

The vision thing

The last issue of the Journal (no. 28, February 1996) was the first issue for new general editors Simon Pollard and David Standen. In that issue we stated that the Journal had already been moulded particularly by previous long-time editor Liz Broderick and her colleague Virginia Gore into a fine publication which served its readers well. We emphasised that the new editors' role was evolutionary not revolutionary, given how balanced and successful the Journal already was. Those observations have been borne out by, among other things, the substantial volume of positive comment received by the editors from Journal readers about our tribute in the last issue to Liz and Virginia and the work they performed over the years together with Dan Hunter.

Readers resoundingly agree that Liz, Virginia and Dan did a fantastic job. It is no coincidence that respondents to the recent NSW Society survey of members rated the Journal the greatest asset of the Society and the best service delivered by the Society to members.

With that legacy, the new editors are acutely conscious of the need for consistency. We also believe that the Journal must continue to be relevant to its readers. This is a challenge at a time when the NSW Society and some other state Societies are planning membership drives which will bring in new readers. The editors also hope to expand the subscriber base of the Journal independently of any Society membership drives. Together these initiatives may result in new demands on the Journal as the mix or range of readers changes. The editors believe this all means that the Journal, while excellent, must continue to respond to those it serves and to evolve.

The best way to remain relevant is to ask current and new readers what they want. The NSW Society members' survey did not address directly the needs of members in their

capacity as Journal readers.

The editors therefore seek feedback from readers on the direction, content and vision of the Journal. The feedback can usefully be in any format and on any topic you consider appropriate or helpful. Do not hesitate to suggest changes, despite our expressed concern for consistency and an evolutionary approach.

The editors will take all contributions on board and prepare a vision statement for the Journal and a strategy for increasing its reader base which takes account of readers' needs. We look forward to receiving your comments and suggestions. We will share the range of feedback with you in future articles from the editors' desk. Once the vision statement and strategy are finalised, we will also set them out clearly in the Journal for the benefit of all readers and welcome any further feedback readers care to make on them.

Meanwhile the Journal rolls on. The editors make no apologies for featuring the Internet as the theme of this issue so soon after a previous Internet thematic issue last year (issue 27, September 1995). The interest in the Internet remains insatiable. The testimony to that is found not least in the number of Internet-related seminars held by the Societies in recent times. In this issue we feature three papers from one of those seminars, namely that held by the Victorian Society in October 1995 entitled *Business on the Internet: Opportunity or Black Hole?* The featured papers are those by Tim Roper (*Internet Business Security: Prudence or Paranoia?*), Julian Burnside QC (*Virtual Liability*) and Gordon Hughes (*Nowhere to Hide?: Privacy and the Internet*).

Our lead article in this issue is by John Lambrick (*Censorship and the Internet - not a good start*). The Law Foundation has contributed an

invaluable piece on the key issues for those looking to set up an Internet capability for their legal practice (see the article by Sandra Davey, *Thinking of connecting to the Internet?*) This issue also includes articles by Anne Trimmer (*The Internet - copyright issues and some thoughts on protection*), Paul McGinness (*The Internet and privacy - some issues facing the private sector*) and Harley Wright (*The Net: the beginning or the end for free speech?*). The editors have still found room for a further article which moves away from our theme for the issue, by Rebecca Leshinsky (*Litigation animation*).

The editors hope you enjoy the feast of reading in this issue. We look forward to receiving your feedback on the vision and objectives of the Journal and any contributions you care to submit for inclusion in upcoming issues.