

Letter to the Editor

Re: Energy Crisis: Reflection and Perspective

(Papers by Wilton R. Holm, in the *Journal* for February, pp. 81-83, and for March, pp. 220-223.)

Dear Sir:

The papers by Mr. Holm were a welcome and salutary warning that we are facing one of the most critical phases in man's evolution, a phase in which man must now both think and plan many generations ahead. The first pains are being felt already as the "Energy Crisis." Holm's papers are both critically detailed, and cautiously optimistic.

I join in his concern for the future, and in his optimism that, to a *limited extent*, developing technology may of itself be able to contain the environmental impact and the demand for resources by changing the "scale of need." For example, fifty years ago it required about a ton of copper per circuit mile to provide a means of electronic communication. Today, many thousands of circuits can be dealt with in terms of grams copper per mile.

It is, however, abundantly clear that technology cannot expand resources infinitely, and the nitty gritty, the crux of the problem, was only touched on in Holm's last paragraph, and that is population control, and the material expectations of standard of living, rather than quality of life. By quality of life I mean communication and concern between individuals within a protecting and stimulating environment. By standard of living I mean domestic technology, power slaves, high-speed transport, overkill in the comfort of living. The United Nations

estimate of average per capita income for world populations in developing countries is about \$200. We in the developed countries enjoy an average some twenty times that.

If the human race is to survive and is to enjoy a high quality of life, then we must develop global population policies. We must curtail our own materialistic standards of living in the developed countries, and assist development, to a certain level of material standards, in the underdeveloped countries thus producing an overall global increase in the "quality" of life.

Above all we must not consider the energy crisis, the availability of raw materials, the pollution spectre as an American problem, a British problem, a European or an African problem. We must, with Buckminster Fuller, consider all these problems as global — and realize that we now live in a physically inter-related community in a way entirely new to the human race, and that our planet is not a series of independent communities, but a network of *interdependent* communities on board "Spaceship Earth."

6 June 1974

ERIC LUCEY
Research Film Unit
University of Edinburgh
West Mains Road
Edinburgh EH9 3JN, Scotland

Engineering Committees Activities

16mm and 8mm Motion-Picture Committee Report

In the meeting of the committee on 23 April 1974, the status of several current projects was reviewed. The ballots on two documents, which are revisions of RP 1, "Recommendations for 16mm and Regular 8mm Sprocket Design," disclosed some technical errors which are being resolved and this project should be completed shortly.

The work for revising and clarifying PH22.159.1, "Specifications for Super-8 Motion-Picture Film Camera Cartridge and Camera-Cartridge Fit," and PH22.159.4, "Dimensions and Characteristics of the Take-up Core Drive for Super-8 Motion-Picture Film Camera Cartridges," has been essentially completed. It was decided that these two documents should be combined for easier use.

A draft proposal for camera aperture image for "super-16" has been submitted to the committee membership for ballot. The subcommittee under Mr. Detmers reported that "super-16" is used only for enlargement to 35mm and is likely to be used so also in the future. His group is working on a proposed recommended practice concerning enlargement ratio.

The committee viewed a rough-cut work print of a revised

"Jiffy" Test Film (RP 18). It appears that considerable more work is required on this project.

A request for super-8 magnetic sound test films at a running speed of 18 frames per second was discussed, proposed in addition to such films running at 24 frames per second. It was recognized that primary responsibility for such a development lies within the Sound Committee, and it was recommended that the Sound Committee move with great reluctance in considering standards or test films for sound reproducing speeds other than 24 frames per second.

The various proposed standards concerning enclosures and reels for 8mm film for projection were again the subject of considerable discussion. All of these proposals have been circulated again for ballot on a technical basis only. The major question has involved the appropriateness of standardization efforts for items of this sort. After a thorough review of the requirements of the SMPTE and the somewhat different requirements of ANSI, work on all of these items is being held in abeyance pending clarification and resolution of the policy problems.

No additional actions or reports were received concerning