

# **The Censorship and the Truth : An Analysis of the *Sydney Morning Herald's* Coverage on the World War II in the Pacific, 1941 - 1942**

---

by

**Wong Yee Tuan**

When a nation engages in a war, its resources, which include the manpower and raw materials, must be utilised to the best advantage. The public has to be informed and persuaded to do what is expected of them. The various publicity media must co-operate with the government, both in the negative sense of suppressing publication of material that might imperil the war effort and in the positive sense of expressing the government's war stance and enhancing public appreciation of its efforts.<sup>1</sup> In other words, an unified action of the nation has to be galvanised and the media, the influential shaper of public opinion, is required to act in the 'national interest' both in respect of publicising the decisions of Government and also in relation to foreign policy. In light of this, all the Australian publications, especially the newspapers were subjected to censorship by the Publicity Censorship of the Department of the Information, acting under the National Security Act and Regulations derived from the defence power of the Constitution during World War Two.<sup>2</sup>

In practice, however, the Department of Information set up a separate branch, the Publicity Censorship, to impose necessary wartime censorship to orientate the newspapers to behave more like the propaganda arm of government than a genuinely free agency. Gazetting the Press Censorship Order, the Chief Publicity Censor might at any time compel any editor, printer, publisher or author to submit for censorship all matter concerning to national security intended for publication.<sup>3</sup> In applying this order, the Publicity Censorship adopted the method of voluntary censorship.<sup>4</sup> By arrangement the newspapers were trusted to judge for themselves what was forbidden and, if doubt arose, to submit the matter to the authorities.<sup>5</sup> In a word, all newspapers must publish and disseminate news or information in line with government-imposed restrictions. Under the Curtin government, censorship was influenced by the need to project Australia's position as an nation in its own right in order to encourage assistance from the American following the entry of the Japanese into the South West Pacific. It was also integral to Australia's foreign policy and its main effect was to suppress unfavorable or unpalatable publicity about Australia or its allies. Hence, the newspapers were obligated to give prominent display to news that was favorable to the government's policies and "burying" or misleadingly headlining or rewriting news that was unfavorable. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, which is the oldest Australian metropolitan daily newspaper, was the explicit subject of the arbitrary censorship and, hence, the news conveyed or reported was superficial, biased, varnished, coloured or distorted, misleading, and unreliable. Its coverage of the Pacific War between November 1941 and June 1942 was the clear evidence of government's propagandist and contradictory text.

November 1941 was a grave and anxious time for the Allied forces fighting the European war and for Australia was facing a growing threat in the Pacific area. Gloomy headlines in *The Sydney Morning Herald* reported German successes in Russia, and the growing showdown of the negotiation between the United States of America and Japan. Between 3rd of November 1941 and 25th of November 1941, many reports in *The Sydney Morning Herald* were about the German onslaughts on Russia and the crisis of the negotiation between the American and the Japanese. The paper noted regularly in banner headlines ¾ "Germans Advance on Moscow's Front",<sup>6</sup> "Most Serious Phase at Moscow",<sup>7</sup> "Decisive Battle For Moscow Looms",<sup>8</sup> "German Drive in Far North Cutting Soviet's Aid",<sup>9</sup> "Germans Push On In Crimea",<sup>10</sup> and "Russian Advance near

Rostov".<sup>11</sup> Moreover, the climax of the negotiation between the American and the Japanese was also reported daily in a section titled "Tension In Pacific/ Japanese Prepare For Possible Clash",<sup>12</sup> "Japan And U.S.A : Last Word in Talks",<sup>13</sup> "Japan's New Bid For Pacific Peace",<sup>14</sup> "Japanese Diet Talks of War/Envoys see U.S. President",<sup>15</sup> and "U.S. Terms To Japan : Leave Axis/Withdraw From China".<sup>16</sup> With all this in view, *The Sydney Morning Herald* did try to inform the public of the unpleasant situation of the German onslaught in Europe and the tension between Washington and Tokyo. But, the paper failed to highlight that the British was engaged in a desperate war of survival in Europe and the imminent danger of the Japanese massive military build-up in Indochina. Evidently, the paper made an unbalanced coverage on the war development by publishing only selected processed news and retailing the half-truths of the war situation.

