

Hi Gary

Proposal for a Contestable Approach to some land development and housing construction and management in Sydney, led by Melbourne architect Andrew Maynard. (NSW has nothing like him!)

Please help this Proposal from Her Outside happen! (This is a real change from George Cole's 'Her Inside', because it has a proper government mandate which I show to you below and attached)

As a result of my reading last weekend, I hope that you are interested in helping to make more affordable and social housing development happen in NSW, using people like Melbourne architect Andrew Maynard who Todd covers in the Australian Financial Review Magazine (AFR March 2016) article **'Home Remedy: Live well....and save the planet while you're at it'**. I also appeal to local politicians and others to work with the stakeholders and Andrew Maynard because his architecture and construction seem the first clear presentation of principles for sustainable affordable housing development that I have seen laid out in practice. They state: **'It is not so much about evolving an aesthetic as propagating an ethic'....'We are open sourcing our intellectual property'**, etc.etc. **Can we trial their system in NSW in any way you know?**

Since I was first introduced to your views in the NSW public service I have increasingly realized that land and housing construction and management are crucial for cost-effective promotion of community health and wellbeing, whatever and wherever it is. Thank you so much for your terrific reading suggestions on 'trust' which clarified many things for me in this direction through Google! And wonderful Wikipedia! I send the related comment below later. And now we have email and pictures. What wonderful tools and potential institutions for the open development of more democratic regional advance. I guess working across factions of any kind so openly and broadly has never been historically possible before and we can do it now for the first time ever if we can make it stick as usual. In this openly cooperative spirit let me first quote **'Contestability in Public Services: An Alternative to Outsourcing'** (2015) which you wrote as a research monograph for the Australian and New Zealand Society of Government (ANZSOG). (Is it the case with ANZSOG that Minchin's 'only a ginger, may call another ginger ginger', rule applies? If so don't bet on it much longer. We may want a go at it so need more open and reliably informed direction addressed below.)

'In 2014, the Australian National Commission of Audit used the term (contestability) in conjunction with 'competition' and 'outsourcing', but it was never defined. The 2014 federal budget documents announced a formal commitment to a process of contestability:

The Government will develop and implement a Contestability Framework to assess whether a government function should be open to competition and the appropriate means for this to occur. A contestable approach can come from outside Government or from other entities within the Government'. (This is a proposal from outside government. Please don't let it slip. I'm counting on you, etc.)

In *'Contestability in Public Services: An Alternative to Outsourcing'* you also state the Australian Department of Finance has been charged with establishing a three year program to review the functions of government against this framework, which is expected to **"offer opportunities for identified functions to be delivered through alternative and contestable approaches"**. You state this looks *'very much like a program of market-testing or outsourcing of support services. Certainly the public sector unions have come to see it as nothing more than outsourcing. Apparently, 'Contestability has a technical meaning in economics: it refers to potential rather than actual competition'*.

One naturally wonders In *'Contestability in Public Services: An Alternative to Outsourcing'* (2015) you state:

if 'potential, rather than actual competition', means broader comparability of services, however delivered, to improve them through increasing their range and utility to the key stakeholders, the Australian people, of whom we folks are all a part for not very long before we are dead. You state your paper *'is concerned with contestability proper' – it explores the origins of the concept, how it applies to the public service sector, and how contestability might be used to drive improvement in service delivery.*

By the term 'contestability proper' do you mean theory in action? If so I am on your side with George Soros, Karl Popper, key doctors, politicians and others. This requires openness rather than closure, as I naturally said first to Billy Crystal and the brothers. Having seen your knack for pouring oil on troubled waters in NSW government, let me offer a cunning local plan in land and housing construction and management because this is where life begins and finishes, on some ground. ***This proposal is therefore aimed at getting more open comparability in land, housing construction and management of funds in practice, (contestability proper?). This is aimed at improving services.*** Contract and fund management are discussed in related competitive contexts later. This proposal begins, however, with praise of Melbourne architect, Andrew Maynard, whose work was addressed in the Australian Financial Review Magazine (March 2016) and is described later. In NSW I have been looking for someone like him since I retired in 2007 and began to take some proper interest in housing and investment. The Senate Report on the Housing Affordability Challenge (2015) and others show broad consensus about trends and problems in construction and rental housing. You might speak to Chairman Senator Dastaryi in light of the attached discussion of the report. One seeks an implementation of a more commonly rational and therefore openly informed vision in NSW, hopefully relying here on your historically leading and more powerful thrusts in NSW government. (Whose language is silliest to you? Ideas on 'trust' are discussed in this context later.)

