3,170,000 people
- Auditor General for Wales (2018) estimates that The Welsh Government has a budget spend on Healthcare of around £6,381,000 (2017)
- The Welsh Government confirm that this equates to i.e. £2050 per person in 2016-2017

Debate on Fair & Equal Allocation of Resources

- Knowing these figures then is it reasonable to calculate that individual budget allocation over a lifetime =
- $\text{Spending} \div \text{Population} = \text{annual spend per person}$
- $\text{Annual spend per person} \times \text{one lifetime} = \text{Life healthcare allocation}$
- I.E.
- £2050 x 80 years (Stats Wales, 2018) (78.2 men. 82.2 women)
- A total lifetime spend of £164,000 per person in Wales

Politics: Choice versus Allocation

- Class discussion.
- Are we or should we be/have:
- Grateful Recipients of Welfare Benefits?
- Have Equal Access to Welfare Benefits?
- Have Equal Allocation of Resources?

Example 1

- The number of Transgender Operations in Wales 2014 was 172
- The cost of each procedure was £11,627.90
- This equates to:
 - $£11,627.9 \div £2050 = 5.67$ years of allocated resources
- Question:
 - Is it the responsibility of the state to provide resources for such life-choices?
 - Debate, discuss argue your point

Example 2

- Wales NHS Vasectomies per year 10,880 UK wide (Argus, 2016; The Telegraph, 2015).
- For Wales assumed one quarter = 2,720 operations
- Cost of each operation = £1,000 approx.
- Reversal operations cost £2,589
- Current rate of reversal operations = 15% of total annual ops. So
 - $2720 \times £1,000 = 2,720,000$
 - $\times 15\% = 408,000 + 2,720,000$
 - $= £3,128,000$ annual spend
- Question:
 - Is it the responsibility of the state to provide resources for such life-choices?
 - Debate, discuss argue your point

Guided Reading

- See
- Smit, K. (2016) *Applying Political Theory, issues and debates*. (2nd Ed). UK: Palgrave Macmillan Education.
- Specifically pages 34-37
- Bad luck or bad choices

Debate: Personal Health Budgets?

- Should we each be responsible for controlling our individual allocation of resources, collected via taxation, throughout our lifetime?
 - Consider issues of management
 - Alternatives
 - Current system
 - Levels of bureaucracy needed to support an intrusive system of control

Bad luck or Bad Choices?

- What is a good choice?
- What is a bad choice?
- Egalitarian Philosophy discusses situations where issues are:
 - Beyond a persons control
 - Irresponsibility or negligence
- Arguing for a 'more limited view of equality'
- (Smit, 2016, pp34-37)

Equalising What?

- Luck rather than material circumstances?
- Distinguishing between:
 - Qualities 'which we're naturally endowed
 - 'Our ambitions to make use of those qualities'
 - Emphasising 'Liberty' (see also session 1 Powerpoint-Appling Social Theory)
- Holding that:
- 'Individuals should be bound by the consequences of
- free choices they make concerning
- the use of talents and resources'

Redistribution of Talents and Resources

- Dworkin's (2001, p1) proposal for 'Correction of Disadvantage':
- In terms of:
 - Natural Talents
- But not in terms of:
 - Ambition or hard work when justifying redistributions
 - (Read also here MUD. RED. SID.)
- Referred to as 'Luck Egalitarianism'

Supporting

- Supporting those with
- ‘Brute Bad luck’ (did not contribute to the bad luck)
- And NOT
- ‘Option Bad luck’ (resulting from poor choices)

Membership & Cooperation

- Dworkin (2001) and Rawls (1993) agree that...
- ‘the benefits we derive from our choices and our luck are a product of our shared membership and cooperation in society’
- And that...
- ‘(Re)-Distribution of wealth is the product of legal order...where
- ‘a citizen’s wealth depends massively on which laws his community has enacted’
- (ownership, taxation, labour law etc...)

Context

- Two basic principles of 'Ethical Individualism' are outlined:
 - 1 'human lives should be successful, rather than wasted'
 - 2. Emphasis on individual responsibility
- 1- 'Justifying state redistribution of resources via welfare policies in order to provide the conditions of autonomy'
- 2. 'importance of individual responsibility'
- Conservative concerns about abuse of the Welfare System.
- Links to a more Liberal desire for people to be more active in their life
- Not merely 'passive beneficiaries of assistance'
- (Dworkin, 2001 cited in Smit 2016)

Theories of Distribution

- Autonomous Choice:
 - Distributional Equality
 - Via
 - Equalisation of Welfare or
 - Equalisation of Resources
- Welfare described as being...
- ‘outcomes that are good for citizens’
- (Smit, 2016, p35)

Differing Needs & Choices

- There is a focus here on 'Ends'
- Rather than
- 'Means'
- Acknowledging that people have:
 - Differing needs
 - Need differing amounts of resources
 - Differing types of resources
 - ...'in order to achieve equal welfare'...attempting to use...

