

# PROBLEMS IN PARADISE: GENDER, RACE AND HISTORICAL 'TRUTH' IN *PARADISE ROAD*

Christina Twomey  
Monash University

## *Abstract*

This article analyses the controversy that greeted the release of *Paradise Road*, Bruce Beresford's 1997 film about civilian women interned by the Japanese in World War II. It centres on three issues that dominated critical reception of the film: its handling of the issue of sexual threat and physical violence to women in captivity; the representation of Japanese camp guards; and debate about the film's claims to accuracy. These issues are intrinsically linked to broader understandings about gender, race and the nature of historical truth. The article examines how race overtook gender in public debate as the fulcrum of the film's cultural comment on war. It suggests that this trend was particularly acute in Australia, where a discussion of race ultimately elided the film's gendered aspects and merged into a consideration of the film's historical truthfulness. This process reveals the strength of perceptions among movie-goers and many reviewers that cinematic history can reveal the truth about the past, and the need for historians to engage more fully in public debate about film and history.

It is rare for a war film to focus almost exclusively on women.<sup>1</sup> One exception is Australian director Bruce Beresford's feature film *Paradise Road*, released in 1997 by a Hollywood production company with high expectations of its success. The promotional material described *Paradise Road* as a 'powerful tale of female courage, friendship and strength' set in a Japanese-run internment camp on the island of Sumatra in World War Two.<sup>2</sup> Despite its relatively unusual focus on the fate of civilian women in wartime, *Paradise Road* nevertheless sat firmly within the prisoner of war genre. The film, which premiered in Los Angeles in April 1997, received negative reviews in the United States. Australian reviewers were inclined to be less harsh, but were at best lukewarm.<sup>3</sup> The substance of most reviews was that the film was prone to stereotype, that its ensemble cast militated against proper character development and that it was too predictable. As a film about women in captivity, *Paradise Road* also prompted reflection on the way film should deal with the issues of sexual threat and violence against women. Furthermore, several reviewers in the United States complained that the film's depiction of the Japanese was racist.<sup>4</sup> This formed a secondary element in their criticism of the film, but it was a censure that received extensive coverage and speculation in the Australian media. In a country where imprisonment by the Japanese has been described by one historian as the 'single most distinguishing fact of the Second World War as far as Australians were concerned', discussion about representation of the Japanese inexorably led towards a debate about the film's historical accuracy.<sup>5</sup> This became largely an examination of whether or not the film was truthful in its portrayal of the Japanese, not if it was an accurate representation of the experiences of a group of women in wartime.

This trajectory, which saw issues of race overtake a public discussion about the gendered specificities of the film, is the focus of the discussion which follows. Although this involved the ways in which the Pacific war, and especially imprisonment by the Japanese was remembered by some key groups within Australia, it would be drawing a long bow to argue that captivity by the Japanese was a contentious political issue in

Australia at the time the film was made and screened. Given much film scholarship, however, this is what one might have expected. Much of the literature on what Robert Toplin labels ‘cinematic history’ – that is films which offer ‘interpretations of people, events and issues of the past’ – has been concerned to demonstrate how films about the past reflect the contemporary concerns of the society in which the filmmaker operates.<sup>6</sup> Or, as Robert Rosenstone has put it: ‘For the most part it is not the difference between the dead and the living that interests filmmakers, but the similarities, what the living share with the dead’.<sup>7</sup> Although giving due weight to some of its contemporary resonances, this article seeks to place *Paradise Road* within its broader historical context, by using as primary sources not just the film itself but the critical responses it generated. It is not often, for instance, that a film is the subject of a question asked on the floor of the national Parliament, as was the case with *Paradise Road* in June 1997.<sup>8</sup> There is also attention here to the production history of the film, in terms of the background research, the publicity prepared by the studio and the statements to the press by the director, Bruce Beresford and the producer, Sue Milliken about their understandings of the film and its purpose.<sup>9</sup> Finally, despite film theorists and historians insisting that the screen is just that, a ‘screen rather than [a] window’, as Tony Barta has so eloquently put it, cinematic history often provokes public debates about verisimilitude, and *Paradise Road* was no exception.<sup>10</sup> Particular understandings about historical ‘truth’ were mobilized in examinations of the film’s accuracy, in ways that revealed the privileging in Australia of the historical experiences of some groups over others.

*Paradise Road* promises viewers it is ‘based on true incidents’ of women interned by the Japanese during the Second World War. ‘When Beresford heard the remarkable story of how the women in one camp, buried deep in the jungles of Sumatra, used music to overcome the harsh realities of war,’ the publicity material continues, ‘he knew it was a tale that had to be told’.<sup>11</sup> The film’s focus is the experience of women of various allied nationalities – English, American, Australian, European –

class backgrounds and personal dispositions who find themselves facing previously unimagined adversity and hardship as internees controlled by Japanese guards. Although there is a considerable Dutch historical literature on civilian internment by the Japanese in World War Two, the English language literature has been dominated by the studies of the experiences of military prisoners of war, but there has been a steady stream of historical work dealing with civilians more generally, and women in particular.<sup>12</sup> In Australia, though, it is the experiences of military POWs that dominate the historiography, and the 1,500 Australian civilians who also spent the war years interned by the Japanese barely rate a mention in most accounts of captivity.<sup>13</sup> The film revolves around two frameworks, one major the other minor. The major concern of the film is an exploration of the tensions, bonds and complexities of the relationships that develop among the female internees. ‘The point of the film,’ its producer insisted, ‘is about how these women handled themselves and how they overcame the situation they found themselves in’.<sup>14</sup> A secondary focus is the relationship between the women prisoners and their Japanese guards. The central dramatic device in the film is the formation of a vocal orchestra, in which the women perform classical music using only the voice as instrument. The orchestra’s formation, without the benefit of sheet music, is the result of the pooled musical talents of women previously poles apart in colonial society, a tea-planter’s wife, Adrienne Pargiter and a missionary, Margaret Drummond. The central contrasts of the film are between the beauty of the music and the squalor of the conditions, and the disjuncture of the previously privileged life of some internees and their current abjection. The women also face a moral choice when they are presented with a proposal to exchange camp life for different conditions as sexual servants of the Japanese. Adrienne Pargiter’s comment when some choir members choose sexual involvement with the Japanese – “I just lost four sopranos” – typifies some of the jarring dialogue about which critics complained.