THE WOMAN'S VIEW ON THE PLOT IDEALLY BEGINS WITH ANDREW MAYNARD IN MELBOURNE BECAUSE I'VE VAINLY LOOKED FOR IT IN SYDNEY SINCE 2007 (NSW ARCHITECTS ARE CAREFUL WHORES?)

In NSW they can't seriously discuss the importance of financial literacy and sit on this legal intellectual dung heap, where words are used without glossaries for key definitions, so as to confuse rather than illuminate any situation mainly in the interests of the court contractor who either knows

or is supposed to. You have a very good reputation with me, which is why I appeal to you. More on Axelrod, Uslaner, Klein, Ostrom, and relational contracting later. They cleared up a lot I don't think. Are we supposed to trust them just because they are America's supposedly top experts? Your reading suggestions on the 'trust' literature confirmed my woman's suspicion of mathematics and my formerly vague notion that only those already crazy would follow Nash and the prisoner's dilemma with interest. Jung and Dylan could perhaps have pointed this out as they thought it strange that those who claimed to be guided by love were always going to war. In mental health is this the ultimate projection and does it matter? US data on guns suggest it does. They apparently are 43 times more likely to kill a member of the family rather than an intruder, according to a recent 4 Corners TV program. This is discussed later, to present housing directions more consistent with the peoples need to know, as distinct from meeting or colluding in ignorant or knowing silence, lies, patronage and corruption. Let these '*folie a deux*' or more flowers bloom elsewhere. I would never know how to respond to their thesis other than honestly. This is open debate. (God knows what the rest of them appear increasingly to be having in academia but the rest of us don't need to follow.)

In practical administration we seek more openly shared, regional and Popperian approaches to continuous improvement with doctors, engineers and others. This is the health services directions NSW and Commonwealth governments have travelled with stakeholders since the UK Robens Report led to establishment of state occupational health and safety acts supported by more openly and securely managed premium funds for injury prevention, rehabilitation, re-employment, investment and related data gathering in the eighties. Earlier, you wrote about UK direction in prisons in ***measuring safety, security and decency***. I look forward to reading Julien Le Grand on this. I guess that similar measures related to safety, security and decency might also apply to other types of accommodation, whether people are behind bars or not. However, the recent House of Representative report on small business '***Getting Business Booming***', suggests again to me that ***health and fitness*** are better assessment measures for putting particular people in particular jobs in particular environments, whatever they are, and whether the potential occupants are seen in any way as sick, disabled, stigmatized, or just like us. (Baby, I'm kidding?)

TOWARDS A MORE RELIABLY INFORMED COMPETITIVE SPIRIT WITH A MAYNARD PRODUCT OR SIMILAR DEVELOPMENT ON LAND IN SYDNEY (IS THERE ANY OF IT ALREADY OUT THERE?)

Maynard '***designs housing with social, environmental and financial outcomes in mind, otherwise known as triple bottom line***'. (Significantly, perhaps, they left out the final word ***accounting***.) Since I retired I have been looking for an organization like Maynard's in architecture, construction or building management and only saw resistance to it in NSW. (Tell me I'm crazy and it isn't so.) I hasten to add I have always been interested in comparatively small, shared personal investments rather than big projects. I will write again soon to Jamie Parker, Tanya Plibersek and Clover Moore cc to you and others in the light of the recent state and Commonwealth directions on more affordable and social housing. It seems to me that the open agenda Maynard presents, deserves to be pursued on the comparative evidence.

I hope you might be interested, for example, in the attached and possibly related questions about the ***Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Amendment (Retention Money Trust Account) Regulation 2014***. I grope in the dark with this and I bet I'm not the only one. However, it seems like a potential opportunity to develop more rational (by which I mainly mean broadly and openly informed) approaches to land, construction and building management. The combinations of mathematical economic and legal theory, such as outlined in Google and Wikipedia descriptions of '***relational contracting***' appear incomprehensible mathematical stuff by people who appear likely to know nothing of any real practice and its' problems on the ground. I think the ***NSW Office of Fair Trading Home Building Contract*** is a good product as it lends itself to clear quality management principles more easily. I don't understand why this comparatively clear, simple and open approach to the contract cannot be scaled up or down with related open arbitration mechanisms attached. Like anybody in NSW I want to improve my financial literacy so that I don't get screwed. This is why I seek support for an Andrew Maynard project in Sydney. Help!