Considering the allies' responses in the paper to the breakdown of negotiation between the Japanese and the Americans, the reporting appeared to be calm and fearless. These responses of the allies were revealed from the conspicuous heading "U.S. Patrols In the Pacific: Wide Area Covered",<sup>17</sup> "Mr. Churchill's Solemn Warning To Japan : Will send Big Warships to Pacific/Britain solidly Behind U.S.A",<sup>18</sup> "Big Warships Reach Singapore/ Royal navy Reinforced",<sup>19</sup> and "Singapore Bastion".<sup>20</sup> Besides, some pictures of the allies' military strength were also displayed in *The Sydney Morning Herald* to prop up the response of the allies. For examples, "Britain's Mightiest Bomber Appears",<sup>21</sup> "Australian Warship At Speed During Exercises",<sup>22</sup> "Battle-Ships, Bombers, and A.I.F Ready in Malaya",<sup>23</sup> and "Aid For the Royal Navy From America",<sup>24</sup> all these pictures showed the allies' mighty military were all ready for action and the Japanese invasion was at stake. From these perspectives, Britain, Australia and America seemed to co-operate with each other or work side by side to strengthen the defence and to thrash the Japanese.

With all this in view, uncertainty and insecurity rather than calmness and fearlessness developed in the Pacific. But, *The Sydney Morning Herald* omitted the conflicts and presented rhetorically a co-operative and well-prepared situation in Pacific. For example, the paper reported that a considerable force of Canadian troops had arrived at Hong Kong to strengthen the British garrison there for defence against aggression, actual or threatened, in any part of the world.<sup>25</sup> Presenting such a positive view, the press and the government aimed at maintaining public order and strengthening national security. Taking all this into account, the paper did attempt to colour or distort the actuality and the pic-

tures used in the paper were a serious misrepresentation that helped to perpetuate a rosy and confident view of the defence in Pacific.

However, there were some elements missing from *The Sydney Morning Herald* reports. The conflicts among these three countries over the defence of Pacific were not mentioned at all. The American's policy of that time in the Pacific was apparently ambiguous. The U.S. interpreted events in Europe, rather than Asia, as the primary threat to its long-term security and economic interests, especially after the fall of the Netherlands and France.<sup>26</sup> The U.S. also refused to accept responsibility for retaining Singapore or defending the Netherlands East Indies, Australia and New Zealand.<sup>27</sup> During late November 1941 Churchill was asked by Australia's government what aid Britain would give to Australia if Japan attacked the Netherlands East Indies or Thailand. Churchill refused to give assurance of military assistance if either contingency developed.<sup>28</sup>

When the situation in the Pacific deteriorated, the censorship became more excessive and stringent. It's evident that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was not reported in detail in *The Sydney Morning Herald*. The front-page of the paper on 8 December 1941 did not give a staggering and alarming headline on the Japanese attacks on the Pearl Harbor. Instead, the headline was featured with an weak and normal sentence "Japan Brings War to The Pacific".<sup>29</sup> This implied that the crisis was expected and not threatening. Furthermore, the loss and damage of the American bases at Pearl Harbor were scantily mentioned in the paper. According to the White House statement, reported by *The Sydney Morning Herald*, an old battleship (presumably the Oklahoma) was capsized, a destroyer was blown up, and several other ships were seriously damaged.<sup>30</sup> The casualties of the bombing were announced as probably 3,000, including 1,500 killed.<sup>31</sup>

If these figures or numbers of damages and casualties were weighed carefully, unequivocally, they were inaccurate. In fact, the figures of damages and casualties exceeded the official one. Five American battleships had been sunk and three damaged, three cruisers and three destroyers badly hit, 200 planes destroyed, and 2,344 men killed.<sup>32</sup> On the contrary, Japanese losses were only twenty-nine planes, fifty-one men and four midget submarines.<sup>33</sup> However, the news of a disaster of such magnitude would prove not only unpalatable to the American but also to the Australian. Hence, the actual figures of the damages and casualties were varnished for publication.

By publishing and reporting the varnished and distorted news of Pearl Harbor, *The Sydney Morning Herald* showed the comfortable approach to censorship, which was instituted by the government. The government believed that the public knowledge of the actual success of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor would impair national moral or retard the war effort.<sup>34</sup> This is because the American Pearl Harbor, which was believed the strongest outlying base of any nation in the world, also succumbed to the savage attack of Japan. Undoubtedly, the imposed restrictive censorship also transformed the paper into government's propaganda arms. On 9 December 1941 the paper commented favourably on the military strength of the American, for example, the North Carolina and Washington were the deadliest and mightiest warships and they can shoot farther, faster, and harder than any other battleship in the world.<sup>35</sup> Besides, the paper also only mentioned the America's belligerency after Pearl Harbor attack was backed by Britain.<sup>36</sup> Actually, Britain's inability to defend its Pacific possessions was painfully revealed after the Pearl Harbor attack and, hence, Britain looked for America as the protector.<sup>37</sup> Taken all this into consideration, *The Sydney Morning Herald* had only made a superficial and prejudicial coverage on the war.

