

**THE MARKET AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST WILL PREVAIL
PROPOSED INDUSTRY AND HEALTH MANAGEMENT CORE**

To: The TAFE Director-General of Education and Training and Managing Director of TAFE NSW

Dear Sir,

I am writing to ask you to please try to get some of my core sociology lectures, which are attached along with information about related subject contexts, accepted as a national industry and health related sociology core.

All the apparently right channels for currently establishing essential vocational training within any broader theoretical and related educational frameworks have been exhausted, in my opinion. In response to my inquiries about how to get my own curriculum recognised by industry, Bert Evans politely passed the buck in NSW, and so has the Institute of Public Affairs of Australia, although they kindly continue regularly to publish my articles in 'Public Administration Today'. I wrote to Bert Evans early in 2007, in his role as Chairman of the NSW Board of Vocational Education and Training just before I took the redundancy package offered by Sydney Uni on my sixtieth birthday. My only regret was my curriculum disappeared when I left, probably to make way for a more professorial type of psychologist or related questionnaire deliverers. I have been trying to resurrect my curriculum somehow ever since, because I regard it as a necessary, holistic, health promotion, risk management and related theoretical approach to accompany the policy direction set nationally in Australia and by the United Nations (UN), the World Health Organization(WHO) and all their related sustainable development requirements.

I have a PhD in Sociology from Macquarie Uni, a Master of Education from Sydney and a BA, Dip.Ed. from Queensland. I also have a letter from John Della Bosca, NSW Minister for Education and Training (RML 08/211 A59820) which was received in the office of Verity Firth, the NSW Minister for Women, Science and Medical Research, Minister for Climate Change and the Environment and Minister for Assisting the Minister for Health (Cancer) on 20th March 2008. In response to my question about how I should get my open curriculum content considered for approval in an open, nationally accredited curriculum core, his letter first refers to the TAFE consultation paper entitled, 'TAFE NSW Doing Business in the 21st Century', released in November 2007.

I had formerly read the above paper and had no confidence in its management recommendations for reasons which are attached. John Della Bosca's letter goes on:

I am advised the acquisition of open curriculum content will be achieved through the sourcing of nationally endorsed training package qualifications and resources through Industry Skills Councils. Utilising national resources and working in a national framework will identify emerging labour market trends and skill shortages and facilitate enterprise workforce development initiatives.

TAFE NSW will broaden its focus from discrete courses to training package qualifications and services. This will build skill capacity and meet the requirements of the labour market and the NSW TAFE extensive customer base including industries, enterprises, individual learners, schools, universities and communities.

TAFE NSW will also continue to utilise innovative technologies, web based learning systems and resources. It will also extend distance education delivery and personalised learning services across the whole of the organization.

There will continue to be opportunities for communication and consultation and I would encourage Ms O'Donnell to make further comments through the TAFE NSW dedicated email address 21C@det.nsw.edu.au

I wrote to the above email address as soon as I received the Ministers' letters in March 08, and as yet have no acknowledgement of this.

From my holistic perspective, like Martin Ferguson's, in which the market and the national interest will prevail, nobody appears willing or obviously in the running to take a firm position on approving a nationally accepted industry and health related sociology core. Who is qualified to do this? You and me? Personally, I'd say we were better qualified to do so than any of the more obvious academics on offer in universities because the latter tend to be driven by their collegiate histories and related narrowly theoretical interests, which may be toxic for good management of vocational practice.

I refer mainly to an ideal sociology core for some of the Australian Bureau of Statistics ANZSIC (Standard Industry Classifications) below:

- Electricity gas and water
- Construction
- Wholesale trade
- Retail trade
- Accommodation, cafes and restaurants
- Transport and storage
- Communication services
- Finance and insurance
- Property and business services
- Government administration and defence
- Education
- Health and community services
- Cultural and recreational services
- Personal and other services

Most Australian sociologists have probably never heard of ANZSIC. The founding sociology fathers, Weber, Marx, Durkheim and Adam Smith are certainly not to blame.

If there is no nationally accepted sociology core, there is a huge hole where a holistic, theoretical, critical and related political and scientific management practice should be. I spent 11 years at Sydney Uni trying to work out what is best delivered in sociology before I was retired. Sociology without the vocational core approach that I provide is part of the world's problems rather than a solution, because it is highly fragmented in its approaches. This means sociology is neither strong nor useful enough to deliver effective support to the holistic, UN, WHO and critical management for sustainable development analysis and direction, as it should be doing. The Open University (the best open site that I have seen), currently requires me to put my open lectures under a collection entitled Health and Lifestyle, as the most logical of the open options they provide. I have followed this, but the 'lifestyle' approach normally involves an individualistic theoretical and related market driven perspective, in my experience. This ideally needs to be openly redirected in the market and national interest, as I am trying to do with this letter to you.