After a bachelor of environmental design and bachelor of architecture, Maynard travelled to London and began working on major land development jobs. This confirmed to him that he 'didn't want to work on mega-projects, and was interested in a more human scale'. In his housing approach services deemed unessential have been stripped away, saving both money and space. This means no basement car parking, second bathrooms or individual laundries. Centralising services such as power, heating, hot water and communications shaves further off the cost. He states: 'We're into transparency and people love that they can see where their money is spent'. In the process the project has rid itself of all the flab of the 'value add'. The allure derives from the honesty of the materials and the clarity with which they are deployed'. (AFR Magazine p. 76)

Since 2007, with some manufacturing product exceptions, I have found strong service provider resistance to sustainable building approaches such as Maynard's. This seems partly because the approach reduces construction and maintenance costs rather than continually increasing them by add-ons driven by raising expectations and taste for giant California out of China bling as an aesthetic, with heavier security. Green manufacturing should be embedded better in service or appears likely to die after a first flush. Yet surely one does not need Australian manufacturing content in the same way one needs Australian intellectual service content. The latter government and related administrative perceptions and services appear to have provided more secure and valuable knowledge resources for driving wellbeing than the dominant US market alternatives which otherwise may easily undermine them. I'm thinking of public schooling, health care, education and communications. The superior advantages of the Australian design and product for general wellbeing are seen most easily through comparison of Australian and US approaches to health care and a study of reasons and effects of the global financial crisis, originating in treatment of US housing.

To get something different in housing seems difficult. The Senate Report on the Housing Affordability Challenge (2015) is discussed in a related context later and is also why I would be grateful for any help you might give. I find the advent of computers, email and Google increased my productivity far more than the Hawke and Keating government did. In old age I find myself a technological determinist supporting Bill Gates, who I regard as having been robbed by the US court

against the interests of the people in having freely accessible and free Microsoft product, when the company was forcibly broken up to comply with convenient US theoretical fantasies about the nature of competition. You will recall Hilmer's 'National Competition Policy' (1993), which was also accepted by all Commonwealth and state leaders at the time. It had a view of competition I shared because it accepted that competition did and should occur beyond the financial and related stockholder arenas, for social and environmental reasons also in the public interest.

I have followed competition policy closely (sort of) since Hilmer and it seems increasingly weird. For example, Rod Sims, in his AFR discussion of how to protect fintech start-ups from the big four banks, referred to **Section 46** provisions which give '*the Australian and Competition Consumer Commission powers to pursue action against companies acting unfairly to cruel competition*' (sic. AFR 30.3.16, p. 5). In communications policy, retail and elsewhere, competition policy appears to have increasingly become an incomprehensible vicious game for lawyers and mates using numbers. From any regional perspective we should avoid making a fetish of some idealized theory of competition and seek a fair trading state as grounded discourse in which cooperation and competition may be embedded, as this makes most obvious sense in terms of the protection of community wellbeing nationally, regionally, globally and locally. Measurement of service delivery ideally involves earlier investigation and discussion of intellectual property treatment and related matters. Maynard has a track record of construction which seems to make his ventures great to model in Sydney if this is not being done already. If it is being done in Sydney, where is it? (Who knows? Pray tell.)

The Senate Report on the Housing Affordability Challenge (2015) showed a broad consensus about trends and problems in construction and related rental housing. It followed the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) in defining **public housing** as *rental housing provided and managed by state and territory governments* (p. 231). **Social** housing is *rental housing that is funded or partly funded by government; owned or managed by government or a community organization; and let to eligible persons*'. Many appear to share the evidence based perception of the report that the housing rental affordability crisis is getting worse for lower income people and especially for those with complex conditions likely to be related to homelessness, such as being without a continuing job or secure private financial support. Patrick Flynn from Mission Australia pointed out the major national housing construction risk management effort should logically be laid on more social and affordable rental housing construction and management when he stated:

'The lack of social and affordable housing is a problem both because it creates a risk of more people being homeless and because it prevents an exit from homelessness. Yet today the percentage of social housing is at a historic low – less than 5% of stock – and falling' (p.310)

Professor Beer, Director of the Centre for Housing, Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Adelaide suggested public housing accounted for around 4% of public housing stock but that this varied significantly on a state by state basis. He noted that the UK had a much larger social housing stock than Australia – roughly 18% of its housing stock. He claimed even the US, which is thought of as the classic neoliberal state, (one assumes ideally depending only on the market), tend to have on average a social housing stock no smaller than Australia (p. 233).

