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magazine

continues
editorial

The magazine this year has presented us with quite a few difficulties in its preparation. This was perhaps due to the very high standard set at the beginning. It is our opinion, however, that unless this high standard was set then a magazine of any worth would not eventuate. We feel we have overcome these problems well enough to present to you a magazine of high merit.

During the course of preparation the idea of the format of this magazine and those of the future gradually moulded itself into one of uniqueness. By this we mean a magazine peculiar to this college, not one that tries to emulate those of other tertiary institutions, but one that is born of our own ideas and talents.

Most beneficial to this end was the separation, almost entirely, of the year book. Also the advantage of complete deletion of advertisements in this edition must not be overlooked. If these basic advantages can be retained and built upon then a firm foundation for this and future magazines has been gained.

We have tried to present to you, both in design and material, a publication of which you, as it is an expression of your opinion, are proud. We know, for our part, that it is a production that will take its place beside those of our contemporaries.

There is one more solid reason why Gryphon should be a true epitome of Caulfield Technical College, this is our future development to degree status. The only way in which most of the public, and students of other institutions, are aware of our distinction or otherwise is through student publications. Gryphon as the major student publication of the academic year must, by its very nature, present us to other colleges and the universities almost in our entirety. Due to these future developments we must all strive to change the general opinion of technical institutions to one that is fair and more truly the situation. We fervently hope that Gryphon '66 has achieved a small step toward this goal.

N.C.
So Cautec has a computer! Is that the device in A7 which will revolutionize man’s future, enslaving him or giving him more leisure than he can use? Well maybe the College computers are not up to the size and complexity of their giant industrial brothers, but their presence is symbolic of the future. They are symbolic of the fact that the Third Industrial Revolution has begun; a revolution of greater impetus and significance than those of the past.

To dream of an automated future with increased leisure and spectacular developments in technology is all very well, but before such times come, there shall be problems to solve, and obstacles to overcome. In the wake of automation, the spearhead of the Third Industrial Revolution, who shall suffer, the worker, the employer or the consumer? Will the impact on jobs and industrial structures be detrimental to present occupations? We are all interested in the answers to these, and similar questions.

the new revolution

The Roaring 60’s will go down in history as the beginning of the Era of the Third Industrial Revolution. Technologists and scientists tell us that the impact of automation will be felt extensively in the next two decades, and that the man in the street is increasingly concerned about the disrupting effect it is bound to have in the future on today’s work patterns. Already in commerce, computer installations are overtaking work assignments that once required banks of clerks. Also computers are being adapted to a myriad of tasks such as engineering design, production integration and scientific processing. In the future the limits to their application will be boundless.

Automation, through the use of the computer, is basically a continuation of industrial changes which began to sweep the world 150 years ago. The problems which faced our forefathers with the mechanization of industrial processes are basically the same as those which will face us in the future, that is, an upheaval in industry, commerce and social structure, excepting that automation is consolidating at a much faster pace.

As with the past revolutions, automation offers vast increases in productivity and living standards—in the long run. The short term adjustments, changes and unemployment present many problems, but are bound to be overcome as they have in the past.

progress

Progress, whether it be econom-
more complicated processes required by automated machines, not because industry requires fewer workers. This is the problem which confronts unions and workers today; that men without technical training will have to accept re-training schemes or loss of job status. The solution to these problems is not an easy one for the unions, but then again the problem is not without a solution.

future requirements

It is unquestionable that the Third Industrial Revolution will, as has happened in the past, bring increased prosperity and economic welfare to the people of Australia. It is also bound to bring hardship to some members of society; such is inevitable with progress. Through government action, much of the impact of automation can be lessened by fiscal and economic control. Also the government should take notice of the needs of the workers and unions to help facilitate a smooth transition to automated industry. The unions should also be prepared to help their members. (The wharf labourers' recent moves for extra annual leave in the face of automation cannot be considered as a positive step.)

Automation will certainly involve greater government control of the economy, industry and the individual as it strives to lessen the detrimental effects of automation. In a purely capitalistic society this would be frowned upon, but such government moves are true of an existing trend to a capitalistic-socialist democracy which exists in Australia today.

In preparation for the future, education seems to hold the key. We as students of technology should have no real difficulty with automation in the future, but it is the present unqualified working force which is bound to strike difficulty in the future. Here, potential lies for adjustment to the future and a vital role exists for colleges and universities in educating the young Australians so that they can face the future with confidence. It is obvious that the Government and Education Department do not share the same view as to Australia's urgent needs for education.

Under appropriate guidance from the government with regard to unemployment, education and co-operation between the trade unions, the feared consequences of automation may not seriously eventuate. Australia, if she can gain export markets, and accumulate or import capital, can use automation advantageously by having her small population controlling large automated industry

This is a great challenge to the Australian people who are no doubt resourceful enough to be able to carry out such a plan. This type of plan is ambitious, but then again so is Australia's future which is bound to yield some very interesting and challenging years ahead.
It is well known that we depend on fresh water. It is not often realized, however, what implications of this dependence are present in the modern world. Disregarding the need for hydroelectric power production, for inland navigation, and for recreation, where there is no significant withdrawal or pollution involved, the amount of fresh water used per head for domestic and urban purposes, for industry, and for agriculture is enormous. It varies greatly from country to country, of course, ranging from as low as 10 gal/day in some undeveloped areas to as much as 1,800 gal/day in the U.S.A.

Of the total world water distribution, 99 per cent is in the oceans of which 2 per cent is frozen at the Antarctic and Arctic. The remaining 1 per cent of world water is on land. This includes rivers, surface and artesian water. However, snow and ice masses constitute more than 80 per cent of the water on the land areas in the world. Domestic and urban uses account for only about 6 per cent of total consumption in the U.S.A., the remaining being shared approximately equally between industry and agriculture.

The demand for fresh water increases with the increase in population and with rising standards of living. It is predicted that the global demand for water should approximately double in the next 20 years, while natural supplies remain roughly the same.

The great promise offered by desalting sea and brackish waters does not in any way modify the general picture since desalinated water only becomes advantageous when the cost of natural supplies has already increased substantially. Therefore desalinated water for agricultural purposes appears out of the question for the time being.