Sociology is the most logical theoretical core for all UN and related competitive, international and regional management approaches in which the market and the national interest will prevail. I know, because I designed and taught my sociology core correctly, from these perspectives. Nobody currently or in recent memory in Australia has taught sociology from such an international, regional and therefore politically, managerially and academically correct and useful position, as far as I know. (I also have a letter of commendation from Dr. Gauden Galea, the Regional Adviser in Noncommunicable Diseases in the Regional Office of the Western Pacific, if that helps.)

There does not have to be only one nationally accepted sociology core forever. Why not make mine the first? If I do not quickly take up the role as a nationally approved core sociology designer and provider, many collegiate others will perhaps muddle around forever on the question of an appropriate sociology core. A committee may be the worst design approach as the result is often lacking in overall coherence. This is the problem of many text books, which must also be very confusing for students. Mechanisms for deciding curriculum properly do not exist as far as I can see. Given my past contribution to policy direction, via my qualifications, work experience, books, submissions to inquiries and articles, do I deserve the title of provider? Definitely. I am the true mistress of the sociology discipline. (Corroborating information provided on request.)

I also think much British Sociology is insufficiently pragmatic and the obvious academic Australian route will be to depend on this kind of highly academic and philosophical direction if the nexus with American mindless number crunching (or chatting to three girls, typing it all into a computer and torturing the results with the Nudist program) is ever sensibly modified. Many British Sociologists haven't adopted the market and the national interest approach and are friends with too many philosophers and lawyers.

For example, British Sociology on the discussion of risk brings us Ulrich Beck. To go from the NSW WorkCover view of risk management to the words of Ulrich Beck makes one fearful for the future. Beck's is a misguided, unclear and theoretically driven approach, from an Australian perspective in which the market and the national interest will prevail. The sociological world without Marx and Freud (of whom I purvey

substantial dollops) risks being either the world of the market, or of Russell and Wittgenstein type thinking, in that it focuses on words and their supposed cultural meanings, rather than on clarifying forces in relevant and changing economic, political, cultural and geographic contexts which have shaped events. I am sure the Chinese would understand my origins as I use the C Wright Mills 'sociological imagination', approach as a primary key to social analysis. This aims to teach tolerance through communication and increasing mutual understanding. Avoidance of the problematic is an ignorant pose.

On the other hand, do not let those in health determine what will be taught in sociology. They will give you a medical model where so many psychologists are employed they trample down any idea that people are contextualised by social structures, which need to be understood, explained and used well. At Sydney University, people who give out questionnaires and turn them into numbers normally think they are involved in science, not social science. That is a fearfully authoritarian idea, especially when combined with lawyers, which has an effect on many other practices, including ethics. It is what Foucault feared most. If medical, psychological and related education practitioners dominate then all may find themselves following many pseudo-scientific, numerical paths because of the prestige and money that rampant information technology brings.

Please do your best to get my sociology and related risk management lectures recognized as a national core in the best way you know how. (Among others, I have also raised this matter with my local member, Ms Tanya Plibersek, the Minister for Housing and for the Status of Women, who has previously informed me that she takes a keen interest in the issue.) You might also wish to discuss this with Jack Barbalet, who has come back from a British university as the Professor of a new Foundation Chair in Sociology at the University of Western Sydney. Is this an opportunity? I have also written to the Inland Education Foundation in the Faculty of Education at Charles Sturt University. However, I fear the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Toni Downes, is no longer with them. I assume this means that nobody else will feel equipped to respond. I await a reply to my letter.

Please act soon, as the National Health and Hospitals Commission is seeking submissions to help Australia's Future System and I discuss sexual health and education in the attached. I'd be happy to talk to you or anyone else about these issues before mid May 08, when I visit London and Borneo for a month. I would be delighted to demonstrate my teaching to anyone on request. The more the merrier. I am available on 9660 8716.

Best wishes
Carol O'Donnell
St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037.

**THE MARKET AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST WILL PREVAIL
(A SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO MANAGEMENT)**

Hi Nix

Yesterday while I was walking in the park a boy about eight years old ran towards me in a red t-shirt with a white maple leaf and the message, 'Pickering College Summer Camp' on it, which reminded me of you. Then in a brilliant interview on the ABC this morning Martin Ferguson said that the market and the national interest will prevail and I agree. (I have been writing in this direction since 1989 at least - you may or may not remember.)