The City of Sydney is very concerned that investor-driven demand is inflating inner city housing prices. The Sydney Housing Issues Paper (April 2015) states the market alone cannot deliver housing that is affordable and appropriate for everyone (p.9). It points out the Sydney metropolitan strategy 'A Plan for Growing Sydney' apparently sets a course for population, housing and employment growth focused on private market housing supply. Similarly, the state plan – NSW 2021 – aims to supply new private sector housing with an annual target of building 25,000 new homes. The Issues Paper states social housing supply is above the City's 2030 target of 7.5% of all dwellings, but there were 59,500 households on the waiting list across the state in 2014 (p. 10). Is this policy working well in the interests of future generations? No.

Senate **Rec. 24** states: ***Consistent with the recommendation for the Australian Government to increase the overall proportion of public housing as a percentage of housing stock, the committee recommends that the Australian Government together with the states and territories commit to achieving a higher proportion of overall social housing as a percentage of Australia's housing stock. This recommendation recognizes that currently social housing in Australia forms only a small proportion of Australia's housing stock and is falling far short of meeting demand*** (xxxviii).

The Master Builders' Association noted to the Senate Committee that public housing was ***'stepping back from providing social housing, with community housing taking on an increasing workload'*** (p. 234). A question in the report is whether the government is cost-shifting into potentially opaque or high risk markets, which might otherwise be seen as charitable. This is a vital question to tackle from the public interest in preventing major and minor corruption, which is often based on demanding and then exploiting some trust, stated or not. The employer, employee, contractor, subcontractor, resident, etc. ideally respond to more openly shared and informed ideas of fair trading. This is impossible to do while so much of the financial arrangements for building construction and management remain so hidden from the public. The funds are apparently sometimes stripped by early and big comers to a project. The late comers in the process often lose out. The way to see if operations are corrupt is by opening them up to judgment. This is cheap.

Corruption is widely seen by many governments as a key reason for social disorder, along with unwanted immigration. In this global context surely Australian citizens must try to stand up openly with China, or any other partner, or else be driven blindly to the next global financial crisis by the US market direction. One wonders how discrimination and risk management issues are ideally resolved in current regional contexts and related to treatment of large and small projects. See some related discussion attached on the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payments Amendment and other funds; including when they may be withheld for any reason. What is going on in this area? I have never been able to find out. The government, the construction industry, engineers and builders should support Andrew Maynard's more affordable and sustainable system as a land, construction and building management tool in NSW because you and many others taught me about this direction with the introduction of the WorkCover managed funds, administered by a dozen insurers. (Yes, Virginia, there is such a thing as too much competition. Tell it to the Competition Czar? Not bloody likely, we already pay too much for the lawyers' monopoly.)

LITERATURE ON TRUST

It was good of you to respond to my email attempts to address measurement like an intelligent human being. It made me feel human. None of my academic colleagues ever did. They were too busy I guess. I haven't had the feeling of intelligent correspondence with another human for years, since a great guy from Jordan, working for Aramco in Saudi Arabia. He was my student until a year later when they suddenly took him away and gave him to a woman from Bangla Desh. I have been ignored in writing by colleagues for years, unless they were complaining, in spite of my persistence. Could this be mania do you think? What will you say to your Danish PhD thesis on relational contracting? Do you think God has a sense of humour? Since I asked you for readings following our earlier discussion of measurement and trust I give comparatively subjective and objective descriptions of trust below. The Collins Empire Dictionary is used for the more objective exercise, avoiding all the crappy US dictionaries one now finds through Google, which may mangle more honest language through being based primarily on the US and related market fiction that perception and language constitute reality. Whose perception and language is that?

From reading about Pippa Norris, of whom I had never heard, and her broad associations, she seems extremely worthy and is now at Sydney Uni. This work fills me slightly with *ennui*, however, as I'd like to get to the development punch-line about how to operate on the particular ground rather than mull again on the big theoretical issues like whether secularism and religion are coming or going. (Call me an openly inclusive public servant *manque*.) Wikipedia sums Norris up I guess: 'Her research compares public opinion and elections, democratic institutions and cultures, gender politics, and political communications in many countries worldwide. One of the most cited political scientists in the world,^[1] ranked 4th most cited in political science by [Google Scholar](#), she has published more than forty books and numerous articles. Her approach is essentially large-N problem-oriented evidence-based comparative political science which attempts to raise large theoretical ideas tackling theoretically interesting debates and addressing pressing real-world policy concerns around the world. (Somebody has to do it and I certainly would never wish to appear anti-intellectual. However, one often wonders how well it is connected to the ground, not theory.)

