

# EDITORIAL

This is the fifth volume of this journal to appear and with each one that has been published its future has seemed more assured. From the very beginning it has been the present editor's intention to establish the journal on as sound a footing as possible and then to let someone else try their hand with the red pen. I hope very much to be able to edit the 1988 Bicentennial Volume but, after that, obligations to my own research and publications will make it necessary for the society to find another editor. In the meantime, I have been very happy to welcome Michael Pearson on board as Reviews Editor: his efforts have made my task easier and have produced the best crop of book reviews to date.

My interest in editing this journal has always been prompted by a concern to encourage publication in the field of Australian historical archaeology: a field in which there is still a great deal of work done that is never made available in an adequately published form. I am sometimes asked what my editorial policy has been but I am not sure that I ever really had one, other than to get the widest possible range of papers both in subject matter and in geographic relevance. It is interesting to examine the extent to which that aim has been met. A total of 41 papers has now been published, of which the geographical distribution is as follows:

New South Wales.....	15.5
Australia General.....	10.0
Victoria.....	3.0
New Zealand.....	3.0
South Australia.....	2.0
Northern Territory.....	2.0
Queensland.....	1.5
Tasmania.....	1.0
Western Australia.....	1.0
Antarctica.....	1.0
U.K./U.S.A.....	1.0

Thus, in spite of the editor's best efforts, there are substantial areas of Australia that remain poorly represented in this journal. A similar breakdown of subject matter is more difficult, because it must inevitably be rather subjective but here also imbalance is evident. The most common sort of paper (9 in all) is historical rather than archaeological. The next most common are excavation reports (8.5) and field methodology studies (6). The least common are landscape archaeology (0.5), maritime archaeology (1) and artefact analysis (2). Theoretical papers and bibliographic papers score 4 each, and structural analysis and cultural resource management 3 each. These figures are, of course, not very reliable because no two people categorizing the various papers would arrive at quite the same result. They do suggest, however, that some subject areas, like some geographical areas, deserve far more attention than they appear to be getting.

This fifth volume presents one less paper than has become customary. This is because the opening paper by Ted Higginbotham is unusually long. This was felt to be justified because of the importance of the excavation in Parramatta

on which it reports. It is followed by a paper by Mark Staniforth which discusses the casks from the wreck of the *William Salthouse* in Port Phillip Bay, Victoria, the first paper to be published in this journal on the subject of maritime archaeology. This is surely a good omen for the closer relationship that many of us would like to see between maritime and dry-land archaeologists.

The third paper, by Noris Ioannou, examines the pottery produced by a nineteenth-century German immigrant to South Australia, and is followed by a paper by Neville Ritchie and Stuart Park that investigates the presence of Chinese coins in New Zealand goldfield sites. It is the fifth paper, however, that will silence for ever all those tall stories about the dreadful weather on this or that excavation of our individual memories. Angela McGowan's account of how you go about excavating in snow and ice in an Antarctic 'summer' temperature of  $-5^{\circ}\text{C}$  will surely excite admiration rather than envy.

It is hoped that readers will find the sixth paper of particular value, because the archaeology of standing structures is becoming increasingly important in Australia and Martin Davies, who has written about it here, is one of its most experienced practitioners. In the final paper, Michael Pearson, our Reviews Editor, has put together a further contribution to the bibliography of Australian historical archaeology.

As always, I have to acknowledge the help of many people. Douglas Hobbs, of the Department of Archaeology and Palaeoanthropology in the University of New England, has worked on a number of the drawings, some of which have been 'redrawn' with the aid of a Macintosh micro-computer and a Laser printer. Others at the University of New England who have materially assisted the editor in the preparation of this volume include Steve Clarke of the Department of Geography, the staff of the Photography Department, and Mrs Di Watson of the Department of Archaeology and Palaeoanthropology. As in previous years, I also remain grateful to the committee of the Australian Society for Historical Archaeology for their continued support, and to my wife, Beryl Connah, for help in all sorts of ways.

Each year I have doubts whether the journal will ever come together but — once again — we made it!

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

25 October, 1987.