Most of the Australian continent lies between the latitudes 15 degrees and 35 degrees south. This is the area where most of the world's hot deserts are situated. Although it is not the driest area in the world, the north-east of South Australia has a rainfall of less than ten inches per year. Such a large dry central area makes Australia the driest continent with an average annual rainfall of 16.5 inches. North America receives an ideal 26 inch annual rainfall. The ten largest rivers in the U.S.A. have an annual average flow of 900 million acre feet, compared with Australia with an annual average flow of only 300 million acre feet for all her rivers. Because of this inherent dryness of Australia more emphasis should be placed on effective utilization of existing supplies rather than solely on the direct approach of increasing water storage.

An Australian scientist, I. R. A McMillan, of Sydney University, has suggested the following possible future steps:

1. Conserve and use for irrigation as much surplus water as possible.
2. Develop underground resources more fully.
3. Become more efficient in the use of water for crop production.
4. Desalinate sea water on an enormous scale.
5. Develop new sources of sea foods (e.g. plankton and sea plants).
6. Develop the use of plant rather than animal proteins.

Australia must do everything possible to conserve water and to see that it is used to the best advantage. It is estimated that the run off of rain from the roof of a small house in Melbourne amounts to over 60 tons of water per annum. In the future we may need to conserve this water which at present runs to waste.

All lands have the water problem, either too little or sometimes too much, and the situation can only be improved by world-wide co-operation. Such improvements can rebalance the production of the world where at present one-quarter of the population earns over three-quarters of world income, and may lead to a situation where two-thirds of the whole population is not starving.

Bruce King
By the time I reached the door to the Public Bar it was raining quite heavily. Inside, the atmosphere was cozy, if a little noisy.

I looked around for a familiar face but found none. Moving up to the bar I sat myself down on a stool beside a young bloke. He saw me sit down and carefully slid an old cardboard Twistsies box along the floor away from my stool.

I glanced down at it. Inside this dilapidated container he had what appeared to be the biggest collection of junk I'd ever seen. I bought a beer and drank. I looked down again at the mangled box. Most of the stuff was of a type unknown to me. There was a round gadget near the top that looked like some type of meter, and beside it were a couple of glass valves—something like the ones I 'saw the last time I had the back off the old "gram" at home.

Anyway I had just finished summarizing the situation when I realized that he had been watching me pretty closely. He said to me, "What are ya looking at?" I told him I couldn't help noticing his pile of junk in the old box he had on the floor.

"A V.T.V.M.," he said, "is just the abbreviated form of saying a vacuum tube volt meter."

"Struth, come off it," I said to him, "you're getting further away from my class every time you say something. So what the hell's this V.T.V.M. gadget?"

"Well actually it's a form of voltmeter for measuring electrical quantities in circuits. They're generally fairly simple really. There's not much to them, but it'd be too hard to explain right now," he said.

"Ah, I see. It's one of those electronic devices."

"Yeah, that's right, but it's only real use is in a laboratory or workshop. All TV service men carry one with them on their rounds as a general purpose test instrument."

"Well what's all the junk in the box for? Are you going to build one out of all that rubbish?"

He looked down at the box on the floor. When he looked up again a second later he was grinning. "Half of this stuff is junk, you know." The grin vanished almost instantly and he continued, "But the rest is all right. I've just finished testing all the bits in the "lab" round at the college."

"Which college is that?" I questioned.

"Caulfield Tech.," he answered. "I'm doing my 'Dip.' in Elec. Eng. there."

I figured out that the "Dip." stood for Diploma and the other jargon was Electrical Engineering. He was only about twenty but I realized by this time that he wasn't by any means dumb. He knew what he was about. I thought I'd stun him with a bit of my knowledge. I remembered looking at some circuit diagrams in a technical journal some time back so I decided to ask him about the circuit he was using.

"What's the circuit you're using for this gadget?" I said. Forthwith he took out of one pocket a grubby piece of folded paper, which was obviously a loose leaf out of one of his notebooks. On it was a scribbled pencil drawing.

I thought he would have produced a book, but then I realized that he must have copied it out of the book on to the paper.

"What book did you use for the circuit you're using?" I asked.
"No book," he said. "I couldn't find anything I wanted in any of the books so I made it up from scratch."

"That'd be pretty hard to do, wouldn't it?" I said, rather sceptical of what he had just said.

"Not really," he answered.

"Well, what made you decide to do it on your own bat?" I asked.

My beer was getting pretty flat by this time so I drained the glass and bought two fresh glasses while he spoke.

"It's like this," he went on. "I needed a meter for working at home for testing some of the stuff I'm building. I'd been using the V.T.V.M.'s at the 'lab.' when doing electronics experiments, so I decided I'd build one instead of the ordinary voltmeter."

"So what made you design your own?" I queried.

"Simple," he answered, "I searched every circuit manual I could lay my hands on, but only one or two that I found were anything near what I wanted."

"I thought those things were all the same," I said.

"Hell no, every one of them is different from the next," he said, and as he went on he explained that every one that appears on the market is different from the next one, even those produced by the same manufacturer. He told me that the electronics manufacturer was always bringing out new models with an improved design and performance, just like the car you buy, it has been built to a price and the performance went according to that price.

Well, that was an eye-opener. I'd never thought about it that way before. I'd always imagined that a TV was a TV and that was that—you couldn't change it, as it were, to suit yourself.

"Anyway," he continued, "I've always wanted to build something up from scratch, and a V.T.V.M. seemed to be a pretty good prospect as a 'starter'."

I was about to object to that last bit, but I stopped before I opened my mouth too wide. Anyway, he knew what he was doing, so I let him go on.

"You know," he said, "there's a bit of slogging in it, but the work's not really hard. I bought the meter for thirty bob at a disposals joint in the city, and the couple valves in the box I pulled out of an old chassis I wrecked. The rest of the bits I got the same way as the valves."

"But how about the circuit?" I questioned.

"What about it?" came the reply. "Well, I mean it's pretty hard work doing it that way, isn't it?"