The coverage of the paper on the Japanese offensive on Malaya and Singapore proved to be in favor of concealment of the 'real' truth and of propagandizing the government and allies' policy. On 9 December of 1941, the paper reported that Japan's first surprise attack on Malaya had failed and the defence preparation was excellence.<sup>38</sup> The troops at Kota Bharu stood up to their task as expected and the R.A.A.F pilots acquitted themselves admirably, showing initiative and daring which has won praise from all sides.<sup>39</sup> All this, however, was the allies' window-dressing and propaganda. In truth, there was only a handful and old R.A.A.F and R.A.F (Hudson and Wildebeeste) were stationed at Kota Bharu and the town of Kota Bharu was occupied at 9 December of 1941 because the troops were demoralised by rumour and evacuated.<sup>40</sup> Surprisingly, the paper of 10 December and 12 December of 1941 still tried to obfuscate and normalize the crisis of Japanese invasion on Malaya by reporting "allies' troops have achieved a large measure of control and were expecting reinforcements"<sup>41</sup> and "very heavy Japanese losses at Kota Bahru — 4800 of Japanese troops died."<sup>42</sup> In reality, the allies' troops deserted Kota Bharu and the Japanese losses were one transport sunk, 179 dead and 314 wounded.<sup>43</sup>

*The Sydney Morning Herald* of 11 December 1941 and 12 December 1941 attempted to trivialize the news of the loss of the battleships *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* which were sunk by the Japanese off East Coast of Malaya. The paper only reported that the two battleships were sunk while attempting to prevent a Japanese landing at Kuantan, 200 miles from Singapore.<sup>44</sup> The paper did not provide any analytical and critical information and explanation on the disaster. The two battleships were actually blundering about in the South-China Sea, within easy reach of Japanese bombers and without any air cover. This, undoubtedly, had revealed the British poor defence strategy, especially the Air Force in the Far East. The disaster was a heavy setback for the allied forces and also got on the South-West Pacific countries nerves by shattering their belief of the British naval supremacy.<sup>45</sup> The disaster also sparked off a dispute about reinforcement between Australia and Britain. Australia urged the British to reinforce the air force in the Pacific and also planned to withdraw some of its troops from the Middle East.<sup>46</sup> This dispute had virtually strained and soured the relationship between the two powers.<sup>47</sup> All this had gone unreported and the paper was deliberately employed to camouflage the critical loss of the *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse*.

The Japanese invasion on Malaya was unstoppable and fast. Within about two months, Malaya was taken by the Japanese. Singapore, which was believed to be an impregnable fortress, faced a severe and immediate threat from the Japanese. However, *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 9 December 1941, 25 December 1941, and 29 December 1941 reiterated the defence of Singapore was always in ready and strengthened. As the paper of 9 December 1941 reported that the ability of Singapore to defend itself against any form attack-either by sea, land, or air, or by all three methods together-has never been questioned by military and naval experts.<sup>48</sup> The paper of 29th December 1941 noted the Allied War Council planned to provide air, naval and field defences to Singapore.<sup>49</sup> All this information was only the allies' propaganda policy and smoke-screen. The truth was that Singapore was poorly defended and strengthened. The defence prospects landward of Singapore were bleak and the reinforcements of Indian and Australian troops were raw and inexperienced.<sup>50</sup> Therefore, the surrender of Singapore to the Japanese was inevitable.

On 15 February 1942, 85,000 British Commonwealth troops surrendered to General Yamashita's Japanese army who were outnumbered three to one. The surrender of Singapore marked the most costly and humiliating defeat in the

history of the British Empire.<sup>51</sup> Astonishingly, the news of the fall of Singapore did not make the headline of the front page of *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 16 February 1942. Instead, the inconsequential headline 'Japanese Invade Island of Sumatra' was published on the front page.<sup>52</sup> The news of Singapore's surrender was insignificantly buried in the middle of the paper. Furthermore, the paper reported that the news of Singapore's surrender was broadcasted by the Tokyo Radio instead of Singapore Radio. It seems that the paper was trying to obscure or cover the unpleasant and unfavourable information. This was clear example of the failure of the paper to give factual and objective news.