This is the regional context from which I viewed the readings you suggested to me on trust. This led to my conclusions that trust is the security of some assured knowledge, which is fleeting, try to preserve it how we will. This is what makes the cultural canon and related concepts great, however we address them here or beyond the fringe. For some over time there appears to be a divinity which shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will. (Like Tim Minchin with Mathilda perhaps. How could you miss it?) The Collins Empire Dictionary states **trust** is: **Confidence; firm belief; reliance; property held for another; combination of producers to do away with competition and keep up prices.** (Wink, wink, say no more, how much do you want? The old pocket dictionary is not mightier than the court but Jesus it's much clearer.)

In regard to Axelrod, I find that I have tried for many years to understand game theory and the prisoner's dilemma, but the subject matter has always been far beyond me. Many years ago, for example, I read Kerry Schotts PhD on the topic in Canberra. My latest and by far most interesting

attempt before last weekend was in reading Sylvia Nasar's wonderfully explained and detailed biography about John Nash and mathematics in her book '**A Beautiful Mind**'. It left the film with Russell Crowe for dead and mainly caused me to wonder if the protection of Nash and his hosts was an astute political gesture to other establishments in the context of the main US political and military game of bringing Jewish scientists from all over Europe and the US to work on the Manhattan Project to bomb Japan.

Like most people, I can't understand theoretical mathematics and I don't think I can bear to go back and try to find out about these people like Axelrod, Akerlof, relational contracting, etc. after the small frolic with them last weekend. I find I have seen too many like them already assessing the price of untapped fish and other marine life along the Illawarra Coast; reducing everything to multiple unexplained figures for *stock*. Are they kidding? The relational contracting theory you refer to seems to double the nuts unhelpfully at the beginning. This is expensive and causes cost problems further down the line identified in the last Royal Commission into the construction industry in NSW. I think that if people can't understand what they are doing and why they are doing it we are in trouble from democratic and practical perspectives. I always have to let the maths roll by and look at the beginning and the conclusion in any article on economics or law which relies on mathematical systems theory largely divorced from ongoing knowledge of production on the ground for its approach. Still, if Akerlof is worried about asymmetric information, as he seems to be, I'm on his side I guess. (What is to be done? Surely we don't need his maths? What a load of bullshit? What is wrong with the general approach in the NSW Fair Trading Home Building Contract?)

On checking Wikipedia last weekend about the "prisoner's dilemma" (Poundstone, 1992), presented it as follows:

Two members of a criminal gang are arrested and imprisoned. Each prisoner is in solitary confinement with no means of communicating with the other. The prosecutors lack sufficient evidence to convict the pair on the principal charge. They hope to get both sentenced to a year in prison on a lesser charge. Simultaneously, the prosecutors offer each prisoner a bargain. Each prisoner is given the opportunity either to: betray the other by testifying that the other committed the crime, or to cooperate with the other by remaining silent. Their offer is:

- If A and B each betray the other, each of them serves 2 years in prison
- If A betrays B but B remains silent, A will be set free and B will serve 3 years in prison (and vice versa)
- If A and B both remain silent, both of them will only serve 1 year in prison (on the lesser charge)

I cannot understand the offer, or the subsequent Wikipedia explanation. However, I wonder why we appear naturally to be caste on the side of the prosecutors in this debate, whatever it is. (Give me a break.)

From rapid reading on Uslaner, whom I have never read and will not in future, I wonder if men like him have been responsible for Robert Putnam 'Bowling Alone' and Eva Cox on social capital in Australia. *'The Moral Foundations of Trust seeks to explain why people place their faith in strangers, and why doing so matters. Trust is a moral value that does not depend upon personal experience or on interacting with people in civic groups or informal socializing. Instead, we learn to trust from our parents, and trust is stable over long periods of time. Trust depends on an optimistic world view: the world is a good place and we can make it better. Trusting people are more likely to give through charity and volunteering. Trusting societies are more likely to redistribute resources from the rich to the poor. Trust has been in decline in the United States for over 30 years. The roots of this decline are traceable to declining optimism and increasing economic inequality, which Uslaner supports by aggregate time series in the United States and cross-sectional data across market economies.'*

