

Editorial

I have found that editing a volume of the Journal takes an awful amount of work. Luckily I have been able to spread the task over some months and for this I owe much to the patience of the volume's authors. They, like the Society as a whole, will be glad to see this volume out. For a number of years now the Journal has been behind and this year will see it finally up to date. This is extremely pleasing to the Society's Committee, particularly Graham Connah who saw an up-to-date Journal as vital, and to the various editors and Editorial Committee who have worked on the volumes produced in the past few years.

This volume has its origin in papers that Graham Connah requested from speakers at the joint AIMA/ASHA conference in Hobart in 1995. This volume's first paper, however, was delivered in Sydney in November 1995 at the occasion of the Society's twenty-fifth anniversary. John Mulvaney provides an entertaining journey through the beginnings of Australian archaeology, both Aboriginal and historic. Of particular interest is the how awareness of archaeology made a difference, such as to the conservation of the ruins at Port Arthur or Norfolk Island. Where once architects thought that the interpretation of sites would be best served by wholesale reconstruction the contribution of archaeology was to demonstrate the value of ruins.

Campbell Macknight gave the opening address at the Hobart conference and his paper adds to the journey started in the previous paper. It surprised me, being an east coast archaeologist, to be reminded that by the middle of the seventeenth century a map of much of Australia's coastline had already been laid out in Amsterdam's Town Hall. The convenient date '1788', which is often used to divide Aboriginal from European Australia, has somewhat less meaning when the west's maritime contacts are considered and less still when the openness of the northern part of Australia to Asian maritime trade is recognised. This paper also deals with the contribution archaeology has made to history and the development of Australian heritage.

Peter Bell provides a commentary on the archaeological resource on the overseas Chinese available up to 1993. In that year a conference on the Chinese was held in the Chinese Museum in Melbourne, and Peter sees this bringing together of scholars as a watershed in the scholarship of the overseas Chinese.

Jane Harrington looks at nineteenth-century lime-burning sites in Victoria by examining them in the context of their wider industry. She argues that the remains associated with

the industry are best understood and interpreted by seeing them in terms of their wider associations. The remains of the industry encompass shipwrecks, jetties, kilns, roads, tramways, residences, and so on, all of which contribute to the understanding of the industry's relationships.

Kevin Jones reports on the contribution of aerial photography to archaeology in New Zealand. Importantly he does not only give us attractive photographs of sites and their interpretation but he also details the methodology used to capture these images. Aerial photography is being used to record Maori and early industrial and farming sites, as well as the rate of deterioration and destruction of these sites.

Barry McGowan describes the techniques used in alluvial mining in southern NSW, and the type of remains that each technique left. In some sites slight divergence in the nature of the remains may indicate the presence of Chinese miners.

Warwick Pearson uses the example of watermills to discuss the transfer of technology from Britain to Australia in the nineteenth century. This is based on the analysis of a large sample of archaeological sites in eastern Australia, being the first systematic recording and analysis of the remains of water-powered industry from nineteenth-century Australia.

Sera Jane Peters discusses the analysis of wines recovered from the *William Salthouse*, wrecked in 1841. This paper has interesting implications because although tasting archaeological wines requires some degree of disturbance to the item, it also opens up a whole new field of analysis and interpretation.

The reader will note an inconsistency in the use of endnotes and in-text references. Although the Journal has as a rule always used endnotes this was clearly inappropriate in several of the papers, such as Bell's and Pearson's. The Editorial Committee is currently revising the Journal's conventions.

I would like to thank the papers' authors and referees who returned copy so promptly, to Mary Casey who laboured long over the papers during the various stages of their production, to Bob Kirk at Brolga Press for yet another impressive-looking publication, to Graham Connah for advice at various times, and to Ilma Powell and Jean Smith who once again will organise to get another volume quickly into the post.

TONY LOWE
Sydney