"Nah, not really. Just a few simple applications of Ohm's Law and junction currents. It's pretty tedious really. I mean you design a circuit and you get all those component values, and then you wake up and find that half the values you want are not even made. Great fun! So you redesign half of it again and find out the other half doesn't fit anymore."

"Sounds pretty tough," I said.

"Yeah! But it's great fun," he said.

"Reckon you must be nuts, myself," I told him.

"Not really," he answered casually, and as an afterthought added, "After all that's the sort of rubbish they'll probably dish out to me when I start out working for some company."

I said to him, "You mean as an engineer you'd be told to design some job from scratch like your V.T.V.M. thing?"

"Sure would. In fact the V.T.V.M. would probably be chicken feed."

After he'd said this I felt a certain sympathy for him. Up till then I'd always had the impression that engineers were a rather lazy bunch, but after listening to Steve for the last ten minutes or so, I reckoned that engineers were all right.

It was half-past six by this time, so I had to push off. I shook his hand and bought him another beer to pay for the lesson.

As I walked I kept wishing him luck. Hell. I hope the thing works after all that.

Paul Blackburn
What is the Technical College—a second rate university stepping stone or an advanced technical school or high school? To a certain extent the role of the technical college must tend towards the latter—due mainly to the fact that it is under the thumb of the Education Department. But does this necessarily mean that the student must not be able to express himself or recognize the fact that there is a world outside the school? A world which should be recognized whilst the student is at school.

Many people say that all students can never be made to read books, attend plays, debate an issue, think for themselves. But is there scope for the development of such things at a technical college? At universities drama clubs, music clubs, political clubs, debating societies and social clubs attached to each faculty are formed by students interested to aid student interest. This attitude to student life does not even get off the ground at a technical college—particularly a suburban one—because the college has not the atmosphere of a tertiary institution. Admittedly a university has a certain status in the community and as yet a technical college has not achieved this status as a tertiary institution. But how can this status be achieved when in the majority of cases students that obtain a diploma have not a good enough general education behind them to enable them to conduct a conversation on anything other than machines, electronics, structures or chemistry.

A certain amount of this lack of depth towards a general education must in part be attributed to the technical school curriculum and in part to the individual himself. The individual to a certain extent cannot be changed in his outlook to the world around him, with regard to general knowledge and a leaning towards the fine arts, but he can be moulded and steered in this direction by his school subjects.

The technical school has been in the past a "working man's school". If a boy was skilled with his hands it was "the tech. for him". But times have changed and so is it necessary for only technical subjects to be taught apart from Social Studies and English right up to the end of the fourth year? Why not have the same course for high schools and technical schools right up to the end of third year? In fact, do not have technical schools until fourth year in which a certain bias towards technical subjects could be maintained. This would mean that the student would have a general education behind him in order that he
future, are promoted by the so-called "public spirited personages" who vent their own particular expressionism concerning any situation—political or social—in protest marches, protest rallies, protest sit-ins, teach-ins. To be "one of the mob"—to be an "in" person one has to attend all these functions. To gain what? Is an education to be achieved by looking at the world and a book with covers—not just figures and diagrams?

Universities presumably have intelligent students attending them. One could say that the university had an almost exclusive copyright on intellectualism in a rising undercurrent of student interest in what before now has meant little in the way of practicalities to a student trying to be a student.

What makes one wonder is what happens to the student who goes to all the protests—the marches, rallies, sit-ins, teach-ins, and who in the outcome is very aware of social and political situations and standards in the world? But who fails to achieve public recognition in the form of his qualification—his piece of paper?

Is he educated or just a nothing who fades into the background and is lost from view forever? How does one define an educated person?

In a world of rising intellectualism, education is becoming a password to social acceptance in the community. Does this occur only at a university, or can it happen at a technical college? It probably will never approach a status in this field until a humanity diploma is instituted at the technical college. Until this happens one assumes that all the literary merit to be obtained in a technical college will come from an art faculty—an assumption which again depends on the individual.
Oxford Dictionary—"Desire" (noun) . . . "unsatisfied appetite, longing, wish, craving, request . . ."

Desires are necessary. Without them there would be no excitement in life and our world would not have progressed if man had not had any "unsatisfied appetites".

Man has the desire to CREATE. He creates buildings to house other men and the things they have created. Man desires to create new things, better things, better than any other man has built. He creates machines so that he can travel.

Man has the desire to MOVE. He does not want to always remain exactly where he lives during the early part of his life. He must see other places, so that he can meet other people and learn some of their desires. The desire to THINK things over, and to make discoveries, has usually led man to better his position in the world. It often leads to discarding the old and welcoming the new.

Many people have a desire for POWER. Some want power over other people, and strive to become the leader of a business, or to become a dictator of a nation. Others desire power over machines, and drive or fly faster and faster. Still others desire to have power over nature, so these men dive submarines deeper or fly rocket-ships higher, although nature actually is more powerful than the greatest man.

A desire for SUCCESS allows a mathematician to attempt an as yet unsolved problem, a "pop group" to better their act, or an author to write an outstanding novel.

Man has the desire to PROTECT and so he builds a high wall, real or imaginary, around his belongings. He does not want anything that is his to be taken away, so he keeps things for himself.

SEXUAL desire, although often over-publicized, is necessary if a man and his wife are to obtain the maximum benefit from the wonderful, unique state of marriage. But one must control himself (and herself) before hearing those wedding bells. Sexual desire is like fire, you must be the master or a tragedy will result.

The desire to LOVE, not to be confused with the previous example, should exist in everyone. Unfortunately it does not. The desire to love your girlfriend or wife, family and relatives, neighbours, workmates and even strangers; each with the "appropriate type of love", makes this world a wonderful place to live in.

Man’s desire to FIGHT ensures that he can succeed and protect. He may fight physically if his girlfriend is attacked, or his nation invaded. He may fight by words in order to win a crucial argument. He may fight mentally to overcome his worries.

Man has a desire to BELIEVE. He needs a God to bring peace to his mortal mind. An individual will vote for a specific political party because he believes what its members believe. He will trust a bus driver, because man wants to think he can enjoy safe journeys from place to place.