The critical failure of the film came as a shock to its director Bruce Beresford and producer Sue Milliken. The film was not a small art-house production with a limited release. It had substantial backing from a major production house, Fox Searchlight, and it had instantly-recognisable names in its ensemble cast: Glenn Close as the tea-planter's wife Pargiter, Pauline Collins as the missionary Drummond, Frances McDormand, who had won the previous year's best actress Oscar, a pre-Oscar Cate Blanchett as well as a host of other recognizable female actors. Beresford had himself won an Academy Award in 1990 for his film *Driving Miss Daisy*. Yet despite the budget, the stellar cast and the prize-winning director, *Paradise Road* did not impress the critics, nor did it do well at the box office, grossing only two million dollars.<sup>15</sup>

Inevitably, given its exploration of themes common to other prisoner-of-war films, comparisons were made. The most frequently mentioned film in the genre was *The Bridge on the River Kwai*, a film that abounds in clichés and improbabilities of its own, but which many reviewers held up as a still-unrivalled classic of 'ambiguity and richness'.<sup>16</sup> The more knowledgeable critics placed *Paradise Road* in a genre with other films about civilian women internees, such as Jean Negulesco's 1950 film *Three Came Home* (based on a memoir by American woman Agnes Newton Keith) and another film from the same era, *A Town Like Alice*, an adaptation of the Nevil Shute novel.<sup>17</sup> Despite several Australian reviewers finding that the film was 'profoundly moving and compelling' and that Beresford had performed an 'honourable task in reminding us what horrors can occur when racism and militarism get out of hand', most found *Paradise Road* too reminiscent of earlier films, and one which did not add anything new to the genre.<sup>18</sup> 'If you think you've seen this film before', one critic warned, 'the fact is that you have, and almost always done better'.<sup>19</sup> The film contained 'a set of incidents and characterizations which seem like a compendium of every POW film you've ever seen', one of the more hostile Australian critics complained.<sup>20</sup> Even broadly favourable reviews commented on the resort to the stereotypes of the prisoner of war drama, but asked: 'But then,

how does a director, working in this field, avoid scenes that portray sadistic guards, abused prisoners and images that testify continually to the triumph of the human spirit?'.<sup>21</sup> That surely was an artistic and creative challenge which Beresford, as a director, had not been able to meet.

Some reviewers praised the film's injection of women into the male-dominated genre of war films. It 'refreshe[d] a testosterone-linked genre' and broke 'from the laughable tradition of women-in-war movies, where hair is done just so and lipstick never smears'.<sup>22</sup> The vocal orchestra could also be interpreted as a plot device which managed to steer the narrative 'away from the usual heroics of the male war film and horrors of the concentration camp film'.<sup>23</sup> Others thought that despite the female subjects, the essential paradigm of male war films remained in place. 'It is really the female version of a 1940s combat movie preaching an upbeat message of solidarity in adversity,' chided the film critic of the *New York Times*.<sup>24</sup> On the West coast of the US, another reviewer considered that 'the film plays like an old-fashioned war movie with women as the embattled buddies'.<sup>25</sup> While some were disappointed that the film was a 'Girl's Own jungle adventure', there were others who felt that its portrayal of female detention and the violence meted out to them in captivity had the 'exploitation-picture air of a women-behind-bars flick'.<sup>26</sup> It was difficult, complained one critic, not to see the women internees as the 'victims of male aggression and the film as a porno movie for wife beaters'.<sup>27</sup> Two scenes in particular were singled out for comment. The first depicted the burning alive of a Chinese woman, Wing, after she was discovered smuggling quinine into the camp. The second involved a sequence where Australian nurse Susan Macarthy is shown standing in the sun for hours above a brace of arrows, upon which she will impale herself if she stumbles or surrenders to heat and exhaustion. 'Did such torture exist?' asked another, 'Yes. Did Beresford have to film them with such lip-smacking attention to brutal, race-baiting detail? I don't think so.'<sup>28</sup>

Much of the substantial criticism of *Paradise Road*, then, rested on artistic grounds. Yet, as the 'race-baiting' quote suggests, there were other issues that surfaced in discussion of the film that raised broader questions about how film-makers deal with violence against women and white female captivity by racial 'others', while at the same time avoiding voyeurism and racism. In order to address the criticism that the film was either insufficiently feminised or pandering to male fantasies about female subjection, reviewers demanded an exploration of femininity that laid its elements bare.<sup>29</sup> It seems that most reviewers wanted Beresford to make more rather than less of the gendered specificities of the women's internment experience, most notably their alleged susceptibility to rape and sexual pressure from Japanese guards. Although one commentator considered that *Paradise Road* was a 'lot like *Stalag 13* with sexual threat', many others were disappointed with the film's treatment of sex.<sup>30</sup> Most postulated that the 'choice' offered to women to prostitute themselves for allegedly better conditions was an 'intense moral crisis' which was treated with 'minimal insight'.<sup>31</sup> The consideration of this issue was, for most reviewers, too cursory. It was the 'one opportunity for an interesting sub-plot' and it had been squandered.<sup>32</sup> The women who chose to become sexually involved with the Japanese are seen again only once, in the distance, as a group at once materially privileged yet morally torn. 'I suddenly longed to hear their story,' one reviewer confessed, 'to catch a glimpse of their emotional world as well as that of the central, uplifting story, which although powerfully told was a little too predictable'.<sup>33</sup> The one historian to critique the film, Hank Nelson, argued that the brevity of the scene obfuscated the variety of ways that women might be involved in sexual relations with the Japanese, and the different parameters of that involvement depending on whether such liaisons occurred early or late in the internment. Unusually, he even concedes that there was a possibility that a woman might be involved in a 'romantic relationship' with a Japanese man. '*Paradise Road* reduces this multiplicity of sexual possibilities to the one choice at the one time'.<sup>34</sup> Others were more crude: 'Am I being vulgarian? Given these brave, muddy women singing

Dvorak, why am I not content? Why do I want to see one of them sell her body and soul to the Japanese?’<sup>35</sup>