Differing Needs & Choices

- 'There is a focus here on 'Ends'
- Rather than
- 'Means'
- Acknowledging that people have:
 - Differing needs
 - Need differing amounts of resources
 - Differing types of resources
 - ...'in order to achieve equal welfare'...attempting to use...
 - Needs based systems try to achieve equality via equality of outcomes.

Group Question

- What are the problems associated with this approach?
- For example...
 - The nebulous way by which 'outcomes' are defined.
 - How do we measure happiness?
 - What does success look like for different people?
 - Etc...
- How would you begin to manage such measurements?
- Would such measurements be intrusive and effect our 'Liberty' and Autonomy'? i.e state buracracy

Choices: Debate

- Welfare might then depend on society's view (laws) and peoples..
 - Illegitimate choices
 - Uninformed choices
 - Irrational choices
 - Denigration of others
 - Essential choices (Global warming, shiny shoes, drugs use)
- Question:
 - Is it then better to adopt a more egalitarian stance
 - and aim to provide
 - equal allocation of resources rather than welfare?

Personal Matters

- Limited Government, Autonomy & Liberty (see session 1)
- Choice of use of allocated resources (Active involvement and responsibility)
- Personal matters (the state is not involved)
- A practical critique of effective welfare? Or not?
- What is YOUR opinion discuss within a small group.

Castaway Exercise

- A small group of you are castaway on a desert island.
- You have limited 'bundles' of resources.
- How do you share these when people have different needs, preferences and would make differing choices in allocation of 'bundles'?
- How do you achieve equality (voice, choice, allocations)?
- How would you ensure that everyone is happy with their allocation?

Abilities

- Should people be penalised for lacking abilities?
- Should people who lack abilities receive unregulated rewards?
- Should people receive unregulated rewards because they possess ‘socially values talents’?

Luck, Risk & Gains

- How we amass more resources depends on many factors
- Some people chose higher remuneration occupations.
- Should they be ‘entitled to the profits they make’?
- Is Luck a factor? (Choices and Risks)
- Dworkin (2001) describes this as ‘Option Luck’
 - People should be entitled to any gains made...and
 - Have to bear any losses incurred.
- As choice entails risk...?

Bad Luck

- Gains may be affected by bad luck
- ‘If this is not a result of their ‘free choice’ then they should not have to bear the brunt of it’
- Dworkin offers that...
- Resource redistribution should thus compensate for ‘brute bad luck’
- Assessment of compensation via a compulsory insurance system.
- Financed by ‘progressive taxation’
- Compensation for ‘brute bad luck’ (‘including natural or physical handicaps’)
- (Dworkin, 2001)

Dworkin's (2001) Concern

- Distinguishing between
- Economic hardship
- Need
- Worst-off groups
- In terms of wealth and income
- Sharing with Rawls the desire to 'prevent people from benefiting from the possession of unearned talent'
- Via a taxation and redistribution system
- Compulsory contribution to redistribution
- (insuring against having no or few marketable talents)

Equalising Resources: Defence

- Clear distinction between:
 - Demands that result from choices
 - Those that result from circumstances not chosen
- If we have expensive tastes then the state should not be expected to fund these.
- Cohen (1989), controversially, points out that we may not necessarily chose our expensive tastes but we are driven to satisfy them' but
- Argues that we should not equalise resources more that we should 'equalise access to advantage'. (unchosen expensive tastes)

Marxist Position

- Karl Marx cited in Cohen, 2004)
 - Called for resources to be allocated on the basis of...
 -‘each according to his need’
- Again the difficulties of ‘Liberty’ ‘Autonomy’ ‘Rights to private property/possessions’ argued against the required high level of intrusiveness and bureaucracy needed to manage (Police) such a system.
- The theory may be valid, however, in practical terms the system would be unmanageable, wouldn’t it?
- Ideal theory versus real world problems (Capitalism)

Further considerations

- Private ownership
- Fairness
- Justice
- Regulations (laws)
- Common Good
- Is redistribution alone sufficient to achieve justice?
- Self-determination and self-development (responsibility for one's self)
- See also here SoA Power-point linked to Emma Goldman Anarchism and other essays.

Main Reference List

- Smit, K. (2016) Applying Political Theory, issues and debates. 2nd Ed. UK: Palgrave Macmillan Education.
- UK Population (2018) Available at <https://www.ukpopulation.org/wales-population/> Accessed 16.11.2018
- Auditor general for Wales (2018) A picture of primary care in Wales Available at <http://www.assembly.wales/laid%20documents/agr-ld11520/agr-ld11520-e.pdf> Accessed on 16.11.2018
- Stats Wales (2018) Life Expectancy by Gender Report. Available at <https://statswales.gov.wales/Catalogue/Health-and-Social-Care/Life-Expectancy/LifeExpectancy-by-Gender-Year> Accessed on 16.11.2018
- The Telegraph (2015) Number of vasectomies falls by nearly two-thirds in last ten years, NHS figures show Report. Available at <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/10/20/number-of-vasectomies-falls-by-nearly-two-thirds-in-last-ten-yea/> Accessed on 16.11.2018
- See also in presentation suggested guided reading
-