Man’s desire to LIVE enables him to fight for his life, and to make the most of his surroundings. He will always look forward, never back.

Yes, desires are fundamentally necessary.
not a worry
noel boman

A wisp of hair,
A breath of wind
The orange-yellow leaves fall gently,
They fall softly to the green damp ground.
Natural parachutes slowly spiral
Like a beautiful lady treading gracefully
Down a spiral staircase in the air
Clad in a ball gown of the active spectrum
Of fire-like emotions—colour.
Red-orange-yellow flakes clash with delight
On the deep bottle green grass
A splash of sun forces brutally through the autumn clouds,
Falls rapidly on the damp ground.
Flashes, flicks on to these fire-like emblems of grace. Diamond glimmer on the cool grass tips
As dew refracts the weak rays
Into all shades that blend into my heart
To leave me breathless,
A pawn in the great expanse of worlds,
To obey willingly to the right cause,
To forward all my efforts to fulfilment,
A warm head of light;
Sun, lights, brightens my eyes sealed
by dark lashes
Against some brute harshness of this world
I am now awake from this silent dream
Brought back into reality cruelly
By some probing fingers
So now I can’t sleep
Just rest back and think
About leaves that have no mind.
What is the future going to hold for us? This question is one which everybody asks himself at least once in his lifetime. A reasonable question, perhaps, as it possibly not only entails our physical existence, but maybe even further than that. A positive attitude toward the future (but not necessarily an optimistic one) is needed so that we know that our children will receive a clean and full lifetime.

Many theories contained in books and periodicals have been published about the year 2000 and beyond, but I wonder how many of these "philosophical" writers honestly believe in what they have written? I would say a very few. After all a wide market is open for this type of literature due to the number of gullible people around who will buy almost anything, and if a profit can be made why not exploit these people? The more the people buy, the more the writers will write, forming an endless chain. The story they pervert can, by a little rational investigation, be brought down and paralleled with any seventh rate western or adventure story. So although the machines, speech and clothing may be new and sometimes quite imaginative, the story which is
loosely woven among these materials has not changed greatly in the past few years. I am referring here mainly to the current line of science fiction writers. The authors of the past ten or twenty years started the "craze". Although they did have fresh ideas to start the ball rolling, and for this I do give them some credit, I feel that more worthwhile plots can be found for these experts on English prose, for although the story might be very drab and commonplace, the grammar and sentence construction is usually above average.

Perhaps I am being very critical of only a certain aspect of this literature, however there are a few of these "future" stories which have become very notable in past years. To take just one example, I will examine George Orwell's satire "1984" (Penguin 972, 55c).

In this novel, Orwell dispenses with the common stereotype future of the current range of "S.F." writers, namely "atomic cars and death ray guns" which the latter use in an attempt to keep their readers enthralled.

Orwell shows great imagination in his characteristic method of presenting an idea and mixing it, unfortunately, with a rather weak story at times. The ideas he puts forward deserve praise above its vices. He concentrates mainly on discussing the world governments of 1984, particularly in England, or Oceania in the book.

He satirizes two main events under severe controversy around 1948. These are Stalinist Russia and the Chinese notorious "brain-washing". Orwell highly exaggerates these two ideas and uses them as the themes in his book. Another interesting point he presents is the Government's complete control of all the distributed literature and records. The method of expressing these ideas in a very stimulating and moving way gives to the reader a feeling of utter helplessness and meekness if he was living in this imaginative community. A satire is meant to be a lighter view of a serious event, but to me this is not altogether the case in "1984" as parts of the novel are quite frightening when one secretly considers the prospect that the story, in many years hence, could eventuate. If we accept the book in the way that Orwell intended it to be taken, then a fascinating satire is obtainable. The only debasing part of the book is the crude sex relationships between the leading character and his lover. A great number of seventh rate writers fall back on to this type of thing to arouse interest in a rather dull plot. Orwell's treating of it is the only part which lowers the standard of an otherwise fine novel.

The world will end tomorrow! How often have we seen this on posters and billboards, written usually by bearded, robed, so-called intellectuals? Most people simply ignore these "philosophers" as they should be, if thought about at all, regard them as a joke. It is just as well too, for if serious thought was paid, especially now that we are in the Atomic Age, then everyone would be expecting it to happen and if a person in charge of the weapons got nervous, his finger could be all that is needed for the proclamation to eventuate. If the time comes when these eccentrics are given the privilege of being examined, then the world will be full of idiots, and do idiots deserve to live tomorrow?

The future: a term holding mystery and suspense for all eternity. It never comes yet it is always so close that we could reach out and touch it had we so the desire.
I sit in a church. No, not a church—a cathedral. What does it matter? I have always thought it does not matter where one prays—a church is a building. Only a building. I was wrong. A church is an atmosphere. I could pray here. Yet it frightens me. Why? Because I am not a Christian? My religion is called Christianity, yet it is unlike the religion of any other person. Surely I am not alone in this.

God. Who is He? Do I believe in Him? No. No. I can't. He is not real. He does not exist. How can I believe in something I cannot see or touch? Yet there is something intangible. He is there. Who? By what name is He called? Must I say God—Jesus—Christ? I cannot. I feel hypocritical thus, because I cannot believe. Faith is the word. God—what you call God—is my Faith. It is not a person. It cannot be seen. Yet it exists. It must be there, for without Faith how can we exist? How can we exist? How can we say God exists and looks over us? Are we so stupid that we allow ourselves to kill each other? Thou shalt not kill. Love thy neighbour. Christianity. God. Why? How?