Why indeed? This is a question worth exploring in greater depth. Although much of the media comment on the film argued that its emphasis on the triumph of the spirit in adversity was a cliché, the insistence that *Paradise Road* devote more attention to the sexual dynamics of captivity for women could also be construed as insisting on a reversion to type. One of the reasons white female captives of the Japanese have a genre of film, plays and cultural productions devoted to them – *A Town Like Alice*, *Three Came Home*, the 1980s BBC television series *Tenko*, John Misto’s award-winning Australian play *The Shoe-Horn Sonata* – is that the detention of women is perceived as having an inherent danger, and one that men do not face: the threat of sexual violence. Concern about the sexual vulnerability of white women in captivity featured in newspaper reporting of the liberation of the camps, and has continued since in cultural productions.<sup>36</sup> Although films and plays in this genre explore many other themes, such as racial difference, the legacy of colonialism and sisterhood, the sexual threat of the captor and the possibility that female prisoners might prostitute themselves for material gain has been an element in all of them.<sup>37</sup> This is a feature that distinguishes productions about female camps from those about military male POWs. One critic described the absence of any actual rape scenes in *Paradise Road* as a ‘peculiar historical omission’ without the slightest hint of irony.<sup>38</sup> Male-to-male sexual violence, and homosexual practice in sites of incarceration is a well-documented phenomenon, but one surrounded with silence in the particular case of male POWs of the Japanese. The only film in the genre to broach this topic, and an exception which tends to prove the rule, is *Merry Christmas Mister Lawrence*.<sup>39</sup> It was an issue the directors of the much-vaunted *Bridge on the River Kwai* did not broach, despite the semi-naked body of William Holden appearing in almost homo-erotic perfection. Already partially emasculated by their defeat at the hands of people considered racially inferior, an exploration of sexual vulnerability would perhaps further



feminize male POWs, a process most POW films explicitly attempt to reverse.

It could therefore be argued that, contra the views of some film critics, by not focusing on the sexual aspects of the internees' captivity Beresford actually resisted the temptation to produce a film about women prisoners which reduced their captivity to a problem of bodily integrity. The decision to make the vocal orchestra, rather than prostitution, the dramatic focal point of the film put issues of mind and spirit ahead of those relating to sex. Nevertheless, the Japanese offer of food and substantially superior accommodation in exchange for sexual favours is a key moment of moral choice in the film, and one which distinguishes the characters that we are meant to admire most from those with a weaker moral compass. In this sense, then, the film conforms to earlier cultural comment on female imprisonment which saw captivity as posing *in extremis* the dichotomy imagined to be at the heart of femininity: is woman a Madonna or a Whore? Yet in interviews after the release of the film, Beresford acknowledged that under conditions of duress moral questions assumed different forms. He claimed that despite the denigration of women who worked in 'officers clubs' they had in fact 'used their association with the officers to send food back to the camp – they were trying to help'.<sup>40</sup> This was a level of complexity missing from the film.

The presumption in interviews Beresford gave on this topic, and in calls from critics for more in-depth treatment of the issue of 'prostitution', was that white women's sexual involvement with the Japanese was a choice, however compromised that might have been by material deprivation. Only one of the many reviews of the film published, mentioned 'the Japanese military's record concerning "comfort women"'.<sup>41</sup> This is surprising, given the attention that the issue of rape in war has received since the 1970s, with feminist critiques of the power dynamics inherent in rape, gendered analyses of human rights violations and the unprecedented media and United Nations attention given in the

early 1990s to the mass rape of women in Bosnia-Herzegovina.<sup>42</sup> The visibility of the issue of rape in war encouraged an examination of earlier wars, and fostered the willingness of women who had been forced into sexual slavery by Japanese Imperial Forces to speak out about their experiences. Led by Korean women, who were the majority of those forcibly recruited to work in Japanese 'brothels', by the early 1990s Asian human rights organizations, academics and historians had revealed the extent of 'military sexual slavery' practiced by the Japanese between the late 1930s and 1945. A central finding was that almost all women present in the 'brothels' were abducted or recruited under false pretences and subjected to daily, multiple rapes.<sup>43</sup> Prostitution, with its implications of material gain, was an entirely inappropriate word to describe the forced detention and abuse that women had endured. 'Comfort women' is another term similarly rejected by survivors as an unwarranted euphemism for slavery and suffering. The vast majority of the estimated 200,000 women involved in this form of sexual slavery were Asian but a small number, possibly several hundred, European women in the Netherlands East Indies were also compelled to participate.<sup>44</sup> The first to speak publicly about this experience was a Dutch woman who had in fact spent much of her adult life in Australia, Jan Ruff-O'Herne. At an International Public Hearing in Tokyo in 1992, Mrs Ruff-O'Herne broke her self-described 'silence' and revealed her sexual enslavement by the Japanese in World War Two.<sup>45</sup> She later published a book, *Fifty Years of Silence*, which is still in print and on sale in the Australian War Memorial's bookshop, and participated in a documentary about her experiences which was screened on ABC television. All of these developments received extensive coverage in the Australian and indeed, international media, but they seem to have made very little impact on reviewers and commentators on *Paradise Road*, who continued to write about women who 'prostituted' themselves to the Japanese as if it were always a deliberate act of choice.

Instead of sparking a media debate about the issue of military sexual slavery under the Japanese, which had been headline copy in the years

immediately prior to the film's release, reviewers' blithe references to 'prostitution' as an 'option' remained unexamined and unchallenged. On the contrary, the issue which caught the eye of journalists and other commentators in Australia was the assertion by some US critics that the representation of the Japanese in the film was racist. Negative American reviews about the film's artistic merits had not been widely reported, and most Australian reviewers were themselves lukewarm about the film, but journalists seized upon the few asides within published reviews about the depiction of the Japanese and the merits of revisiting their behaviour in world war two internment camps. The reviews which did not consider the characterization of the Japanese a failing, such as one which argued that the film struck 'just the right balance between barbarism and humanity in representing the women's Japanese captors' were reports not reproduced in the Australian media.<sup>46</sup> The most-frequently cited criticism came from Associated Press's Matt Wolf, who had written that 'the script is larded with jokes, some of which indulge facile Asia-bashing that sounds queasily racist today'.<sup>47</sup> Some criticism centred on the portrayal of Japanese guards in the film, arguing that they were poorly developed characters – 'we never get a feel for what makes them tick' – who ultimately appeared as 'monstrously inhuman', 'caricatured villains' or 'stereotypical "Jap" beasts'.<sup>48</sup> Others thought the film harked back to earlier productions about empire, in which indigenous or non-white peoples appeared as insufficiently moral, complex or civilized in comparison to Europeans. 'Australian Beresford displays the pride of an imperialist', one complained, 'wagering the pluck of resourceful white women against the nefarious schemes of wily foreigners any day'.<sup>49</sup> The film was 'ethnic propaganda' according to another, who argued that 'the film exalts its women beyond the bounds of believability' and 'demonizes the Japanese beyond the limits of good taste'. Conceding that the 'actions of the Japanese may be historically accurate', this reviewer still wanted to know: 'why did anyone feel compelled to re-create them?'<sup>50</sup>