I am writing to ask you to please try to get some of my core sociology lectures, which are attached along with information about related subject contexts, accepted as a national industry and health related sociology core. You could discuss with Martin whether to do this through the ALP Conference or in a better way. (This is the Little Britain approach.)

All the apparently right channels for currently establishing essential vocational training within any broader theoretical and related educational frameworks seem unlikely to be very fast or useful, in my opinion. In response to my inquiries about how to get my own curriculum recognised by industry, Bert Evans politely passed the buck in NSW, and so has the Institute of Public Affairs of Australia, although they kindly continue regularly to publish my articles in 'Public Administration Today'. I wrote to Bert Evans early in 2007, in his role as Chairman of the NSW Board of Vocational Education and Training just before I took the redundancy package offered by Sydney Uni on my sixtieth birthday.

My only regret was my curriculum disappeared when I left, probably to make way for a more professorial type of psychologist or related questionnaire deliverers. I have been trying to resurrect my curriculum somehow ever since, because I regard it as a necessary, holistic, health promotion, risk management and related theoretical approach to accompany the policy direction set nationally in Australia and by the United Nations (UN), the World Health Organization(WHO) and all their related sustainable development requirements. I have a PhD in Sociology from Macquarie Uni, a Master of Education from Sydney and a BA, Dip.Ed. from Queensland, in case you are wondering.

I also have a letter from John Della Bosca, NSW Minister for Education and Training (RML 08/211 A59820) which was received in the office of Verity Firth, the NSW Minister for Women, Science and Medical Research, Minister for Climate Change and the Environment and Minister for Assisting the Minister for Health (Cancer) on 20th March 2008. In response to my question about how I should get my open curriculum content considered for approval in an open, nationally accredited curriculum core, his letter first refers to the TAFE consultation paper entitled, 'TAFE NSW Doing Business in the 21st Century', released in November 2007.

I had formerly read the above paper and had no confidence in its management recommendations for reasons which are attached. I made that clear to many at the time, without getting any response to this from anyone except my local federal member, Tanya Plibersek, the Minister for Housing and for the Status of Women. Tania wrote thanking me for 'keeping her in the loop'. (Since her husband is the Managing Director of TAFE NSW and also the TAFE Director-General of Education and Training, it makes you wonder what they do in bed each night.) I have no idea what management functions underpin either of the above titles, or how they should relate to each other. His foreword

states that TAFE NSW is the best public vocational education provider in Australia and the world, but no evidence is offered in support of this, as I pointed out in the attached.

After referring to TAFE NSW Doing Business in the 21st Century discussion paper, John Della Bosca's letter goes on:

I am advised the acquisition of open curriculum content will be achieved through the sourcing of nationally endorsed training package qualifications and resources through Industry Skills Councils. Utilising national resources and working in a national framework will identify emerging labour market trends and skill shortages and facilitate enterprise workforce development initiatives.

TAFE NSW will broaden its focus from discrete courses to training package qualifications and services. This will build skill capacity and meet the requirements of the labour market and the NSW TAFE extensive customer base including industries, enterprises, individual learners, schools, universities and communities.

TAFE NSW will also continue to utilise innovative technologies, web based learning systems and resources. It will also extend distance education delivery and personalised learning services across the whole of the organization.

There will continue to be opportunities for communication and consultation and I would encourage Ms O'Donnell to make further comments through the TAFE NSW dedicated email address 21C@det.nsw.edu.au

I wrote to the above email address as soon as I received the Ministers' letters in March 08, and as yet have no acknowledgement of this, let alone a reply. In short, I have absolutely no confidence that TAFE management can proceed quickly or appropriately without strong national direction and I cannot see who is judged to be equipped to give it or who can do so. The Minister appears to have flicked the question. Please pick it up.

From my holistic perspective, like Martin Ferguson's, in which the market and the national interest will prevail, nobody appears willing or obviously in the running to take a firm position on approving a nationally accepted industry and health related sociology core. Who is qualified to do this? You and me? Personally, I'd say we were better qualified to do so than any of the more obvious academics on offer in universities because the latter tend to be driven by their collegiate histories and related narrowly theoretical interests, which may be toxic for good management of vocational practice. I refer mainly to an ideal sociology core for some of the Australian Bureau of Statistics ANZSIC (Standard Industry Classifications) below:

Electricity gas and water
Construction
Wholesale trade
Retail trade

Accommodation, cafes and restaurants
Transport and storage
Communication services
Finance and insurance
Property and business services
Government administration and defence
Education
Health and community services
Cultural and recreational services
Personal and other services

Most Australian sociologists have probably never heard of ANZSIC. The founding sociology fathers, Weber, Marx, Durkheim and Adam Smith are certainly not to blame.

