



Editorial

Inherent in human nature is a propensity to organise. Our reasons for doing so are many and varied. Beyond companionship and comfort obtained from the proximity of others, are instrumental ends where the extra numbers permit achievements, often of remarkable magnitude. Many factors underlie our behaviour in human groups and organisations, not the least of which is the sense of encouragement and affirmation received when we are acting in concert with valued others, the security derived from belonging or being a valued member or possibly the disapproval or sanctions anticipated or applied if our intentions or actions violate group norms. There is no guarantee, however, that the culture or norms of a group will be directed to good ends, that the needs and rights of the powerless or less powerful will be protected. It is also clear that individually and collectively in our organisations our vision is often clouded, so that we fail to appreciate in the present, the longer term consequences of our own powerful organised behaviour, both action and inaction, and we might fail to see what is going on within the boundaries of other groups and organisations.

Armed with the power of hindsight, we are surprised about what we did not see or how distorted was the image we could see. I recall working on a government committee toward the end of the seventies charged with the task of examining the drug problem in the state, and how tentative were our conclusions about the degree to which the drug trade was organised. In retrospect, the clearest window to the problem appeared to be that of outreach youth workers who spoke of established pyramids, a picture conveyed by victims of these illicit conspiracies to confidants in non authority positions in a climate of relative trust. The message was hard to appreciate, especially in the absence of concrete detail which, of course, had a rough passage on the way to

the ears of authority. The necessary, healthy mistrust of anonymity, the wariness of succumbing to over reaction, the need to rely on the lead of those with authority and responsibility, the paucity of research capability, the pressure of time on workers overburdened in fields of activity which have difficulty demonstrating economic productivity or pressing political priority, all combine to cloud perceptions and limit responses. Hindsight revealed starkly the trade and traffic which were, in fact, being built at that time.

In similar vein, there are contemporary concerns here in the early nineties, one large and vexing arena relatively visible, but confusing in its configuration, is the position of young people. The collapse of the youth labour market, slippage in the capacity of post secondary and tertiary educational institutions to match the growth in demand for their services, tightening of social security and social welfare provisions in response to the burden and repeated reference to homelessness, demanding explication and refusing to go away. What is to be the vision for youth in our highly organised society? A few individuals and committees have been working on aspects of these problems, we hear of the Finn Report, the Mayer Report and the Carmichael Report, some State policy frameworks for young people and some legislation coming into force around youth (some of which sounds repressive and frightening). Do any of our readers have comment to make on these issues?

Another contemporary concern, clouded with perceptual difficulty, with which the publications committee of the bureau has been struggling in 1992 has been the subject of satanic ritual child abuse. Some material on this subject has been submitted to the journal for publication which declares the existence of satanic religious practice involving child abuse in Australia. Derived from material