The analyses of Singapore's surrender which were published in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 19 February 1942 and 26 February 1942 did not give a deep, thorough and fair examination on the Singapore's debacle. The analysis in the paper of 19 February 1942 commented that there were four main points for explaining the loss of Singapore.<sup>53</sup> One of the points which accused the bulk of the Asiatic population remained apathetic spectators of the conflicts was unjustifiable. In confronting the Japanese, the British failed to use the Malays because many officers believed they were not a martial race and they failed to use the Chinese because they were afraid of arming Chinese communist.<sup>54</sup> Another point also essential for the fall of Singapore was the strength of the Japanese army. Although the British troops outnumbered the invading Japanese, many of them were poorly trained and motivated Indian troops and inexperienced Australian troops in fighting tropical warfare.<sup>55</sup> The Japanese, on the contrary, had a well-trained, highly-motivated, well-equipped, and well-led attacking force.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, the Japanese battle plan and strategies were well-executed and backed by excellent intelligence.<sup>57</sup> With all this in view, the paper had only provided one-sided, superficial and controlled information.

Before the Japanese advanced down to the Dutch East Indies, the Australian people were informed that the defence of Australia was ready, sufficient and strong. *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 9 February 1942 reported that the troops and watchers at Darwin were on the *quívivo* and ready.<sup>58</sup> Moreover, the paper of 29 December 1942, 12 January 1942, 16 January 1942 and 29 January 1942 displayed respectively the pictures of Australian soldiers' vigilance and readiness. For example, the picture in the paper of 29 December 1942 showed the soldiers operating a range finder and anti-aircraft weapons and was titled "Darwin Air Defences Ready for Action."<sup>59</sup> Another picture in the paper of 16 January 1942 showed that the crews signaled with an Aldis lamp as the Catalina

circled to inspect a ship and was titled "Australia's Airmen Keep Non-Stop Watch At Sea."<sup>60</sup>

In spite of these reports, on Thursday 19 February 1942, Darwin was raided twice by the Japanese aircrafts. In these two Japanese attacks on Darwin, 243 people were killed and about 350 wounded.<sup>61</sup> The Japanese air-raid sank an American destroyer, two American transports, a British tanker and an Australian transport, merchant ship, lugger and coal hulk, and destroyed 23 Allied aircraft, many of them on the ground.<sup>62</sup> Hundreds of panic-stricken civilians expecting invasion, fled southward, some air force personnel deserted their station. By far, the most shameful aspect was the behaviour of numbers of the armed forces after the raids. Hundreds of Australian and American military personnel systematically looted what the fleeing civilians had left behind.<sup>63</sup> However, *The Sydney Morning Herald* coverage gave no indication of this. The paper of 20 February 1942 and 21 February 1942 reported the damage to property was considerable and the casualties were 39—15 persons killed and 24 wounded.<sup>64</sup> It was unquestionably that much unpalatable news was glossed over or excluded. In light of this, the imposition of restrictive censorship was utterly revealed because the government tried to cover the news or information which was significant to the security of public and nation.

Some sensitive issues concerning the relationship between the Australian and American troops was not touched by the coverage of *The Sydney Morning Herald* during the wartime. The presence of American Negro troops in Australia, for instance, was not made any reference at all. The publication of news about the American Negro troops was tactically sidestepped because Australia still adhered firmly to the White Australian policy.<sup>65</sup> With this in view, the censorship which was implemented for military security, diplomatic considerations and maintenance of public morale still contained a racist dimension.

Another sensitive issue never touched by *The Sydney Morning Herald* was the widespread tension between Australian and American servicemen. The paper tried to portray the good image of the American and their cordial relationship with the Australian. The paper of 19 March 1942 published a short but conspicuous article to extol the American. The article commented that The American troops had been building up reputation for cutting red tape to get things done and had worked long hours in organizing administration which laid a solid foundation for an Allied victory in the Pacific.<sup>66</sup> Besides, the article also noted that the American only had the currency and slang problems and they had



established warm relationship with the Australian family.<sup>67</sup> It seems that the American did not exert much pressure on the Australian society. However, the paper had never fully revealed the truth. Indeed, the relationship between the Australian and American was under strain. The presence of American did profoundly affect the Australian society in terms of its moral and culture. Many Australian feared that their country would be permanently 'Americanised'.<sup>68</sup> But, all this news of 'war at home' was suppressed or withheld and went unreported in the paper.