The well-known Australian film reviewer David Stratton, one of the few who felt that the film was ‘a tremendously moving experience’, suggested that such argument ‘doesn’t merit a response’.<sup>51</sup> But controversy over the actions of Japanese captors overwhelmed public debate about the film in Australia. The major contributors to this debate were the film’s producer and director, former internees and POWs and federal politicians. The film-makers’ response to allegations of racism was to defend their characterizations, explain critics’ outrage by arguing that there was a historical amnesia about the Pacific War combined with a hyper-sensitivity to race in the United States. Former prisoners, however, focused more strongly on the historical ‘truth’ of the film, as did federal politicians. In this process, the debate gradually drifted towards the iconic figures of the Pacific war in Australia, military POWs of the Japanese, ultimately erasing the wartime experiences of civilians. The entire debate was conducted without recourse to even one historian of the Second World War, who might have been able to place some of the competing claims in their historical and cultural context. More tellingly, participants in the debate assumed that cinematic history was capable of portraying the ‘truth’ about the past, exhibiting little consciousness of film as a creative art form that by its very nature is an act of composure and interpretation.

When confronted with controversy about the depiction of the Japanese in the film, the producer and director went on the offensive. Beresford confessed that rather than fearing accusations of racism, his initial concern was that he may have erred on the side of caution:

Of the four major Japanese characters in the film, three are actually quite sympathetic. I was frightened of having gone too far the other way. I thought ‘my God, if I make any more of these Japanese sympathetic it’ll be like Club Med rather than a prison camp!’<sup>52</sup>

Complaints that the Japanese guards were portrayed as excessively brutal therefore led Beresford and his producer, Milliken, to assert quite the

opposite, and argue that their concern about stereotyping Japanese guards had led to a conscious decision to present a 'balanced' portrait. 'The film shows the brutality', Milliken insisted, 'but it also shows that some of the Japanese were human and they were caught in circumstances they couldn't avoid'.<sup>53</sup> Milliken's comments that 'some' of the Japanese were 'human' are testimony to the strength of narratives in Australia about the wartime behaviour of the Japanese, which in fifty years has struggled to move beyond stereotypes of wanton barbarity. In order to justify the characterization of the guards, the film-makers also pointed to the research they had conducted in preparing the film and their interviews with women who had survived the camps. 'We worked on this very closely with survivors and interviewed more than a dozen women who were there and know of what we speak', Milliken told the press.<sup>54</sup>

The controversy prompted the film-makers not only to justify their characterizations, but also drew them further into speculation about why American critics had expressed discomfort about the film's depiction of the Japanese. They suggested that the attacks on the film stemmed from an excessive concern not to cause offense. Beresford stated that 'the general feeling seems to be that now we are friends with the Japanese we shouldn't have made the film at all'.<sup>55</sup> Apart from expressing cynicism that the US was reluctant to upset a major trading partner and political ally, the film-makers also maintained that there was a forgetfulness about the Pacific War in the US which militated against an appreciation of the historical specificity of some Japanese actions during World War Two. Beresford also speculated that American 'guilt' over the use of atomic bombs against Japanese civilians at war's end had in fact repressed public debate about the Pacific War.<sup>56</sup> Indeed, only a few years prior to *Paradise Road*, the Smithsonian's plans to exhibit the aeroplane which carried the bombs, the *Enola Gay*, had collapsed in controversy over war veterans' resistance to a presentation of the Japanese as victims rather than aggressors in World War Two.<sup>57</sup> 'Guilt' may well have driven the desire to repress acknowledgement of the civilian victims of atomic

warfare, but the Smithsonian controversy suggests that the Pacific War was not as 'forgotten' as Beresford had postulated. Film critics and war veterans are rarely cut from the same cloth, however, and the contrasting responses may well suggest generational difference, heightened sensitivity about the issue of atomic warfare, and the relative lack of public knowledge about prisoner of war camps.

Moreover, there are two implicit contrasts at work in Beresford's comments, one with the dominance of the Holocaust within American culture and another with the Australian memory of the Second World War. Representations of Nazi brutality in films such as *Schindler's List*, Beresford suggested, did not provoke public outcry, but depiction of Japanese captors engendered an entirely different response. In the US film industry 'it is possible to say almost anything about the European war and the Holocaust' because 'everybody knows about it ... and they don't query it'.<sup>58</sup> 'Americans do know that their troops served in the Pacific but they really don't know anything about this period of history at all', Milliken commented, 'It has all come as a bit of a surprise to them'.<sup>59</sup> The second implied contrast here is with Australian memories of the Second World War, in which the experiences of the Pacific War dominate and come as anything but a shock. One journalist described American 'surprise' at the depiction of violence in the camps as 'folk memory to us, a revelation to them'.<sup>60</sup> Hank Nelson, a well-known historian of the Pacific war who conducted a later analysis of the film, argued that the criticisms of the Japanese 'came not from those who had knowledge of prisoner of war camps, but from simplistic 1990s assumptions about how one race should portray another'.<sup>61</sup> The film-makers would have agreed, although to collapse the broader point about the representation of one race by another as intrinsically problematic into a rather glib accusation that critics were the hostages of 'political correctness' was a missed opportunity for more informed and complex debate.<sup>62</sup>

