

Matthew Stubbs*

EMBRACING A NEW DIGITAL ERA FOR THE *ADELAIDE LAW REVIEW*

The first issue of the *Adelaide Law Review* was printed in 1960. In the 61 years since then, a total of 103 issues (including this one) across 43 volumes have been printed. This issue — volume 43, issue 1 — is the last issue of the *Adelaide Law Review* that will be printed in hard copy. From volume 43, issue 2, the *Adelaide Law Review* will be a digital-only journal.

We see this as an important step in embracing the future of law reviews. It is now 13 years since the ‘Durham Statement on Open Access to Legal Scholarship’ (‘Durham Statement’) called on law schools to ‘commit to making the legal scholarship they publish available in stable, open, digital formats’ and then advocated that ‘law schools should stop publishing law journals in print and law libraries should stop acquiring print law journals’.¹

The *Adelaide Law Review* had proudly been open access (available freely to all on our own website and elsewhere) for some years prior to the Durham Statement — and we endorse the view of Richard Danner, Kelly Leong and Wayne V Miller that ‘[t]he use (and presumably the usefulness) of legal scholarship published in law journals has increased since their content has become accessible electronically’.² This is a function of both more ready access to content and also more timely availability of content — and transitioning to digital-only will enable the *Adelaide Law Review* to publish scholarship in a more timely fashion than it does now. However, we have (until now) persisted with the print publications of the *Adelaide Law Review* as well.

There are a number of persuasive reasons why print publication is no longer appropriate. As the Durham Statement noted, digital versions are accessed more frequently, are available more quickly, do not consume resources in purchasing and storage in campus libraries, are more environmentally friendly, and save on printing and postage costs.³ The traditional subscription-based business model for academic

* Editor in Chief, *Adelaide Law Review*; Associate Professor, Adelaide Law School.

¹ ‘Durham Statement on Open Access to Legal Scholarship’, *Duke Law* (Web Page, 11 February 2009) <<https://law.duke.edu/lib/durhamstatement>> (‘Durham Statement’). See, eg: Richard A Danner, Kelly Leong and Wayne V Miller, ‘The Durham Statement Two Years Later: Open Access in the Law School Journal Environment’ (2011) 103(1) *Law Library Journal* 39; *Final Report of the Durham Statement Review Task Force* (Report, 31 August 2021) <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/faculty_scholarship/4092>. Cf Margaret A Leary, ‘A Response to The Durham Statement Two Years Later’ (2011) 103(2) *Law Library Journal* 281.

² Danner, Leong and Miller (n 1) 44.

³ ‘Durham Statement’ (n 1).

journals is also unsuited to the digital age.⁴ Once a journal is readily available to all the world at no cost, continued publication in hard copy is anachronistic, even if a declining number of us will look back with some nostalgia on the arrival of freshly-printed journal issues. But the fact is, ‘electronic access has become the preferred means for locating legal scholarship’.⁵ The advantages of the *Adelaide Law Review* transitioning to digital-only are clear.

This final print edition of the *Adelaide Law Review* is dedicated to Judge James Richard Crawford AC SC FBA (1948–2021). It also contains a special forum feature celebrating 10 years of the South Australian Law Reform Institute. It is fitting that we remember the past and look to the future as we make the transition to a digital-only open access journal, ensuring that the reach of the scholarship published in the *Adelaide Law Review* continues to expand into the future.

Finally, I thank all of the *Adelaide Law Review*’s subscribers over the past seven decades for their support.

⁴ See, eg, Jessica D Litman, ‘The Economics of Open Access Law Publishing’ (2006) 10(4) *Lewis and Clark Law Review* 779.

⁵ Danner, Leong and Miller (n 1) 47.