If there is no nationally accepted sociology core, there is a huge hole where a holistic, theoretical, critical and related political and scientific management practice should be. I spent 11 years at Sydney Uni trying to work out what is best delivered in sociology and then they threw me out. Sociology without the vocational core approach that I provide is part of the world's problems rather than a solution, because it is highly fragmented in its approaches. This means sociology is neither strong nor useful enough to deliver effective support to the holistic, UN, WHO and critical management for sustainable development analysis and direction, as it should be doing. The Open University (the best open site that I have seen), currently requires me to put my open lectures under a collection entitled Health and Lifestyle, as the most logical of the open options they provide. I have followed this, but the 'lifestyle' approach normally involves an individualistic theoretical and related market driven perspective, in my experience. This ideally needs to be openly redirected in the market and national interest, as I am trying to do with this letter to you.

Sociology is the most logical theoretical core for all UN and related competitive, international and regional management approaches in which the market and the national interest will prevail. I know, because I designed and taught my sociology core correctly, from these perspectives. You all have read enough of my policy direction to know that this is logically my teaching direction also. Nobody currently or in recent memory in Australia has taught sociology from such an international, regional and therefore politically, managerially and academically correct and useful position, as far as I know. (I also have a letter of commendation from Dr. Gauden Galea, the Regional Adviser in Noncommunicable Diseases in the Regional Office of the Western Pacific, if that helps.)

There does not have to be only one nationally accepted sociology core forever. Why not make mine the first? Why wait? Am I not a highly recognised scholar? If not, why not? (You bastards should all know the answer to that by now, in my opinion.) If I do not quickly take up the role as a nationally approved core sociology designer and provider, collegiate others will perhaps fart around forever on this question of an appropriate sociology core. Mechanisms for deciding this properly do not exist as far as I can see. Given my past contribution to policy direction, via my qualifications, work experience, books, submissions to inquiries and articles, do I deserve the title of provider? You bet.

I also think much British Sociology is currently the pits and that the obvious academic Australian route will be to depend on this kind of highly academic and philosophical direction if the nexus with American mindless number crunching (or chatting to three girls, typing it all into a computer and torturing the results with the Nudist program) is ever sensibly modified. Many British Sociologists haven't adopted the market and the national interest approach and are friends with too many philosophers and lawyers.

For example, British Sociology on the discussion of risk brings us Ulrich Beck. To go from the NSW WorkCover view of risk management to the words of Ulrich Beck makes one afraid, very afraid. It is far too unclear, theoretically driven and the wrong approach, from an Australian perspective in which the market and the national interest will prevail. The sociological world without Marx and Freud (of whom I purvey substantial dollops) risks being either the world of the market, or of Russell and Wittgenstein type thinking, in that it focuses on words and their supposed cultural meanings, rather than on clarifying forces in relevant and changing economic, political, cultural and geographic contexts which have shaped events. I am sure the Chinese would see where I am coming from as I use the C Wright Mills 'sociological imagination', approach as a primary key to analysis.

On the other hand, do not let those in health determine what will be taught in sociology. They will give you a medical model where so many psychologists are employed they trample down any idea that people are contextualised by social structures, which need to be understood, explained and used well. At Sydney University, people who give out questionnaires and turn them into numbers normally think they are involved in science, not social science. That is a scary, Nazi idea, especially when combined with lawyers, which has an effect on many other practices, including ethics. It is exactly what Foucault feared most. If medical, psychological and related education practitioners dominate then all may find themselves following down some kind of pseudo-scientific, numerical path because of the increased prestige and money that rampant information technology brings.

Please step up to the plate and do your best to get my sociology and related risk management lectures recognized as a national core in the best way you know how. I bet that Martin will see the sense of this. I have given a similar rave to Jack Barbalet, who has come back from a British university as the Professor of a new Foundation Chair in Sociology at the University of Western Sydney. I have no idea if he will take any notice. I have also written to the Inland Education Foundation in the Faculty of Education at Charles Sturt University. However, I now discover the Dean of the Faculty, Professor Toni Downes, is no longer with them. I assume this means that many will wander round the tea room even more like headless chooks than usual. I await a reply to my letter.

Please get back to me about this as I see no reason for you not to pursue the direction outlined above and somebody sensible should do so fast, in my opinion, before the National Health and Hospitals Commission decides to contact all the usual academic suspects for advice. God knows who they are or how they will judge the outcome. I am off to Tipperary in the morning. (Actually, I've off to London somewhat later but I'd be

happy to talk to you or anyone else about these issues before mid May 08. I can also demonstrate my teaching to anyone on request. I am available on 02-9660 8716.)

Cheers

Carol

St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037.