Despite the barb about ‘political correctness’, the film-makers’ comments actually raised pertinent issues about the politics of racial representation, the contrasting legacies and memories of the Pacific war in the United States and Australia, and the dominance of the Holocaust in broader cultural understandings about trauma in wartime. The public discussion which ensued, however, missed this layering of concerns and instead focused upon whether or not the film’s representation of the Japanese had been accurate. Wilma Young, a former nurse interviewed by Beresford when researching the film, told a reporter interested in the controversy: ‘I can’t see how you can call a film racist because it shows history as it was ... Japanese guards would slap your face at the drop of a hat’.<sup>63</sup> Tom Uren, well-known former POW and federal ALP politician for many years, also supported the depiction of the Japanese in the film. ‘No film has depicted Japanese prison life as this film does. In comparison, *The Bridge on the River Kwai* was a fantasy of the experiences of POWs on the Burma-Thailand railway.’<sup>64</sup> He also had a broader point to make, that this chapter of history was not yet closed because Japan had not accepted responsibility for the crimes it committed as part of the military expansion of the 1930s and 1940s. Another correspondent from New South Wales thought the film was a useful way to educate the coming generation about history. ‘It is most important for the realistic and truthful education of our children and grandchildren that the evils of warfare are not emphasized, buried or glossed over’.<sup>65</sup> ‘In an era when we know less of our own and other countries’ histories,’ one commentator remarked, ‘films such as *Paradise Road* and *Schindler’s List* perform a cultural service. They don’t just show us the money, but also give us some of the facts’.<sup>66</sup> All of these remarks are linked by an assumption that a film can accurately recreate the past, and tell history ‘as it really was’. Yet there was evidence in other comment that the film generated that the past is not so easily reconstructed, and even participants in similar events can have divergent memories of them. One correspondent from Perth, a ‘former camp inmate’, made what she called a ‘protest’ against the ‘exaggerated emotion-mongering and hysterical behaviour of the inmates and guards’.

For her, the real suffering was caused by slow starvation and vulnerability to disease.<sup>67</sup>

Further debate about the accuracy of the film revealed how easily in Australia discussion about imprisonment by the Japanese slipped into an examination of the experiences of military POWs, once again marginalizing their civilian counterparts. One correspondent considered the sentiments of the 'former camp inmate' were 'despicable' and an insult to the memory of the 'mainstream' POWs. 'We should honour the memory of these men, not denigrate them by a cheap comparison with the altogether different experience of non-combatants in holding camps'.<sup>68</sup> Yet there had been no 'cheap comparison' made. The implication here is that there was a hierarchy of suffering, in which the military outrank civilians in 'holding camps'. The imprisonment of Australian service personnel, 22,000 Australians in total, might be the distinguishing feature of captivity for Australia but in the Pacific War it did not represent the 'mainstream'. 130,000 civilians, a far greater number, were interned by the Japanese throughout the regions. Almost 70 per cent of the deaths in civilian internment occurred on the islands of Sumatra and Java, where conditions were extremely harsh. The letter to the editor is an attempt to assert the primacy of military men in the way we conceptualise and reflect on the meaning of war, when the whole point of *Paradise Road* had been to tell a war story about civilian women. It also underscores Jay Winter's point that 'nations do not remember, groups of people do', and veterans often claim a 'proprietary interest' in the way war stories are related.<sup>69</sup> The memory of a conflict is not fixed and largely resides within particular collectivities and groups, and in Australia it is former POWs who have enjoyed the most sustained and vocal representation.

These two tendencies in debate – to ponder the 'accuracy' of the film and to assert the primacy of military men over civilian women – came together in the discussion of the film on the floor of the Australian federal parliament. The assumption in the exchange between South



Australian Liberal MP Trish Worth and the Minister for Veterans Affairs, Bruce Scott, was that criticism of the film's 'improbabilities' was offensive to the memory and suffering of POWs. There was no indication in their exchange that the film *Paradise Road* dealt with the issue of civilian internment, and primarily with the experiences of women. The Minister stated that reviews which had questioned the accuracy of suffering portrayed in the film had caused former POWs 'a great deal of hurt'. POWs 'do not want us to forget and cleanse those stories', the memories of which 'are still very vivid and hurtful'. The Minister then proceeded to deliver a homily about the importance of future generations of Australians developing a proper appreciation of their history. The film would deliver to Australians the true story of 'what really happened'. 'We must never underestimate the importance of telling history as it really was .... 'I commend the film to Australians' the Minister concluded.<sup>70</sup> There was little evidence in these remarks that the Minister actually appreciated that the film was not about the experiences of Australian POWs, although some former nurses had been consulted in the making of the film. Coming at a time when the Coalition Government was embroiled in controversy over the Prime Minister's attitude to the history of Aboriginal Australians and particularly the 'stolen generation', the remarks about 'telling history as it really was' brought forth 'howls of derision' from the Opposition.<sup>71</sup>

At the height of controversy about the film's representation of the Japanese, the producer had remarked that 'it's not actually a film about race – it's about courage in adversity and the triumph of the human spirit'.<sup>72</sup> Beresford was so concerned to downplay criticism of the film's depiction of the Japanese that he publicly conceded that the film might be bad – 'if reviewers all over the world say much the same thing about it, you'd have to be an egomaniac to turn around and say they are all wrong. They are not' – but he 'vigorously rejected' the charge that it was racist.<sup>73</sup> Marketed as a 'true story' about the experiences of European women in a Japanese-run internment camp, the studio and director attempted to position the film as a war movie about women and the

victory of spirit in adversity. Rather than initiating a broader public debate about the impact of war on civilians in general and women in particular, however, the film garnered the most attention for its depiction of the Japanese.

Race ultimately overtook gender as the fulcrum of the film's cultural comment on war. Given near-contemporary revelations about the Japanese Army's practice of military sexual slavery, it might be imagined that the film would instigate an examination of the gendered specificity of some Japanese war crimes. The virtual silence on this issue demonstrates the ways in which cinematic history is not always neatly interpolated within contemporary political concerns. Although it might be argued that the silence of *Paradise Road* in relation to 'comfort women' indeed reflects the ways in which the predominantly Asian victims of the military sexual slavery have remained outside Western consciousness, the activism of Dutch woman Jan Ruff-O'Herne in the early 1990s had in fact prompted journalists to revisit Australian women known to have been interned to inquire whether they, too, had been raped.<sup>74</sup> The Australian media certainly privileged the stories of white women enslaved, thereby eliding the suffering of Asian women, but this made the story more rather than less newsworthy.<sup>75</sup> The predominantly Asian victims of the Japanese military's policy of sexual enslavement were certainly effaced in analyses of the film, but so too were white women who had dared to speak publicly about it. Instead, discussion centred on whether or not the representation of violence and cruelty in the film was 'accurate'. The consideration of 'accuracy' was conducted within racial rather than relative terms. Commentary circled around the particular brutality of the Japanese and did not contextualize Japanese treatment of prisoners within the history of modern warfare, where their record, while inexcusable, is 'not exceptional' given the extent of criminal neglect, brutality and atrocity perpetrated by captors as diverse as the Turks, Germans, Russians, Koreans and Vietnamese.<sup>76</sup> Debate about the Japanese as captor was particularly intense in Australia, where POWs are iconic figures of the Pacific War and the citizen-soldier

remains at the heart of public commemorations of sacrifice. Gradually, civilians and women again slipped from view as the male soldier re-entered the centre stage.