I find such views problematic. I prefer openness to trust in management and think apparent trust may be a foolish burden which may often hide comparative collective ignorance. It seems to me that this literature on trust often involves the US approach of putting the cart before the horse again. It seems, perhaps the source of the trust question that keeps bobbing up in health and other surveys which we discussed and seemed to agree about earlier. In Australia I also find such views problematic in regard to the concept of 'social capital' – *the institutionalized social connexions or obligations which are convertible in certain conditions, into economic capital*, according to Bourdieu. (I love the French. They are so cultured. It's all just human capital to us?) Putnam and Cox, however, appear to believe in stated trust and assume it is a desirable precursor for effective cooperation. As I said to Adrian Bauman in the early Sax Institute questionnaire 45 and Up survey: *'Question 74 asks 'Do you agree that most people in your neighbourhood can be trusted'? I claimed this is a foolish question because the immediate response is to ask 'Trusted to do what?' (Bring in my washing out of the rain? Etc. etc.) Bauman's response was to state these were not questions he developed, but 'are established scales that reliably assess elements of social support and neighbourhood social capital'. I doubt this and am glad to see that you do too. Stalin was no doubt deemed trustworthy by Russians and many others long before he was dead. What he and others did is surely more important than what he and others said. This distinction should not be eroded in policy as it discourages more honestly and broadly informed expression which may also be therapeutic.*

Reputation, writes editor Daniel Klein (Santa Clara University), explores how *"good conduct is sustained even in the absence of an external enforcement authority," and shows how "social affairs can be self-policing." Information tells economic agents which parties are behaving unethically. Markets punish misconduct by withholding business, cooperation, and other benefits. Hence a reputation for honesty is valuable, and ethical conduct is in one's interest. The result? Trust, cooperation, and honesty—without government regulation'*. This reminds me of 'Live and let live, but remember this line. Your business is your business and my business is mine' as Chevalier and Sinatra sang in 'Can Can'. This panders to men's worst instincts I'm afraid. They need to open up the operations for us to judge and learn from them better.

I have never read Eleanor Ostrom's work but am familiar with other manifestations of the commons discussion. I read again about her: **8 Principles for Managing a Commons**, which appear

interesting. However, I guess they could easily turn into closed and failing shops without effective systems for monitoring members' behaviour, largely because of the declared need for trust. The 8 principles for managing a commons are: *1. Define clear group boundaries. 2. Match rules governing use of common goods to local needs and conditions. 3. Ensure that those affected by the rules can participate in modifying the rules. 4. Make sure the rule-making rights of community members are respected by outside authorities. 5. Develop a system, carried out by community members, for monitoring members' behaviour. 6. Use graduated sanctions for rule violators. 7. Provide accessible, low-cost means for dispute resolution. 8. Build responsibility for governing the common resource in nested tiers from the lowest level up to the entire interconnected system.* (One wonders about the nature of these nested tiers.)

In 2007 I came across Cisco systems and related development operations at the UN Conference on Reinventing Government in Vienna, which was gigantic and gloriously free to anyone wishing to attend. I have since found the practical outcomes in much supposedly 'open source' computing disappointing because they appear to end in comparatively closed shops run by comparatively narrow and small bunches of tech-heads who can't be bothered to communicate with the great unwashed outside, let alone fast or clearly. I'm also thinking of Ubuntu for example. As I said earlier, I'm on the side that Microsoft should not have been broken up for providing consumers with free product, as a result of having such a great, widely and openly accessible service. This is all water under the bridge I guess. Thanks very much for your efforts.

Cheers and best wishes, Carol (a.k.a. Lilith the Magic Pudding, Chief Alternative to Faith and Queen of the Monkeys)

St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037 www.Carolodonnell.com.au

Dear Ministers and Others

SHALL WE DESTROY THEM OR NOT? TRUST AND GAME THEORY IN MATHEMATICS AND THE AUSTRALIAN INNOVATION, SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND ENGINEERING DIRECTION

From Painters and Dockers to Painters and Decorators

This submission arises from the continuing discussion with Gary Sturgess AM, addressed in the attached file on measurement, for your perusal. Sturgess is currently an adjunct professor with the Australia and NZ School of Government, (ANZSOG) holding the NSW Premier's ANZSOG Chair in Public Service. (As you may imagine, the ANZSOG chair is a sticky business.)