*The Sydney Morning Herald* also tended to deliver personalised news, which gave preference to certain individual or event while played down the others. It is evident that the paper gave focus and magnification on General Douglas MacArthur. The paper of 18 March 1942 reported in an article, which was titled 'MacArthur Supreme Anzac leader', that General MacArthur arrived in Australia from Philippines to assume supreme command in the South-West Pacific Area under the request of the Australian Government.<sup>69</sup> The paper of 19 March 1942 reiterated the arrival of General MacArthur and his task as the Supreme War Commander in the ANZAC Area.<sup>70</sup> MacArthur was portrayed as a co-operative, brilliant and mindful commander. With all this comments and reports in view, the paper did try to emphasize and promote General MacArthur but, in a sense, other generals who also played an important role in the wartime were singled out and de-emphasized. From this perspective, the paper which was subjected to the censorship attempted to put the public out of reality by giving the misleading illusion of a heroic general presiding over the Pacific war theater. In fact, the transfer of MacArthur to Australia from Philippine was forced by the humiliating defeat to the Japanese and MacArthur increasingly denied Australian any effective voice in the management of the war. All this had been censored or suppressed.

The Coral Sea Battle was also treated favourably and glamorised by the paper. The article, which was published in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 12 May 1942, highlighted that the battle had some significant implications. The battle disclosed that a powerful and aggressive striking force had been placed at General MacArthur's disposal and American navy emerged a decisive winner.<sup>71</sup> In this regard, the paper tried to infer that the victory of the Coral Sea Battle attributed solely to the American excellent general and powerful forces. It was apparently that other elements which could be part of the factors contributing to the victory of the battle, for instance, the Japanese miscalculation or poor

strategy planning had been omitted or missed out. This is evident that the personalised news was used again to obscure events and lock the public into a misleading illusion of American glorious accomplishment.

In conclusion, the Australian censorship during World War Two was severe and repressive. The censorship was implemented to suppress or conceal unfavourable news or information, which could weaken national moral, retard war effort and disintegrate the society. Hence, the press, under the restraint of censorship, could only publish and deliver the biased, varnished, distorted, superficial, misleading, and unreliable news or information in order to divert the public, avoid social action and increase passivity. By following or complying the censorship lines, the press was mostly transformed into the propaganda arms of the government. The coverage of *The Sydney Morning Herald* on the Pacific War between November 1941 and June 1942 showed a strong adhesion to the British and American-dictated propaganda policy which involved the exclusion of certain facts and alternative viewpoints that may prejudice or undermine the credibility of the case being made, such as the disguise or whitewash of the attack of Pearl Harbor, of the war in Malaya, of the fall of Singapore, and of the air -raid of Darwin. However, the ability and freedom of the press to report and interpret the news or information with scrupulous honesty, particularly in the wartime were strictly limited. The press is possible to be 'impartial' or 'factual' only within the parameters agreed upon by prevailing socio-political consensus.

## NOTE

- 1 J. Hilvert, *Blue Pencil Warriors : Censorship and Propaganda in World War 2*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1983, p. 1.
- 2 Peter Coleman, *Obsenity, Blasphemy, Sediton : Censorship in Australia*, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1974, p. 87.
- 3 *Ibid.*, p. 180.
- 4 *Ibid.*
- 5 *Ibid.*
- 6 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 3 November 1941, p. 7.
- 7 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 4 November 1941, p. 7.
- 8 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 5 November 1941, p. 9.
- 9 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 19 November 1941, p. 9.
- 10 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 19 November 1941, p. 9.
- 11 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 25 November 1941, p. 7.
- 12 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 3 November 1941, p. 7.
- 13 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 5 November 1941, p. 9.
- 14 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 8 November 1941, p. 13.
- 15 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 19 November 1941, p. 9.
- 16 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 21 November 1941, p. 7.
- 17 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 4 November 1941, p. 7.
- 18 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 11 November 1941, p. 7.
- 19 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 3 December 1941, p. 5.
- 20 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 9 December 1941, p. 10.
- 21 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 13 November 1941, p. 10.
- 22 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 25 November 1941, p. 8.
- 23 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 4 December 1941, p. 5.
- 24 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 6 December 1941, p. 14.
- 25 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 17 November 1941, p. 7.
- 26 R.J. Bell., *Unequal Allies : Australian-American Relations and the Pacific War*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1977, p. 31.
- 27 *Ibid.*
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- 29 *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 December 1941, p. 1.
- 30 *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 9 December 1941, p. 7.
- 31 *Ibid.*
- 32 Phillip Knightley, *The First Casualty From the Crimea to Vietnam : The War Correspondent as Hero, Propagandist, and Myth Maker*, Pan Books Ltd, London, 1975, p. 272.
- 33 Jack Bleakley, *The Eavesdroppers*, AGPS Press, Canberra 1992, p. 21.
- 34 Tim Gurry (ed), *Focus On Australian History : An Emerging Identity*, Heinemann Educational Australia, Victoria, 1988, p. 170.
- 35 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 9 December 1941, p. 10.