Belying all discussion was an understanding that cinematic history serves a useful 'cultural service' by educating the public about the past, and in Australia Beresford received strong support for the message he was intending to convey. To the best of my knowledge, not one historian featured in the historical debates the film prompted, and the one analysis of the film published a few years later made some pertinent points but was centrally concerned with questions of 'accuracy'.<sup>77</sup> Although film scholars and historians interested in the uses of the past in cinema warn against 'mimetic readings of film' and consider cinematic history an act of composure and creation every bit as contingent as fiction, this is not a commonplace among film critics nor, it seems, the movie-going public.<sup>78</sup> If, as many historians suggest, the screen is replacing the page as the source of messages about the past, it is also worthwhile remembering that the public reception and response to films demonstrates that audiences, too, react to them in ways that film-makers themselves can never quite anticipate.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Wendy Webster, for instance, argues that post-1945, British women experienced an 'increasing expulsion ... from national imagery of the Second World War', in 'Reconstructing Boundaries: gender, war and empire in British cinema, 1945-50', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, vol. 23, no.1, 2003, p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.foxsearchlight.com/paradise/story/index.html> accessed 7 April 1997. In August 2005, a visit to the website revealed that the publicity for other films remained archived and accessible to the public, but any reference to *Paradise Road* publicity had been removed.

<sup>3</sup> Mark Nagalazas, 'Trouble in Paradise', *West Australian*, 7 June 1997, p. 54; Sandra Hall, 'By Music they Lived and Died', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 June 1997, p. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Peter Travers, *Rolling Stone*, 1 May 1997, issue 759, p. 59; Matt Wolf, 'At the Movies: Paradise Road' cited in Kirsten Galliot, 'Songs of Survival', *Who Weekly*, 16 June 1997, p. 35; Desson Howe, 'Prisoners Drama: "Paradise Lost"', *Washington Post*, 18 April 1997, p. n 44; Susan Wloszczyna, "'Paradise Road" is one better left untraveller', *USA Today*, 18 April 1997 and Michael Wilmingont, 'Voices of Courage', *Chicago Tribune*, 18 April 1997.

<sup>5</sup> Hank Nelson, 'Measuring the Railway: From Individual Lives to National History', in Gavan McCormack and Hank Nelson (eds), *The Burma-Thailand Railway: Memory and History*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1993, p. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Brent Toplin, 'Cinematic History: Where do we go from here?', *The Public Historian*, vol. 25, no. 3, Summer 2003, p. 81.

<sup>7</sup> Robert A. Rosenstone, 'The Reel Joan of Arc: Reflections on the Theory and Practice of the Historical Film', *The Public Historian*, vol. 25, no. 3, Summer 2003, p. 69.

<sup>8</sup> The question was asked by South Australian Liberal MP Trish Worth of the Minister for Veterans Affairs, Bruce Scott. See *Hansard*, House of Representatives, 4 June 1997, p. 4884.

<sup>9</sup> This corresponds to Robert Brent Toplin's identification of 'three levels of research' for historians: the film itself, the historical context of its reception and its production history. See Toplin, 'Cinematic History: Where do we go from here?', pp. 86-87.

<sup>10</sup> Tony Barta, 'Screening the Past: History since the Cinema', in Tony Barta (ed.), *Screening the Past: Film and the Representation of History*, Praeger, Westport, 1998, p. 2.

<sup>11</sup> 'The Story', [www.foxsearchlight.com/paradise/index.html](http://www.foxsearchlight.com/paradise/index.html) accessed 7 April 1997.

<sup>12</sup> The earliest and most influential Dutch study is D. van Velden, *De Japanse Interneringskampen voor burgers gedurende de tweede wereldoorlog*, J.B. Wolters, Groningen, 1963. For a Dutch study written in English see Esther Captain, 'The Gendered Process of Remembering War Experiences: Memories about the Second World War in the Dutch East Indies', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, vol. 4, 1997, pp. 389-95. For studies of civilian internment see A.V.H. Hartendorp, *The Japanese Occupation of the Philippines*, Bookmark, Manila, 1967; Lavinia Warner and John Sandilands, *Women Beyond the Wire: A Story of Prisoners of the Japanese, 1942-45*, Michael Joseph, London, 1982; Joseph Kennedy, *British Civilians and the Japanese War in Malaya and Singapore, 1941-45*, Macmillan, London, 1987; Margaret Brooks, 'Passive in War? Women internees in the Far East 1942-45', in Sharon Macdonald, Pat Holden and Shirley Ardener (eds), *Images of Women in Peace and War: Cross-Cultural and Historical Perspectives*, Macmillan Education, London, 1987, pp. 166-78; Lynn Z. Bloom, 'Till Death Do Us Part: Men and Women's Interpretations of Wartime Internment', *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1987, pp. 75-83; Shirley Fenton Huie, *The Forgotten Ones: Women and Children Under Nippon*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1992; Bernice Archer, 'The Women of Stanley: internment in Hong Kong, 1942-45', *Women's History Review*, vol. 5, no. 3, 1996, pp. 373-99; Bernice Archer, '"A Low-Key Affair": Memories of Civilian Internment in the Far East 1942-1945', in Martin Evans and Ken Lunn (eds), *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century*, Berg, Oxford, 1997, pp. 45-58; Frances B. Cogan, *Captured: The Japanese internment of American civilians in the Philippines, 1941-45*, University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA, 2000; Theresa Kaminski, *Prisoners in Paradise: American women in the wartime South Pacific*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 2000; Bernice Archer, *A Patchwork of Internment: The Internment of Western Civilians Under the Japanese, 1941-45*, Routledge Curzon, London, 2004.

<sup>13</sup> For brief reference see Hank Nelson, *P.O.W. Prisoners of War: Australians Under Nippon*, ABC Enterprises, Sydney, 1985, p. 77. See also Christina Twomey, '"Impossible History": trauma and testimony among Australian civilians interned by the Japanese in World War II', in Joy Damousi and Robert Reynolds (eds), *History on the Couch: Essays in History and Psychoanalysis*, MUP, Carlton, 2003, pp. 155-65.

