

Editorial

Many of you reading this issue of *Archives and manuscripts* will have heard by now that in October 2011, the members of Council voted unanimously on behalf of the Australian Society of Archivists to enter into a publishing arrangement with Taylor & Francis for future production of the journal. This decision came after many years of information gathering and consultation with experts, including former editors of the journal, editorial board members past and present, and a range of other members of the ASA who have an interest in the journal and knowledge of academic publishing. As part of this process, I also provided Council with informed advice as the current editor of the journal. I was pleased to be able to work closely with Council, alongside the ASA's hard-working Executive Officer Alice-Anne Boylan, to help them arrive at a considered, rational and wise decision on the journal's future.

Having worked as the editor of the journal since 2009, this decision comes as a great relief to me as it will make my role a less onerous one. But more importantly, it is my view that the decision taken by Council has provided the journal with a sustainable production model that will take it into the foreseeable future and hopefully beyond. As I tried to emphasise on a number of occasions during the public consultation phase, the future of the journal and the society required a decision to be made on available resources and how best to achieve the society's aspirations for the journal based on those resources.

One of the recommendations of the review committee that met in 2009 to report to Council on the way forward for the journal expressed the aspiration that '*A&M* is perceived by the archival community as being better or at least equal to peer journals such as *Archivaria* and *American Archivist*.' Part of the equation in achieving this kind of perception is that the journal receives and publishes contributions of the very highest standard. Another part of the equation, however, has to do with the mechanics of production. Both *Archivaria* and *American Archivist* are produced simultaneously in print and online by larger editorial and

administrative teams, and with better overall resourcing, than was erstwhile the case with *Archives and manuscripts*.

For the sake of sustainability of the role of editor and the journal's place within the society, but also to put the journal on an equal footing with the likes of *Archivaria* and *American Archivist*, this equation had to change. Some members of the editorial board were not satisfied with the direction taken by Council having strongly advocated an alternative course of action. As a result of the decision and the process in which it had been reached, five members of the editorial board decided to submit their resignations. While I did not share their views on this matter, I would like to thank Michael Piggott, Joanna Sassoon, Toby Burrows, Joanne Evans and Karen Anderson for their significant contributions to the journal over recent years and for their efforts to support me as the new editor. I wish them all well in their future endeavours.

As part of the transition to Taylor & Francis, the journal will eventually have a new look and feel which will be developed in consultation with me, the editorial board and ASA Council. The journal will also move to publication of three issues per year (appearing in March, July and November), while retaining the same amount of overall yearly content.

I would like to urge all members to support and promote the journal as it enters this exciting new phase in its development, and continues serving the ASA and the broader profession as a leading forum in archival debate.

~ ~ ~ ~

In this issue we have a letter to the editor from Stephen Yorke, who urges the ASA to leave behind the obsession with the Heiner Affair to focus on more pressing issues that will need to be mastered if the society is to have a future. Perhaps, in the absence of compelling new evidence, what is most pertinent about the Heiner Affair needs to be recast within a broader perspective about the problems besetting the relationships between government archives and archivists, gaps in the official record created by action or inaction, and the politics of recordkeeping and accountability in modern political systems.

With rapid social and technological change requiring archivists to re-think their approaches to access, it is not surprising that the same

conditions are prompting questions about current approaches to appraisal, in particular whether these need to be supplemented by new strategies that map risk in relation to recordkeeping. Posing the question 'Are reasonable appraisal processes even possible in a world of hyper-interconnectivity and continuous change?', Gavan McCarthy, Ailie Smith and Jens O Zinn in 'Knowledge for the "risk society"', report on the International Social Science Risk Database (ISSRD). The authors propose that 'mapping of risk events as a network, and in particular their visualisation, provides insights that will help archivists identify the most important record creators and appraise records for long-term value.'

In 'Gift to the nation', Anne-Marie Condé examines the history of the diaries and notebooks of Charles Bean, official war correspondent and historian of Australia's part in World War I. In so doing, she presents a case study of how archives 'are not the still points in a turning world we might have hoped for', often being made to carry more evidence than their original inscription through the transactions they undergo to become archives.

This issue also features two articles examining the uptake of electronic recordkeeping and the challenges faced by organisations attempting to manage electronic records and transactions. Proscovia Svärd in 'Transforming public administrations and challenges of administration' describes transformations taking place in two public municipalities in Sweden with a focus on the way their engagement in e-government has presented a number of information management challenges. 'Accelerating positive change in electronic records management' by Julie McLeod, Sue Childs and Rachel Hardiman, presents 10 headline findings from a three-year multidisciplinary project funded by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council, exploring issues and practical strategies to enable acceleration of positive change in managing electronic records in modern office environments.

Another article dealing with information challenges being faced by contemporary organisations examines the rapidly evolving practices and technologies of social media. In her article, 'Developing an Organisational Information Policy to Mitigate the Risks Posed by Social Media Technologies', Elizabeth Shaffer proposes that we can learn from four public policy models and the way they adapt to changing

environments to ensure that recordkeeping regimes remain agile enough to capture valuable records.

Finally, Michael Karabinos examines the role of Indonesia's *Arsip Nasional* (national archives) in shaping the republic's post-colonial history. Karabinos undertakes a close reading of a letter written by Indonesian National Archivist Dr Raden Adjeng Sumartinion in 1970 to examine the role that post-colonial archives played in redefining the relationship with Indonesia's colonial past and integrating this past into the nation's present and future.

In the reflections section, we have an article by Ray Edmondson, who was recently awarded the *Distinguished Achievement Award* of the Australian Society of Archivists. His article is the final in a trilogy about the failed marriage of the National Film and Sound Archive with the Australian Film Corporation during the Howard Government. Edmondson brings the story of this remarkable and very successful grass roots advocacy campaign to a close with the creation of new legislation that took effect on 1 July 2008 and the establishment of the NFSA's new governing board.

Errata

Apologies to Dr Martin Masek, whose name was misspelt in the contents pages of vol. 39, no. 1, May 2011. I would also like to offer an apology to Dr Toby Burrows who joined the editorial board of the journal in 2010 – his name did not appear in the list of editorial board members on page 256 of the May 2011 issue.

Sebastian Gurciullo