

# EDITORIAL

When I was about to go to press with the first volume of this journal, a wise friend commented that it was good to hear that this new venture was 'ready to go' but he added that it was the second volume I should really worry about, not the first one. So often, he pointed out, a new journal will start out well, only to produce a disappointing second volume. I took these words to heart and I hope that this second volume will prove him wrong.

In putting together this volume, I have sought material from as wide a geographical area and from as wide a selection of relevant subject matter as I could. The papers range from northern Queensland to southern Tasmania and across into the Northern Territory but there is a disproportionate amount of New South Wales material and I am unhappy about not finding suitable papers from South Australia, Western Australia, or even Victoria. Perhaps this can be remedied in future volumes, just as I hope to include rather more material on overseas subjects than the two reviews of New Zealand books that appear in this volume.

The papers include two on general and theoretical issues, by Damaris Bairstow and Vincent Megaw respectively. There is also a continuation of Jane Wesson's bibliography, commenced in the first volume, and this is followed by four papers by Grace Karskens, Jon Winston-Gregson, Michael Pearson, and Ian Jack et al., that include substantive field archaeological research. Brian Rogers' paper, on the other hand, looks at an aspect of technological history that fieldworkers have yet to follow up: that of salt-making in Australia. Next is a paper by Brian Egloff that considers the organization of large-scale cultural-resource-management projects and finally is a paper by M. Zeman and B. Blakeman that shows how photogrammetric survey can reduce the labour of recording a large number of structures on a complex site. In addition, four reviewers discuss seven recent publications.

Jane Wesson's continued bibliography should surely stimulate comment. As she says, the majority of the references in this addendum relate to maritime archaeology. Indeed, if one adds to those references the number of unpublished 'reports' listed, then it would appear that Australian land-based historical archaeology is not doing very well. Other than the papers in the first volume of this journal, there has been little new actually published since late 1982. If I am correct in my conviction that a discipline consists very largely of its body of published material, then we should all of us be concerned over this poor publication record. Of course, there have to be suitable publication outlets and the existence of such outlets can itself stimulate publication that might otherwise not occur, hence the importance of the contribution by the Australian Society for Historical Archaeology in producing this journal. There is more to it than that, however. An increasing amount of field research in Australian historical archaeology is being done by contract archaeologists, whose reports often languish unpublished (and sometimes unpublishable) in government or private-sector files (or almost more disturbing circulate locally among small groups virtually at random). Now I realise that there are practical limitations that restrict what

contract archaeologists can do in the way of publication but surely it would be possible for them to make their archaeological findings accessible to the rest of us without compromising their clients? Admittedly, this might be difficult in the case of private-sector work but it is particularly distressing to observe that government-sponsored contract work suffers also from a poor level of publication. This might be forgivable if the sites were to remain available, in an undisturbed condition, for further study by others but by the nature of contract work this is often not the case.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge help from a number of people who assisted with the editorial process, particularly Rosemary Annable, Beryl Connah, and Julie Hamilton. I would also emphasize the very substantial input from Douglas Hobbs of the Department of Prehistory and Archaeology in the University of New England. His drawing-board work on contributors' illustrations included everything from minor surgery to organ transplants, and the overall quality of the figures owes much to his skills. In addition, I have to acknowledge the receipt of a contribution to the cost of producing this journal, from the Royal Australian Historical Society. This is a sum of \$125 that comes from funds made available by the Government of New South Wales, on the recommendation of the Cultural Grants Advisory Council.

---

## Corrigendum: Volume 1:

1. The captions for Figures 3 and 4 in Godwin's paper were reversed. Also the 'Conclusion' in the Birmingham and Jeans paper should have appeared before the 'Notes', not after them.
2. 'Instructions for Contributors': 3(b) maximum illustratable area is 252mm × 173mm not as shown (this is anyway only an estimate). 3(c) for 'Copyrapid' read any process that produces a top-quality photographic copy, preferably with a matt surface. Also although 'Helvetica light' is preferred on drawings, any comparable lettering style is acceptable.
3. Kate Holmes wishes me to include the following which she omitted from the end of her paper. 'ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. I would like to thank the Australian Heritage Commission for continuing financial support, and the University of Sydney for contributing towards the expenses of the first 1978 season. The Conservation Commission of the Northern Territory has provided equipment, help and advice since 1976 and I am most grateful to all the staff concerned. I would also like to thank Brenda Thornley for her line drawings, and the many volunteers who made the fieldwork possible.'

Graham Connah,  
Department of Prehistory and Archaeology,  
University of New England,  
ARMIDALE,  
N.S.W. 2351

31 August 1984.