- 36 Ibid., p. 7.
- 37 Tim Gurry, *op cit*, p. 170.
- 38 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 9 December 1941, p. 10.
- 39 *ibid.*
- 40 Louis Allen, *Singapore 1941-1942*, Davis-Poynter, London, 1977, p. 119.
- 41 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 10 December 1941, p. 11.
- 42 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 12 December 1941, p. 7.
- 43 Allen Louis, *op cit*, p. 119.
- 44 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 11 December 1941, p. 9.
- 45 Nigel Kelly, *History of Malaya and South-East Asia*, Heinemann Asia, Singapore, 1993, p. 85.
- 46 RJ.Bell, *op cit*, p. 44.
- 47 *Ibid.*
- 48 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 9 December 1941, p. 10.
- 49 *Ibid.*
- 50 Allen Louis, *op cit*, p. 161.
- 51 J. Kennedy, *A History of Malaya*, S. Abdul majeed & Co., Kuala Lumpur, 1993, p. 264.
- 52 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 16 February 1942, p. 5.
- 53 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 19 February 1942, p. 5.
- 54 Allen, Louis, *op cit*, pp.185-186.
- 55 J.Kennedy, *op cit*, p. 55.
- 56 Jim Baker, *Crossroads : A Popular History of Malaysia and Singapore*, Times Books International, Singapore, 1993, p. 222.
- 57 *Ibid.*
- 58 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 9 February 1942, p. 5.
- 59 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 29 December 1942, p. 8.
- 60 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 16 January 1942, p. 8.
- 61 Timothy Hall, *Darwin 1942 : Australia's Darkest Hour*, Methuen Australia Pty Ltd, Richmond, 1981, p. 127.
- 62 *Ibid.*, pp. 66-84.
- 63 *Ibid*, pp. 163-164.
- 64 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 21 February 1942, p. 11.
- 65 R.B. Walker, *Yesterday's News : A History of the Newspaper Press in New South Wales from 1920 to 1945*, Sydney University Press, 1980, p. 212.
- 66 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 19 March 1942, p. 7.
- 67 *Ibid.*
- 68 M. Mckernan, *All In ! Australia During the Second World War*, Nelson, West Melbourne, 1983, p. 189.
- 69 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 18 March 1942, p. 9.
- 70 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 19 March 1942, p. 5.
- 71 *The Sydney Morning Herald* 12 May 1942, p. 5.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

## PRIMARY SOURCES

*The Sydney Morning Herald* 3 November 1941 to 12 May 1942.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Allen, Louis., *Singapore 1941 – 1942*, Davis-Poynter, London, 1977.
- Baker, Jim., *Crossroads: A Popular History of Malaysia & Singapore*, Times Books International, Singapore, 1999.
- Bell, R.J., *Unequal Allies : Australian-American Relations and the Pacific War*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1977.
- Bleakly, Jack., *The Eavesdroppers*, AGPS Press, Canberra, 1992.
- Coleman, Peter., *Obsenity, Sedition : Censorship in World War II*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1983.
- Gurry, Tim (ed.), *Focus On Australian History : An Emerging Identity*, Heinemann Educational Australia, Victoria, 1988.
- Hall, Timothy., *Darwin 1942 : Australia's Darkest Hour*, Maethuen Australia Pty Ltd, Richmond, 1981.
- Hilvert, J., *Blue Pencil Warriors : Censorship and Propaganda in World War II*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1983.
- Kelly, Nigel., *History of Malaya & South-East Asia*, Heinemann Asia, Singapore, 1993.
- Kennedy, J., *A History of Malaya*, S. Abdul Majeed & Co., Kuala Lumpur, 1993.
- Knightley, Phillip., *The First Casualty : From the Crimea to Vietnam : The War Correspondent As Hero, Propagandist, and Myth Maker*, Pan Books Ltd, London, 1975.

Mckernan, M., *All In ! Australia during the Second World War*, Nelson West Melbourne, 1983.

Walker, R.B., *Yesterday's News : A History of The Newspaper Press in New South Wales from 1920 to 1945*, Sydney University Press, 1980.