In front of me—an archway, almost Eastern in character. On the archway—stars. They could almost be the Star of David. Almost Jewish. It feels Jewish. To me. How can we criticize them? The word itself sounds condemning. Does “Christian” sound equally ugly to them? How can we hate Jews—or Hindus—or Buddhists? How? They have only a faith like that of our own. They believe. It is only a faith—something to hold, something to believe in. We call it God. He has other names. Others present faith in a statue. We have none. Does a tangible figure make the intangible faith any less real? It cannot. They believe. We believe. Different names, but surely they are the same. The laws of religion differ. Does it matter
whether we pray in a church, a cathedral, a temple, a synagogue? No. It cannot matter. It must not matter. Love thy neighbour. Our commandment. One of the Christian commandments. The Jewish religion reveals a similar one. They cannot be so different. No religion can be so different, so how can we condemn others because they call their faith by a different name? Surely it is we who are wrong. A world religion is no answer. What could it be? Christianity because it is already so widespread and so superior? No. There must be different faiths. My religion is different to that of any other Christian. Yet I am grouped under the expansive heading of Protestant or Christian. Surely the religion of every person must differ from that of his neighbour. Why not? Each is an individual. He cannot and must not conform to set ideas to such a degree that he becomes a mechanized, indoctrinated, non-thinking man. Yet it is happening. And if we continue thus, it must happen to all those who at least ostensibly accept religion as an important part of their lives.

Tolerance. Does it exist? Does it really exist? It must of necessity be present to some extent in every man. But as an element of the life of man in general? We see now that it cannot. Look around. All around. Death. Destruction. Wars. Wars. Hate. Kill. Kill. Kill all those who do not agree with your own ideas. Satisfy your lust. But can it be so easily satisfied? It cannot be. By protecting your own religion you are desecrating it. You are pulling it apart until it means nothing but an imaginary symbol of righteousness. Righteousness! Have they not their own righteousness? Are they not as justified as we are? Or more justified than we are? Think. Think hard—about yourself. About what you believe. Talk about religion. Any answers? No. There can be none. You will discover differences between your own ideas and those of your friends or your parents. It must be so. How could we live if our ideas were identical? There must be differences. So, gradually, these differences are stretched to embrace another sect. Then another, further divorced from our own ideas. One step at a time, we can encompass other religions, other beliefs. And if it works thus for Christianity, then surely it must work for other religions. With their own beliefs as a centre of all, they must eventually be able to bring themselves to embrace first branches of their own religion, then others. And Christianity must be included. So we are not all so different. Yet we cannot be tolerant. Why must there be those who condemn any religion not their own? And some are so strong that they can incite the masses to act. Kill. Kill those who do not believe as we do. Surely God does not say that. He is not God. He is Faith. And He is not ours. Not ours alone. He belongs to every one who cares enough to think and to believe in anything.

So many millions of people. Each one so different. Yet they all have a faith. Religion. A personal faith. Something private, yet to be shared with others in a meeting place. A church. Something unexplainable. Religion. What can I say? What must I say? Some feel so much about their own faith that they feel a compulsion to tell others. But what can they say? What can they tell others about something which exists only in the mind and which exists in a different way for every man? How can they feel sufficiently justified in attempting to convert others to their own way of thinking? How can we exactly describe our thoughts. And how can we be assured of an exact understanding by others? How can others think the same way? They cannot. Individuality. It must be present. It must dominate. Narrow mindedness. It exists. It has existed always. It will always. Tolerance can be achieved only by evolution in thought. Ages yet. Until then we shall remain as now. Intolerant, narrow in thought, self-righteous in attitude. Condemnation. Always condemnation, either spoken or thought—about religion which is, after all, the dominant feature in our lives. Whether or not we call it religion. It exists in a faith. In a faith exactly shared by no other person. Personal faith. Religion.
Calvin once said that the human mind is a permanent factory of idols. And what is an "idol"? As Luther put it, "Trust and faith of the heart alone make both God and idol... Whatever then the heart clings to and relies upon, that is properly thy God." “For where your treasure is”—where the centre of your existence is, whatever is most important in life for you, that which gives meaning, hope, order, and direction to your life—“there will your heart be also” (MATTHEW 6:21). This means that everyone has some kind of "god" or "faith" or "belief"; there are no "atheists"—a word never found in the Bible. Trying to live without a god, without some kind of ultimate concern in life, is like trying to play a baseball game without a home plate—it cannot be done. So all of us have some one thing we cling to, some joy above all others, some "cause" that causes us to go on living in the particular way we live.

Furthermore, it is possible to have only one "god" at a time, only one supreme value—unless of course one is genuinely "two", a real "dual personality". Secondary values can be many, but "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon" (MATTHEW 6:24).

If mankind be itself God, the appearance of the idol is then inevitable. And so it is that the original sinfulness of men usually manifests itself, is garnered up, comes to a head in a more or less clearly defined idolatry of one kind or another. As far as the Bible is concerned there are only two kinds of gods available to man—the real one and the phony one, but there are multitudinous variations of the phony God, ranging from the intellectually sublime to the childly ridi-

"For although there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth—as indeed there are many 'gods' and many 'lords'—yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist.” I CORINTHIANS 8: 5-6.
culous—and vice versa. All phony gods, however, have one thing in common: they kill your soul to worship one of them. It is your god, you love it, you are a slave to it, and you will stick with it to the bitter end come hell or high water.

But this is unfortunate. For in the Biblical view of idolatry the end necessarily will be bitter, and indeed will involve a type of hell, as all phony gods inevitably will prove to be the cruelest possible taskmasters. This is all St. Paul meant when he said, “the wages of sin is death” (ROMANS 6: 23). “Sin” for St. Paul meant no more than worshipping any other god than the God who is met only in and through Jesus Christ. And by “death” Paul did not mean physical death; but he meant a type of spiritual death, a living death, a fate worse than death, a death which man can actually experience as no less than hell during his lifetime, and hence a death from which man can actually be “saved” here and now. For the wages of sin is death—now.

But though the Bible clearly shows man his true spiritual condition — death because of idolatry, it does not merely condemn and then offer no solution.

For as “the wages of sin is death” so “the free gift of God” is “eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord”. And this offer of God’s forgiveness does not come to us with any attached strings of our own status or personality or moral life.

It is “By God’s undeserved favour that we are saved through faith; not by works lest any man should boast” (EPHESIANS 2: 8-9).

And so the gift of eternal life is freely offered to all men and it is an offer which will be open up to the last second of our life here on earth. Not that this provides any grounds at all for putting off the time of getting right with God until some more convenient date: For the Bible clearly says “Boast not thyself of tomorrow, for those knowest not what a day may bring forth”, and again “God is not slack concerning His promise, but long suffering to all men; not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentence.”