- <sup>14</sup> Sue Milliken quoted in D.D. McNicoll, 'Film-maker rejects Japan-bashing charge', *Australian*, 12-13 April 1997, p. 5.
- <sup>15</sup> <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=paradiseroad.htm> accessed 1 August 2005.
- <sup>16</sup> Mark Naglazas, 'Trouble in Paradise', *West Australian*, 7 June 1997, p. 54. *The Bridge on the River Kwai* (David Lean, 1957).
- <sup>17</sup> See for example David Stratton, 'A harrowing song of salvation', *Australian*, 7 June 1997. *Three Came Home* (Jean Negulesco, 1950); *A Town Like Alice* (Jack Lee, 1956).
- <sup>18</sup> Stratton, 'A harrowing song' and Barbara Creed, 'A road oft travelled'. *Age*, 5 June 1997, p. 4.
- <sup>19</sup> Matt Wolf, 'Paradise Road', Associated Press, 7 April 1997.
- <sup>20</sup> Hall, 'By Music they Lived and Died', p. 16.
- <sup>21</sup> Creed, 'A road oft travelled', p. 4.
- <sup>22</sup> *Philadelphia Inquirer: Weekend*, 18 April 1997; *San Francisco Examiner*, 18 April 1997, page D2.
- <sup>23</sup> Creed, 'A road oft travelled', p. 4.
- <sup>24</sup> Stephen Holden, 'It Takes a Saint to keep a Prison Camp Humming', *NYT*, 11 April 1997, p. c12.
- <sup>25</sup> Peter Stack, 'Ensemble Acting Imprisons "Paradise"', *San Francisco Chronicle*, 18 April 1997, p. d3.
- <sup>26</sup> Brian D. Johnson, 'Captive Harmonies', *Maclean's*, 28 April 1997, vol. 110 issue 17, p. 63, *Philadelphia Inquirer: Weekend*, 18 April 1997.
- <sup>27</sup> Rita Kempley, '"Paradise": Battered but Unbeaten', *Washington Post*, 18 April 1997, p. c7.
- <sup>28</sup> Peter Travers, *Rolling Stone*, 1 May 1997, issue 759, p. 59.
- <sup>29</sup> Brian D. Johnson, 'Captive Harmonies', *Maclean's*, 28 April 1997, vol. 110 issue 17, p. 63.
- <sup>30</sup> *Philadelphia Inquirer: Weekend*, 18 April 1997.
- <sup>31</sup> Margaret McGurk, 'Music winds through Paradise Road', *Cincinnati Enquirer*, 25 April 1997.
- <sup>32</sup> Naglazas, 'Trouble in Paradise', p. 54.
- <sup>33</sup> Creed, 'A road oft travelled', p. 4.
- <sup>34</sup> Hank Nelson, 'A map to Paradise Road: A Guide for Historians', *Journal of the Australian War Memorial*, issue 32, March 1999, online para 21.  
<http://www.awm.gov.au/journal/j32/nelson.htm>
- <sup>35</sup> Roger Ebert, 'Paradise Road', *Chicago Sun-Times*, available online at [www.suntimes.com/ebert/reviews/paradise\\_road.html](http://www.suntimes.com/ebert/reviews/paradise_road.html)
- <sup>36</sup> For an analysis of the Australian media's reporting of the sexual threat posed to POW nurses in captivity see Christina Twomey, 'Australian Nurse POWs: Gender, War and Captivity', *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 36, no. 124, October 2004, pp. 267-71.
- <sup>37</sup> Christina Twomey, 'Retaining Integrity? Sex, Race and Gender in Narratives of Western Women Detained by the Japanese in World War II', in Bob Moore and Barbara Hatley-Broad (eds), *Prisoners of War, Prisoners of Peace: Captivity, Homecoming and Memory in World War II*, Berg, Oxford, 2005, pp. 175-83.
- <sup>38</sup> John Anderson, 'Chance at Depth is Lost in Paradise', *Newsday*,  
[www.newsday.com/movies/rnmxz03r.htm](http://www.newsday.com/movies/rnmxz03r.htm)
- <sup>39</sup> *Merry Christmas Mr Lawrence* (Nagisa Oshima, 1983). The film was based on the novel by Laurens van der Post, *The Seed and The Sower* (1982), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1987.
- <sup>40</sup> *Age*, 1 June 1997, p. 5.
- <sup>41</sup> Anderson, 'Chance at Depth is Lost in Paradise'.

<sup>42</sup> See for example, Carolyn Nordstrom, *Rape: Politics and Theory in War and Peace*, Peace Research Centre, Canberra, 1994; Alexandra Stiglmayer (ed.), *Mass Rape: The War Against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln 1994; Ustinia Dologopol, 'Rape as a War Crime – Mythology and History', in Asian Centre for Human Rights, *Common Grounds: Violence Against Women in War and Armed Conflict Situations*, Philippines, 1998, pp. 122-47; Human Rights Watch Women's Rights Project, *The Human Rights Watch Global Report on Women's Human Rights*, Human Rights Watch, New York, 1995; Yuki Tanaka, *Rape and war: The Japanese Experience*, Japanese Studies Centre, Melbourne, 1995.

<sup>43</sup> Hyun Sook Kim, 'History and Memory: The "Comfort Women" Controversy', *Positions*, vol. 5, no. 1, Spring 1997, pp. 73-106; Ustinia Dologopol, 'Pragmatism, International Law and Women's Bodies', *Australian Feminist Studies*, vol. 11, no. 24, 1996, pp. 227-242; Watanabe Kazuko, ' Militarism, Colonialism and the Trafficking of Women: "Comfort Women" Forced into Sexual Labour for Japanese Soldiers', in Joe Moore (ed.), *The Other Japan: Conflict, Compromise and Resistance since 1945*, M.E. Sharpe, New York, 1997, pp. 305-19; George Hicks, *The Comfort Women: Sex Slaves of the Japanese Imperial Forces*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1995. For testimony see The Executive Committee International Public Hearing, *War Victimization and Japan: International Public Hearing Report*, Toho Shuppan, Osaka, 1993; Keith Howard (ed.), *True Stories of the Korean Comfort Women*, Testimonies compiled by the Korean Council for Women drafted for Military Sexual Slavery by Japan, trans. Young Joo Lee, Cassell, London, 1995.

