

Editorial

I once knew an archaeologist who edited a journal of which some issues consisted almost entirely of his own papers. Well, I seem to have beaten him at the game, because this volume of *Australasian Historical Archaeology* consists entirely of one of mine. Having over the years been at different times an author who cursed editors and an editor who cursed authors, I now find myself assuming both roles at once and rather wishing that I had not done so. There is, however, a very good reason for this curious situation. As members of the Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology will be painfully aware, the journal has slipped two years behind and has remained in this situation despite a great deal of work by its various editors in recent years and by the Editorial Committee as well as the National Committee of the Society. On a couple of occasions plans to catch up on the backlog have been frustrated by circumstances beyond the Society's control, when planned volumes have not eventuated. In short, there has been something of a run of bad luck and it seemed time to try a different approach. As the founding editor of the journal, I therefore offered to produce a 'quick' volume, while the other editors worked on another volume at the same time. One member of the National Committee was even heard to be laying bets as to which one would appear first, but I seem to have won and I hope nobody found that they had backed the wrong horse.

This is Volume 12 of the journal and it is the 1994 volume. When I put the first volume together in 1982 (it was published in 1983), I doubt if any of us realised how successful it would prove to be. At the time I even got some criticism for printing so many copies which, I was told, would never sell. In fact, the first volume has now been out of print for some years and I would seriously advise members and readers who do not have a full set of the other ten volumes to remedy the situation before it is too late. Collectively, the back issues of this journal provide both a useful research tool and an invaluable teaching resource in a subject in which published material still remains very limited. They are certainly worth a modest investment and the Society would be pleased to sell backnumbers (except for Volume 1) to those who would like them.

When I started this journal all those years ago I cursed it with a cumbersome endnote and referencing system that I have frequently regretted ever since. The reason was that I hated footnotes (and still do) and could not think of a way of using my preferred option, the Harvard referencing system, when one had to cope with such a mix of published material,

unpublished material, theses, newspapers, maps, archival box numbers, and so on. In this respect, it seemed to me, historical archaeology presented referencing problems rather different from those faced by prehistoric archaeologists. Whatever the case, as time has gone on I have found myself somewhat embarrassed by the system I adopted, and would agree totally with Aedeon Cremin's description of it in her editorial in Volume 11 as 'our idiosyncratic reference style'. Being both author and editor of the present volume, I decided I should do something about it and readers will find that the system used here is straight Harvard, even if it gets a bit rough round the edges in places.

The paper presented here discusses an excavation and supporting research done over many years but this is not something the I have merely dusted off for the occasion. It has been specially written for this volume, during March, April and May 1996. I think it raises some interesting issues, issues that are very far from being new but nevertheless ones of which we constantly need to be reminded. In writing it, I have also juggled that old problem of historical archaeology: how to integrate the history and the archaeology without the one submerging the other or without the two conflicting one with the other. The story of Bagot's Mill is one concerning a most remarkable and largely forgotten individual, a man who deserved to be remembered, but it also concerns a very interesting archaeological site that presented particular problems of interpretation. I have deliberately illustrated the paper heavily, because I remain fascinated by visual explanation, the power of images rather than words. I often think that western scholarship has an unfortunate tendency to treat pictures as of secondary importance: merely there to decorate the writing rather than to act as vital vehicles of information and understanding in the way that I think of them.

So here it is; a rather thin volume perhaps but the last one was almost twice the usual length, so this one will help to balance things out. I will finish by adding my voice to the last editor's invitation 'to think seriously about publishing your recent work within our pages'. We need you and we need your papers to produce the best possible journal that you, as members, are financing. I don't think that I can get away with monopolizing an entire journal more than once!

Graham Connah
Canberra
25 May 1996