In the words of the hymn writer:

What will you do with Jesus, neutral you cannot be!
One day your heart will be asking:
“What will He do with me?”
Russel Lewis-Nicholson
I do not mean to say that youth’s uncertainties are new, merely that they have been accentuated by the age we live in and brought into stark relief by the combination of scientific advancement and social pressures of today.

The world today is not in a state of stability. We have lived with the threat of nuclear war for so long that we accept it. But although we don’t consciously think of it, somewhere in our subconscious still lurks the thought that the world could end tomorrow.

As well as this we have the pressing population problems which although don’t threaten us with the prospect of death as does the bomb, threaten us with something nearly as bad, too much life. Birth control seems to be a solution, but I can never free the nagging thought from my mind that some Asian countries will never follow the example of Japan.

These are adult problems and adults are the ones to solve them, yet no one is quite sure that they can be solved, not even the experts of the various sciences.

So a nagging uncertainty remains and this permeates its way through till it reaches the youth who wonder if they can solve the problems when it becomes their time to do so or indeed if they will do as well.

As well as these distant problems of how they will cope with adulthood, of which these two previous examples are only a small part, youth has its immediate problems. Schooling is perhaps the most pressing. The emphasis nowadays is on degrees, diplomas and all the paraphernalia of education.

Although there is no shortage of jobs you must have the qualifications and to do this you must pass the stiff exams and survive the grind of hard work with only the promise of a distant reward years ahead.

The youth of today is immediately conscious of two things. The first is that he or she must do well at school, for the number of jobs for people without qualifications of some sort are decreasing every day. The second is that they have problems to face when they grow up, both of social position related to their earning power and as a citizen with responsibility towards such problems as the population explosion.

It is perhaps technically incorrect to say that these things are consciously known or are even credible to youth but in general they are what motivates his or her actions. Sometimes social position or lack of it comes before school or perhaps even takes the place of school, but whatever the variation it adds up to the same thing; some kind of uncertainty or pressure.

Now there is nothing wrong with this momentary escape. In fact, it is good to let off steam and relax and no human can go on without some sort of pleasure, but when we have the disagreeable situation of people being individualistic, as they call it, by nonconforming, we have a contradiction. For these people, be
Youth and Society

The uncertainties... they mods or sharpies or anything else, are conforming to a pattern. They say that they are protesting, but what they are doing is deluding themselves into believing that they are great rebels. In fact, it takes a great deal more courage to conform to your parents' ideas and have a short haircut and be treated with derision by your contemporaries than to defy your parents and conform to the general code and have long hair.

Youth's high-powered search for self-expression has created a group which does in fact conform to itself even though it purports to defy society and we find as an example that non-drinkers are treated with derision by their mates, even though all of them may be under the legal age at which one is allowed to drink in an hotel. Not only must you drink, which is fair enough, but unless you get drunk you're just not in the race.

Now it is very easy to moralize, but in fact what I am trying to show is that the cult of conformism to some decided code of social behaviour, preferably as outlandish as possible, is a sick thing. This vicious circle only drags its exponents in tighter and tighter till it does in fact mar and break young lives apart. The orgies of seventeen only too certainly become the nightmares of thirty-four.

Sooner or later youth has to take up the standards it abandoned and uphold them. If it does not it is outside society and its members become drunks, perverts, drug addicts or criminals.

Now when youth does return to society it must either forget the insane teenage acts in a rather hypocritical way or let them lie inside and tear it apart mentally. Most people can rationalize their mistakes and that is what you would have to do with the follies of youth or suffer some mental disease.

It is therefore my contention that youth should overcome its problems in a sane and reasonable way. By all means write letters to the editor, stand on a soap box or wear long hair or dance in a queer fashion, but please don't assassinate someone or kill or maim in anger, don't throw yourself under a horse or indulge in immoral activities or have the gall to call yourself progressive.

Youth's uncertainties should be solved in a reasonable and logical manner, not by getting drunk or driving a car fast. I must say in all fairness that I believe that the prominent youth is that one which is in the minority, that is to say, the bad one. Unfortunately the lunatic fringe are often only too predominant.

If you don't believe that pressure caused by uncertainty causes youth to do foolish things then perhaps you're rationalizing or I'm not typical, or both.

It must also be said that this is a simplification and there are many side turnings and different paths to take. However, I believe that you will arrive at the same conclusions as I have, although it may take you a little longer.

I also hope that youth will never be pitied for its deficiencies but that an attempt will be made to understand its precarious position caught somewhere between the innocence of a child and the cynicism of an adult.
IDENTIKIT

This is your own partially compiled IDENTIKIT inserted by THE CAUTEC CRIMINAL SOCIETY to test your perception in searching for well-known criminals. This character is a well-known local identity and should present no problems to homicide fans.
These feelings are shared by thousands of other twenty-year-olds in each of the half-yearly "draws", but this is little consolation. What does one think of when one fills in the papers, will one be called up, if so what does it mean, what does one's family think, or one's girl or one's employer, what about one's career, will one be sent to Vietnam, will one collect a belly full of lead, what is this communist aggression? These are a few of the questions that make conscription the most contentious issue in our society (decadent?) today. Even to the extent that the opposition party is prepared to contest the federal elections over it.

Thus many objective views have been expressed and many more opinions will be voiced, for no matter how many people protest there are just as many prepared to show why their opinions conflict. So we have two sides to a story which even "Peanuts" finds dour and that's not particularly funny.

Because conscription is consanguineous with war it can be discussed from two angles, moral and political implications. There is, however, the other consideration that basically we are all pacifists and reject any form of violence. I think they call this military cowardice when related to war.

Firstly, what is the moral dilemma created by conscription. To me this is simple; how can it be morally right to force someone, against his wishes, to participate in an action which is basically against world opinion and not let him have a say in it; that is, the undeclared war in Vietnam? At this point one must concede that conscription is a side effect of Australia's involvement in South-East Asia. This becomes apparent when you realize that after Mr. Humphrey's visit to Australia, our task force in Vietnam was immediately stepped up. To supplement this increase the government has had to revert to the old duress of conscription.