In approaching Sturgess in discussion of measurement in prisons and other areas of work, he directed me to the literature on trust and to game theory, to which I was at first violently opposed. This is because the key propositions and related mathematics appear so thoroughly incomprehensible and confusing to any but a small circle of global friends. (Don't worry they're growing it?).

Game theory also appears to have an oppressive and wrong view of humanity, but surely you must judge this matter clearly for yourself and comment, before we go further in innovation and related science, technology and engineering directions, not to mention social or public services on which Sturgess may be expected to represent the NSW Premier, in conflict with ANSZOG, or not.

You should note Sylvia Lazar's wonderful book on John Nash and mathematics entitled 'A Beautiful Mind' for engrossing bedside reading. In my view this should be required reading for all first year students in mathematics, because Lazar judges game theory as 'the most influential theory of rational human behaviour of our time'. Having read her wonderfully clear book I can easily believe it.

I am surprised Jessica Irvine, Saul Eslake, Ross Gittins or other columnists have not commented on game theory in their regular columns in the Fairfax press. What about Adam and Dr Karl or are they both off comparing their belly button fluff, or something equally trivial as usual? You must judge for yourself. Sturgess, however, appears to like game theory a lot.

I guess game theory is also the precursor to the work of sociologists Robert Putnam and Eva Cox, about whom I have mixed feelings, discussed attached. Gary Sturgess will lend me a good book on game theory soon to discuss it further, in the light of global public and private concern over the Great Barrier Reef and in regard to marine life along the Illawarra Coast, also discussed attached.

The related direction in the ***Digital Dividend Green Paper (2009)***, is also considered later below and attached (in the file Bamboo and communication) to support the landmark grand bargain on climate change, outlined in an agreement reached by 200 countries for the first time in Paris in December 2015, to take action to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Tom Arup's article, 'It's over to Australia to act now' and his quick guide to key elements of the Paris agreement seem a clear and helpful summary of events (Sydney Morning Herald (SMH 14.12.15, p. 3). In the same edition, the International Monetary Fund Chief, Christine Lagarde, states: '*Governments must now put words into actions, in particular by implementing policies that make effective progress on the mitigation pledges they have made.* (p.4).

This debate on the merits of game theory seems one that must be had to fulfil the roles of the service economy and related environments better for current and future generations. I've pointed this out to Nixon Apple and Bill Ferris at Innovation Australia. They may not remember. Impress this upon them again today and tell them to speak up plainly about the matter so all the stupid in the real world can understand. By all means shove it up their arses if you can eventually find them and invite Fairfax and other journalists to the event.

On the Woman Question and Development, sustainable or not

You may note related discussion with colleagues in media below, as well as related regional directions resting on the ideal supremacy of regional and strategic plans and projects, rather than closed collegiate direction. I find Sturgess and I appear in furious agreement about the desirability of direct action in relation to climate change. How is the money to be got for regional projects related to more sustainable development, such as those in in land and housing construction or building management, or communication or maintenance services, or other jobs, addressed attached?

The benefit of regional and strategic plans and the implementation of related projects, is that they may focus usefully on projects for the community benefit, rather than on many collegiate interests which rely on the public purse, as if their services were being more broadly, openly and inclusively considered in relation

to the attainment of the public good. Rather than game theory, which I think I detest, I support the **Fair Trading and Home Building Contract** because it is suitable for quality management work and related action research on the ground with Popper, doctors, and suitable for anyone in proper education. This approach combines theory with practice rather than endlessly dictating to the latter in growing ignorance about it. It was Robertson's Painters and Decorators who introduced the Fair Trading and Home Building Contract to St James Court. I was very impressed by the clarity and potential of the product in use for quality contract management and related teaching purposes. I feel that since I retired in 2007 from a life of being a teacher, academic and public servant, I have mainly been taught that life in action looks very different on real ground always looking up. I am always grateful for good experience as long as it isn't too painful. We can also learn a lot from watching others in action on TV to prepare and by reading books instead.

One notes that in the disciplinary field of sociology, with which I am most familiar, if not embedded, game theory perhaps appears best represented in work by Robert Putnam, Eva Cox and others who discuss and measure trust and 'social capital' although not how I like. Their view of trust seems too trusting by half. I don't know what Eva's maths are like but I guess she might have to do the qualitative stuff after the big boys and their chosen mates have left the table as usual. Then the psychologists and their friends step in and carve up the rest into numbers in my experience.

