

Editorial

I was greatly honoured to be invited to act as Guest Editor for volume 11 of *Australasian Historical Archaeology* and have found this a most enjoyable task because of the range and quality of the contributions to this issue. The contributors have been a delight to work with, responding quickly and efficiently to comments from the referees or from the editorial committee and adapting good-naturedly to our idiosyncratic reference style.

This issue of the Journal is unusually broad-based, reflecting partly my own interdisciplinary interests and partly an increased consciousness among archaeologists of their place in world scholarship. To set the scene and remind us of the importance of nineteenth-century archaeology to the formation of modern consciousness we have two papers by non-archaeologists: Michael Shortland's erudite but entertaining analysis of Freud's admiration for Schliemann and Jennifer McDonell's elegant dissection of archaeological imagery in Robert Browning's work.

We then have a pair of articles on nineteenth-century women and women's places. These papers were written independently, but are fascinating to read together. The insightful analysis of 'woman's place' by the historian Penny Russell gives an added significance to Jane Lydon's entirely archaeological analysis of The Rocks, which brings to the fore archaeology's ability to obtain a different access to social realities through the analysis of material culture.

The five succeeding papers all deal in different ways with the integration of documentation and physical evidence. Edward Higginbotham's study of the 1828 census presents a method by which the searching analysis of a basic source can be used to create a design for field research. The papers by Joanna Capon on decorative plasterwork, by Eve Stenning on early textile manufacturing and by Monte Woodhouse on a pastoral landscape, are each in their own way highly successful combinations of archival and field research, in which the authors have brought to bear on historical archaeology their expertise in other fields (art history, textiles, historical geography). Michael Pearson's paper on eucalyptus distilleries continues the series of specialist studies he has contributed to this Journal over the years, bringing to our attention some quintessentially Australian sites, from woollscours to recycled ship tanks.

The next pair of papers, by Proust and by Gross, raise some important issues about heritage. Katrina Proust, who is both a lawyer and an archaeologist, defines the role played by governmental and non-governmental bodies in studying and preserving the archaeological resource. While her focus is on South East Asia, Proust's comments have a wider applicability and raise questions about public involvement which are relevant to all archaeologists. She also highlights the question of competing values, which is probably the key heritage question in the postcolonial world. Her concerns are echoed by Laurence Gross, a historian of technology, who addresses the question of deindustrialisation, meditating upon the nature of industry and presenting a brief for the future.

The relationship between history and archaeology has soured in the latter quarter of our century and David Dymond's 1974 plea for reconciliation has largely been ignored. Interestingly, historians feel the lack of contact more than archaeologists,

many of whom have got tired of playing what Gina Barnes calls 'the matching game'. My own impression, as an archaeologist physically located for the past decade within a department of history, is that we are inevitably talking at cross-purposes, because archaeologists tend to be thinking about behaviour (*habitus*) and historians tend to be thinking about action (*agency*). In order to explore this problem a little further I asked a number of historians with an interest in archaeology what they thought about the relevance of archaeology to their own field: those who accepted were invited to write from a personal point of view, using their own experiences, and they have been most obliging in doing so.

The resultant section on History and Archaeology gives food for thought and for argument. Jonathan Barlow introduces the topic with a spirited attack on the misuse by both parties of physical evidence in a domain which is normally advertised as being a good example of archaeological-historical work, early medieval Europe (formerly known as the Dark Ages). Closer to our own concerns, Sybil Jack analyses the use of archaeology in studies of early modern Europe and, to a lesser extent, of Australia and outlines the sorts of questions that could be studied by scholars working in a more equal partnership. Ian Jack focuses closely on Australia, sparing neither discipline, but with some positive suggestions, particularly about bringing into view people who are historically invisible. David Carment reflects upon his own use of archaeology for a history of the Northern Territory (1991) and makes some acute comments on the state of historical archaeology at that time. Susan Marsden had already spoken about history and archaeology at the 1993 ASHA conference and has kindly allowed us to include her paper in this discussion: she notes areas of potential study in the archaeological record of the later twentieth century and may inspire some readers to shift their focus to the contemporary period.

One message that comes out of the historians' comments (with varying degrees of tact) is that archaeologists do not publish enough or publish in ways which are not sufficiently accessible to other scholars. My first reaction, of self-righteous indignation, was muted by the consideration that there may be some truth in what they say. Which leads me, of course, to invite you, the reader, to think seriously about publishing your recent work within our pages. This Journal has a high reputation, is widely cited and is not confined to Australasian material, as can be seen from this issue and from others.

The standard of the Journal is largely determined by our referees who, sadly, must remain anonymous, but to whom we are all grateful for giving of their time and expertise. Producing a journal of this scope and quality requires a great deal of meticulous attention and my task as guest editor would have been impossible without the collaboration of the editorial committee and particularly that of Mary Casey and of Tony Lowe, whom it is a pleasure now to thank again. Because of delays in the publication of volumes 9 (1991) and 10 (1992) the present volume has an imprint date of 1993. As is clear from their referencing, however, the majority of papers were submitted in 1994.

AEDEEN CREMIN
Archaeology
University of Sydney