"So what's wrong with conscription?" you may very well ask. "All nations have a form of compulsory military service." At first it would seem a feasible means to fight the undeclared communist aggression except for one point: it's not a fair means. (The communist aggres-
conscription

tom jack

Conscription takes the form of a Viet-Cong who is sneaky, horrible and bitter on the world because he's underfed. He also stands about five feet tall and I've heard that they even have twenty-year-olds in their army which is surprising seeing the prime military age of the V.C. is fifteen. We couldn't have fifteen-year-olds in our armies because we have to go to school until sixteen.)

As I have said before there are many moral issues attached to conscription. What can a prospective conscript do? He has no vote, although the government is debating whether or not the voting age should be lowered to eighteen years for males. The biggest opposition to this proposal comes from the disbelievers in human nature. (To think that a prospective conscript would cast a vote on the conscription issue only is absurd. With voting also comes the power to think. Why everybody knows you're a man when you start voting!) But as it stands he can't vote, so what does he do—Protest! No he can't protest because its undignified and only students and other no-hopers protest by publicly demonstrating. Besides, as a prominent politician, retired, said as he ripped up a placard, "You young Commies, only communists and union officials protest like this." And then the lady threw the marbles at Mr. Holt which must have been an act of communist aggression. (Funny though, for I was of the opinion that freedom of speech is one of our democratic principles.)

He can't reneg by not registering because a severe fine and gaol term follow. And he still is called up, so this action is pointless. He could register as a conscientious objector (passive resister) but the seriousness entailed turns potential objectors away. To achieve exemption on these grounds one must be of the highest religious order which is a kick in the head for all heathens. To object on moral grounds seems easy, seeing most of us do honestly morally disagree with conscription. However, in this instance it's not enough to just object. One must be thoroughly "brainwashed" in order to put the right answers before the court. Chances are that one makes a fool of oneself as well as carrying the C.O. label for the rest of one's life. (The recommendation here is that if the slightest bit of doubt exists, then don't even consider it.)

So in order to miss call-up there are only two alternatives left. Both are beyond the financial reach of most of us, but some may find them suitable. The first is to leave the country before registering and return ten (or more) years later thus dodging the ballot. The second is to seek matrimonial partnership, which is slightly longer than ten years. (A third alternative exists but is limited to Surfies. By extensive paddling one can develop "knots" on the insteps which exempts one from wearing boots, and consequently marching.)

It can be seen from these observations that no serious or realistic way is left open for a twenty-year-old to express his disapproval. It follows that he is like the proverbial shag on a rock. Many might inquire as to why one would give up a chance to serve one's country. This could be answered in two ways: firstly, each of us is, in some small way, already serving the country, if not patriotically then certainly economically. Also, the war in Vietnam is an undeclared one, so the compatriotic call is not there. Secondly, the "digger spirit" has been dying since the finish of World War I and is just about expired. This is a new era of history and circumstances don't call for a nation of heroic young men to die. What is twenty-nine
WHY CONSCRIPTION?

The political implications of the conscription issue are not so straightforward. The government had to introduce a form of compulsory military service after its stepped-up recruiting campaign failed. Such slogans as “Full adult pay at 17” weren’t good enough. There are plenty of free souls who would take an army career provided that the “adult” pay was equivalent to that earned in industry. It has been said that Sir Robert Menzies created the Snow Ball and left the fields before it started rolling, but whether he was the man or somebody else, the inevitable political deadlock could not have been mastered. (While on the subject, no article would be complete without mention of this certain member of our society. His influence over the last fifteen years has been strong and conscription is one of many born of his political outlook. Though I prefer to think of him as a statesman rather than a politician. So it’s not with malice I say this—that if I had to choose between receiving a .303 and a thistle, the choice would be simple.)

The Labor Party is using this issue for its federal election campaign although I don’t think it will be the deciding issue. Anyway, the Government will have to answer certain embarrassing questions in relation to its policies. The basis of the Government’s policy on Vietnam stems from SEATO and American pressures. (Not the pressure of the Labor Party or even the people of Australia.) Now I’m not going to attack the United States’ overseas policies for there are enough doing so at the present. In fact, I often wonder what state the world would be in if the Americans, finally sickened of the smaller nations quarrelling, withdrew their thousands of troops from the corners of the globe. The results of this, if it ever occurred, would be staggering to say the least.

But the fact is that the SEATO pact has made conscription necessary and as a result other pressure groups within Australia have been able to harness this obligation and make it work for them. Such an example is the recent oil finds off Victoria, where overseas finance took control. Similarly, Britain’s Trade Bill falls to our detriment partly because it opposes the overall picture of Vietnam.

The tragedy is that the incidence of conscription would have occurred no matter what government was in power, and so the way this government has gone about it is confusing. Firstly, it said that the ballot results would be made public, then they weren’t. Conscripts would not be used in war zones, then they were. If they failed to register they would be automatically called up. But in the first registration period they weren’t called up, or even fined. And so it goes on, the complete catastrophe and mishandling of the issue. Cases such as a trainee being called up while another with his birthday on the same date being deferred. A volunteer to the regular army being refused on medi-
ttractive because of the length of enlistment and so most of us would prefer to take the chance of being balloted out. (At the present this chance stands at about six out of every ten which is good odds if you're the gambling type. However, I find the stakes too high for my wheel of fortune.)

Two years is too long to serve because in those two years one's career progresses without one. Nobody could be expected to regain that lost time and this shows the injustice of conscription when only the chosen few have to forfeit. The feelings of family and friends during this period must reach the points of mortification. (Maybe the easiest way out is quick change of sex, although even that's not a certainty these days.)

The whole issue is complicated and very tiring. So many points on the Vietnam issue alone are unanswerable. Such questions as Australia's part in South Vietnam; the number of desertions in the South Vietnam army. Is this war a civil war? What are the consequences of Soviet backing? What of the U.S. bombing of Hanoi? All these probing thoughts only tend to cloud the issue even further.