Ministers should be warned that '**qualitative**' research in universities these days often requires endlessly typing up rambling discussion by a few people who may not have a clue, before the student typists get repetitive strain injury. The output can't even be tortured with Nudist, as it's not finished. This is not proper research as much as it is horribly slow, costly and narrow in its understanding and related output. (On the other hand, it's a great way of teaching students to type and operate Nudist. (It's also a great way to pad out the filming contract costs with paid work for a typing friend.)

However, the division of measurement and related research into **quantitative or qualitative categories** often drives it poorly, because the drivers are mathematical and probably based on a version of game theory I guess. **Step back and let the computer drive research as usual while we trust the contract and the numbers?** No thanks very much because the approach is wrong and expensive. Try tape recorders or film in interviews instead and write about the results of research in related regional locations, understanding the related available data on the place produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and other reliable sources for the place. This is recommended instead of putting a few typed scripts through a computer so they can be tortured with Nudist and turned into trash. Avoid the nightmarish dichotomies of quantitative and qualitative research arising before my eyes again now, where the **quantitative groups** always drive, as they make people sick.

(On the other hand, recorded interviews and film are often good for credibility and related accountability, as we see every night on TV. I think. See the related discussion with former colleagues at Sydney University in a debate related to the digital dividend direction in the *Digital Dividend Green Paper (2009)*. Whither games theory? Have we had enough already?

However, I say this without properly understanding game theory or the maths in applications, such as country or city dwellings, which appear of particular interest to Sturgess. He has met with Putnam and Cox on this already. *Sociology Themes and Perspectives* by Haralamos, van Krieken Smith and Holborn (Australian Edition 1996) has no reference to Putnam or Cox. Long story short - if you want to rely on definitions of trust related to games theory or Popper and friends you must understand them. Try Lazar and Google and see what you think. They scare me to death because of the maths and the apparent assumption of worlds at war where we, as researchers, identify with being the few guys on top, foxing the others with our clever offers and maths. I guess the police and prisoners might not like this game theory view if they understood it. I wouldn't touch it? Try following up on what happened to people in 'Joe Cinque's Consolation' and make a movie based on Helen Garner's book instead. The victim or the

miscreant often goes on to become the academic I guess. One drags out the perennial debate of whether this is healthy. Let's take another look.

On its plus side, games theory appears to be based on the general principle that people should talk to each other rather than remain silent. (Jesus. That is insightful! Whoever would have thought it? Mum and Gary Weaven at the ACTU? Ask them further about this but don't expect much from mum.) Apparently the others in the comparative mathematical space at the time were Jewish scientists from all over Europe and America who were all working together secretly on the Manhattan project to bomb Japan and then carry on. They brought each other on board. You can see how game theory has a lot of political ramifications, especially if you haven't got a clue about maths or what you are doing. I am indebted forever to Sylvia Lazar's 'A Beautiful Mind' for this interpretation. God knows I have never understood maths. They used to make my hands go icy in the morning at primary school and I just wanted to go home. Game theory has been a total mystery to me since I read Kerry Schott's thesis in Canberra in the eighties. It has bobbed up in my ignorant woman's life sporadically ever since. I still don't understand it, which is not a good omen for the future.

On the woman question you must also consider whether too much sport is never enough, because the theoretical positions of the Pope and the Business Council of Australia appear to assume one can never have too many babies. This belief is wrong and against the interests of women and future generations. The role of limiting the number of children a woman bears is crucial in development and taken for granted by wealthy women around the world who have voted with their feet. The importance of reduced family size for women and future generations is easily seen in the comparative development of China and Africa since 1966, for example. **'The Global Burden of Disease: A comprehensive assessment of mortality and disability from diseases, injuries and risk factors in 1990 to 2020'** also shows that family limitation in China was a vital part of a plan which brought greater health and development for people across the world through the production of cheaper goods, including and especially in China. **The Global Burden of Disease Report was produced by the Harvard School of Public Health on Behalf of the World Health Organization and The World Bank.** The common Australian view, also lead by many politicians, that the Chinese one child policy was some kind of stupid attempt to be nasty to people is insulting to the Chinese who sacrificed so much for their own and the rest of the worlds' people. Tell these pig ignorant Australian bastards to open up and get a more broadly informed and rational life.

See below and attached for related discussion of direction. Yours truly, Carol O'Donnell, St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037 www.Carolodonnell.com.au

(Also known as Lilith the Magic Pudding, Chief Alternative to Faith and Queen of the Monkeys)