<sup>44</sup> For the trial of Washio Awochi for 'Enforced Prostitution as a War Crime', for 'having forced Dutch women to practise prostitution', see Case no. 76, U.N. War Crimes Commission, *Law Reports of Trials of War Criminals*, vol. 13, HMSO for the UN War Crimes Commission, London, 1949, pp. 122-125. No Japanese were tried for similar crimes against Asian women. See also Bart von Poelgeest, 'Oosters stille dwang: Teverkgesteld in de Japanse bordelen van Nederlands-Indie' [Eastern Silent Force: Employed in Japanese Brothels in the Dutch East Indies], originally published in *NRC Handelsblad*, 8 August 1992, represented in *ICODO Info*, 93-3, pp. 13-21. See also Jolande Withius, *The Cosmonaut's Dress: Essays on Politics, Culture and Psyche*, Amsterdam, 1995.

<sup>45</sup> Jan Ruff-O'Herne, *50 Years of Silence*, Tom Thompson Editions, Sydney, 1994. For an analysis of Ruff-O'Herne's activism see Christina Twomey, 'Captivity, Human Rights and World War II: Japanese Captors and the Military Sexual Slavery of Western Women', in Joy Damousi and Katherine Ellinghaus (eds) *Citizenship, Women and Social Justice: International Historical Perspectives*, History Department, University of Melbourne, 1999, pp. 371-81.

<sup>46</sup> James Bowman, 'Those Awesome Aussies', *American Spectator*, vol. 30, issue 6, June 1997, p. 66.

<sup>47</sup> Matt Wolf, 'At the Movies: Paradise Road', cited in Kirsten Galliot, 'Songs of Survival', *Who Weekly*, 16 June 1997, p. 35.

<sup>48</sup> Desson Howe, 'Prisoners Drama: "Paradise Lost"', *Washington Post*, 18 April 1997, p. n44; Susan Wloszczyna, '"Paradise Road" is one better left untravelled', *USA Today*, 18 April 1997 and Michael Wilmington, 'Voices of Courage', *Chicago Tribune*, 18 April 1997.

<sup>49</sup> Lisa Schwarzbaum, 'Singing for Time', *Entertainment Weekly*, 25 April 1997.

<sup>50</sup> John Anderson, 'Chance at Depth in lost in Paradise', *Newsday*, [www.newsday.com/movies/rnmxz03r.htm](http://www.newsday.com/movies/rnmxz03r.htm)

<sup>51</sup> David Stratton, 'A Harrowing Song of Salvation', *Australian*, 7 June 1997.

- <sup>52</sup> Jim Schembri, 'Truth too strong for critics', *Age*, 5 June 1997, p. 4.
- <sup>53</sup> D.D. McNicoll, 'Film-maker rejects Japan-bashing charge', *Australian*, 12-13 April 1997, p. 5.
- <sup>54</sup> D.D. McNicoll, 'Film-maker rejects Japan-bashing charge', *Australian*, 12-13 April 1997, p. 5.
- <sup>55</sup> D.D. McNicoll, 'Film-maker rejects Japan-bashing charge', *Australian*, 12-13 April 1997, p. 5.
- <sup>56</sup> Lynden Barber, 'Besieged Beresford fears critics may be right', *Australian*, 5 June 1997, p. 5.
- <sup>57</sup> Lisa Yonoyama, 'Transformative knowledge and postnationalist public spheres: the Smithsonian Enola Gay controversy' in Gordon Martel (ed.), *The World War Two Reader*, Routledge, New York, 2004, pp. 449-69 and Mike Wallace, *Mickey Mouse History and Other Essays on American Memory*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1996, pp. 269-318.
- <sup>58</sup> Lynden Barber, 'Besieged Beresford fears critics may be right', *Australian*, 5 June 1997, p. 5 and Dale Paget and Blair Speedy, 'US critics blast Paradise Road', *Daily Telegraph*, 12 April 1997, p. 23.
- <sup>59</sup> D.D. McNicoll, 'Film-maker rejects Japan-bashing charge', *Australian*, 12-13 April 1997, p. 5.
- <sup>60</sup> Sandra Hall, 'By Music they Lived and Died', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 June 1997, p. 16.
- <sup>61</sup> Nelson, 'A Map to Paradise Road', online paragraph 38.
- <sup>62</sup> Sue Milliken quoted in Emma-Kate Symons and Grace Nicholas, 'Sisterhood stands firm on the road', *Daily Telegraph*, 27 May 1997, p. 13.
- <sup>63</sup> Kirsten Galliot, 'Songs of Survival', *Who Weekly*, 16 June 1997, p. 35.
- <sup>64</sup> Tom Uren to Editor, *Australian*, 7 June 1997, p. 20.
- <sup>65</sup> K D Sligo, NSW to Editor, *Australian*, 19 April 1997, p. 22.
- <sup>66</sup> Liz Porter, 'When in doubt, sing', *Age*, Extra, 7 June 1997, p. 10.
- <sup>67</sup> Josie Leeden Letter to Editor, *Australian*, 26 July 1997.
- <sup>68</sup> Richard Ireland, 'Insult to POWs who died', Letter to Editor, *Australian*, 1 August 1997, p. 10.
- <sup>69</sup> Jay Winter, 'Film and the Matrix of Memory', *American Historical Review*, vol. 106, issue 3, para 29, <http://www.historycooperative.org.ezproxy.lib.monash.edu.au/journals/ahr/106.3/ah000857.html> viewed July 26 2005.
- <sup>70</sup> *Hansard*, House of Representatives, 4 June 1997, p. 4884.
- <sup>71</sup> Ian McPhedran, 'Minister's History Lesson Irks ALP', *Canberra Times*, 6 June 1997.
- <sup>72</sup> Milliken cited in Symons and Nicholas, 'Sisterhood stands firm on the road', p. 13.
- <sup>73</sup> Lynden Barber, 'Besieged Beresford fears critics might be right', *Australian*, 5 June 1997, p. 5.
- <sup>74</sup> See for example Gary Hughes, 'POWS fight comfort women rumours', *Weekend Australian*, 25-26 July 1992, p. 1.
- <sup>75</sup> See Twomey, 'Captivity, Human Rights and World War II', pp. 377-8.
- <sup>76</sup> For details see Nelson, 'Measuring the Railway', pp. 20-1.
- <sup>77</sup> Nelson, 'A Map to Paradise Road'.
- <sup>78</sup> Jay Winter, 'Film and the Matrix of Memory', online para 5 and Marcia Landy, 'Introduction' in Marcia Landy (ed.), *Historical Film: History and Memory in Media*, Rutgers University Press, New York, 2001, p. 12.