One thing is clear, however. This issue is worth fighting and every little part of it should be brought out into the open. And even if a twenty-year-old misses call-up he shouldn't forget it, for it is only by his young and objective view that the problem will be solved. We are undergoing a change in morals and at the same time a change in political and economic outlook. It is therefore essential that these conscripts as well as the other young people of the nation think about this issue and others that affect our world. Whether the answer lies in expressing one's thoughts by participating in the actions of groups (such as Youth Campaign Against Conscription, Save Our Sons Movement) or if one prefers to take the issue to the ballot box is the privilege of the individual. And this is more than those conscripted were allowed to do.

So there it is, a complicated subject that leaves bitter tastes in the mouths of those concerned; it can best be described as "poor" (i.e. the greatest catastrophe).
This painting, like most, can be analysed in terms of pure design. That is to say, composition, aesthetic values, invented images. However, when one examines the metaphysics of the painting it can only be explained in terms of symbolism expressed through visual images. The essence of this particular painting brought down to simple factors is "a balance of opposites", of good and evil, of light and dark, of love and hate. Essentially the meaning of the painting can only become clear to the viewer by analysis and invocation of emotion.
beauty

"As well as the obvious essentials for life, human beings need beauty in some form—music or art, nature or literature."

This statement is not wholly correct as I feel that there must be many people in this world who feel no need for the beauty that can be obtained in the arts or from nature. These people are too busy making money, an end in itself. However, I must add that these people are leading very incomplete lives.

To me it seems folly to live without some appreciation of the beauty around us. To live from day to day gathering the material things of life without any enjoyment of things about us seems to me to be a futile way of spending one's life. To me it seems that without this appreciation life would hardly be worth living. If we can see no beauty around us, we might as well be dead. Beauty is something that gives a will to go on living. It is not something that is incidental to life—or at least, it should not be.

Life without beauty is death and for this reason those who have no appreciation of beauty are dead in that they are not living a full life. Beauty, I feel, should be the ultimate aim of everyone, not in attaining it but in its appreciation. To attain beauty is not to attain perfection as there can be beauty in things that are far from perfect. The Greeks attained perfection in the Hellenistic period which is considered to constitute the decline of Greek art for "perfection implies immobility, and immobility, death". Therefore I think it can be seen that perfection and beauty are two separate things, both are attainable, one implying death, the other life. Beauty is the appreciation of the soaring of a bird, the sweep of a curve or the clarion of bells, for these there is no set standard of perfection, yet they are still beautiful.

An appreciation of beauty is essential for a full life, without it life would be empty and meaningless. Man must have something to live for apart from just the sake of living. Beauty can be found in all things, in the muscular back of the navvy digging his trench, in the sweep of the golfer as he hits his ball. Many things that appear ugly at first sight such as Goya's caricatures contain elements of beauty raising them from the commonplace. These things can be found if looked for but many people fail to look, going through life oblivious of the beauty that surrounds them. They are interested only in what "counts". That new car or the holiday to the beach and they are too busy making money so that they can "enjoy" themselves, forgetting or perhaps never knowing in the first place what an important part in life beauty plays.
April 1, 1966.

Mr. Robert J. Mullen,
26 Myers Parade,
MELBOURNE, C.l.

Dear Sir,

I have read your letter in which you have stated that secretaries and stenographers are a dying race owing to the introduction of office machinery.

In modern industry it is most beneficial for any organization to employ competent stenographers and secretaries. A secretary is valuable to her manager as she is able to supply him with facts and information which he may be ignorant of, and in case of faulty grammar she may correct the mistake. She is usually more familiar with letter setting out, and with new methods of producing forms and circulars, since she has studied these items in detail.

The declining number of office workers is mainly in the field of general office workers such as filing and adding clerks. For example several workers in one field have been replaced by one person who is now sufficient to control the machines. More and more firms are introducing modern machinery and the number of general office workers shall be reduced even more. But this does not mean that any fewer secretaries or stenographers will be employed. On the contrary these ladies will now play a more important part in the office because their creative ability will serve to the credit of the firm. A machine is able to carry on the routine tasks but not the psychological aspect of the firm which is involved.

When a client calls at an office or firm the impression is more friendly when he is greeted by an attractive and cheerful secretary instead of computers lined along the wall. A secretary can create and maintain the goodwill of the company since the customers are received by her. Therefore such favourable impressions helps the business to prosper.

A capable secretary or stenographer may tactfully train her employer in acquiring good habits such as keeping his appointments and see that important work is given priority and not overlooked. Helpful suggestions and good initiative will save the employer's time which may be spent on other useful tasks.

I hope my reasons will convince you that secretaries and stenographers are not only office decorations but are important in carrying on the functions of the business.

Yours faithfully,

(Mrs.) J. Papp.
the runner

He sat at his desk as if chained there, a mountain of papers confronting him. Virtually a prisoner. He was as Prometheus aching to be free. Every paper he put pen to tore something out of him, not from his liver but from his heart. He hated his work, walled in as though in a prison, struggling against the elements to keep alive. He seemed a beaten soul but deep inside a persistent fire kept burning, urging him to struggle on.

Only to be free of this seemingly eternal damnation, only to be rescued, he was not a lump of clay to be pushed around, moulded to his tormentor’s wishes. No by God! He would mould himself, but only to be free. He would not be as Sisyphus condemned to rolling a rock up a hill for eternity, only to have it roll down again at dusk. He would succeed!

He moved agonizingly on towards the end of the day. His body ached to be free and unlettered, moving free with the wind, running, occupying a world of which he was master, not slave. He dreamed of his winged feet carrying him with the speed of the wind like Hermes, of the ground flashing under his feet, the trees moving swiftly passed and out of existence. He had an ideal to strive for and to fulfil, he would run; run with the best.

He dreamed of running with the Gods. But first he would have to be free. The dragging movements of the office clock dragged slowly on towards his release. The siren at five o’clock released him like a spring uncoiling, snapping into an awakening. He could feel the life throbbing through his hitherto cramped limbs. He was alive again, released from his stifling confines.

Neville Crawford