

---

THESES, SIS/LIBRARY  
R.G. MENZIES BUILDING NO.2  
Australian National University  
Canberra ACT 0200 Australia

Telephone: +61 2 6125 4631  
Facsimile: +61 2 6125 4063  
Email: [library.theses@anu.edu.au](mailto:library.theses@anu.edu.au)

## **USE OF THESES**

**This copy is supplied for purposes  
of private study and research only.  
Passages from the thesis may not be  
copied or closely paraphrased without the  
written consent of the author.**

**Organs of Becoming:  
Reading, Editing and  
Censoring the Texts of M.  
Barnard Eldershaw's  
*Tomorrow and Tomorrow and  
Tomorrow***

**Declaration By Candidate:**

I declare that, except where otherwise indicated, the work in this thesis is original and has not been submitted for the award of any other degree.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rachel Cunneen', written in a cursive style.

Rachel Cunneen

# Abstract:

This thesis, a study of the reading, editing and censoring of M. Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, contains two key objectives.

Firstly, it aims to demonstrate how the unusual structure and subject matter of the novel influenced its conflicting readings, its uneven reception and its tortuous editorial history. A utopian reading of the novel is offered as a useful method to explore the ambivalent messages in its contradictory and many-layered narrative. The novel's treatment of authorship and authority, already the subject of scholarly attention, is revisited: firstly in relation to material within the book itself and secondly in relation to Marjorie Barnard's claim to be the sole author of the novel. A close study of one of the extant typescripts throws this claim further into doubt. It is posited that the novel's publication history and censorship have been directly influenced by the way that *Tomorrow* lends itself to conflicting and diverse readings. In addition, public perception of the authorship of the novel has also affected its interpretations, and the literary reputations of Marjorie Barnard and Flora Eldershaw. A study of the reception history of the novel addresses the ideologies and assumptions underpinning the assessments of critics and readers, and speculates on the methodologies influencing the actions of the editors and censor of *Tomorrow*

Secondly, this thesis aims to present and examine new manuscripts, correspondence and other documentation that came to light with the death of Marjorie Barnard's companion, Vera Murdoch. The material already archived in Barnard's papers at the Mitchell Library in NSW is crucial to this examination, particularly the typescript which has been understood to represent the censoring of the novel in 1944, and which formed the basis for the Virago edition of the book in 1983. In examining this typescript, it is argued that Virago's claim that the 1983 edition represents the full text of *Tomorrow* is misleading. Many emendations attributed to the censor were probably the work of editors or of the authors themselves. It is also demonstrated that the greater part of the Virago edition is a photostatted copy of the earlier published edition and is thus not a completely new edition. These contentions are supported by the new material, which includes a complete, revised typescript of *Tomorrow*. It is argued that this typescript was probably completed by Barnard in 1957, as part of a three-decades-long effort to get the novel



republished. It is also posited that the manuscript in the Mitchell Library, hitherto seen as the most satisfactory example of final authorial intention, was assembled by Marjorie Barnard sometime after 1947 and was never intended to be used as a copytext. These findings further complicate the difficulties of conclusively locating the author of *Tomorrow*, and of finding an authoritative text.

Thus, while the latter part of the thesis is not in itself a preparation for a scholarly edition, many of the issues provoked by a study of the different texts of *Tomorrow* are addressed by textual criticism usually associated with the preparation of scholarly editions. Authorial intention and notions of complete and authentic texts are questioned. A complex picture of Australian literary and publishing history emerges, that illuminates the many collaborative influences that have produced versions of *Tomorrow* to date, and suggests directions for the future publication of a new edition of the novel.

-- May 2003

# Acknowledgments:

This dissertation explores the notion that producing a text is a social act. It is itself a good example of this. Many people over many years have been crucial to its completion.

Firstly, I wish to thank Rosemary Campbell, for her warmth, keen eye and scholarly encouragement. On countless occasions she has provided support well beyond the formal duties of a supervisor. She has become a valued mentor and a firm friend.

For permission to quote from their personal papers I wish to give my heartfelt thanks to Drusilla Modjeska, and to John and Jenny Eldershaw.

For assistance with my research, my thanks to the staff at Phoenix House London, especially Ben Buckham and Simon Cobley; the staff at Penguin New York, particularly Nancy Berg, and the staff at Chifley Library, especially Christine Boyd and Anita Haniford. My thanks also to the staff in the reading rooms at the Baillieu Library, the Mitchell Library and the Australian National Library.

For giving their time to talk to me, I also wish to thank John and Jenny Eldershaw, Drusilla Modjeska, the late Vera Murdoch, Clem and Nina Christesen, Brian and Tim Harris, Nan Bowman Albinski, Barbara Holloway and Tim Curnow. Maryanne Dever and Robert Darby showed particular scholarly generosity and I am grateful for my many conversations with them. For discussions on the relationship between Aileen Palmer and Flora Eldershaw, I am indebted to Sally Newman.

I also wish to thank Paul Eggert and the late Axel Clark for their work as my advisers. Carmel Callil, David Marr, Van Ikin, Ian Saunders, Jan McKennish, Eddy Vickery, Judy Byron, Paul Gillen, Helen Irving, Peter Caldwell, David Carter, Carole Ferrier, Ann Curthoys, Chris Wallace-Crabbe, John Arnold and Hugh Campbell all provided information and advice in many and varied capacities.

From the staff at the English Department at the ANU, I would like to thank in particular David Parker, Ralph Elliott, Rich Pascal, Graham Cullum, Ian Higgins, Fred Langman, Jacqueline Lo, Anne Pender, Rosamund Dalziell, Raewyn Arthur, Debbie Wood, Margaret Brown, Beverley Shallcross and the late Christine Carroll. Paul Johns and Milan Janjic as the computer support staff for the School of Humanities have also been very helpful. From the many postgraduates in the Literature and Art program, special thanks to Yuan Fang Shen, Mary McKenzie, Tony Matthews, Duncan Beard, Richard Berkely, Stephanie Jones, David Lim, Jerry Everard, Connie Schulze, Debjani Ganguly, Saeed Ur-Rehmann, Catherine Summerhayes, Susan Tridgell, Kathie Barnes, Jan Lloyd-Jones, Fiona Brideoake and Kavita Nandan.

I would also like to thank the following people for their unconditional personal support: Jim and Chester Adamik, Ngaire Kinnear, Mick Gow, Jonathan Lees, Robert Eales, Francis Elliott, Cherisse Lyons, John Grech, Melissa Johns, Anne Napier, Anne Burnett, Deborah Poole, Su Wild River, Megan Smith, Louise Harrington and Stephanie Boyle.

I wish to thank these members of my family: Ann, Pat, Jane, Michael and David Cunneen, and Evelyn and Robert Dyball. They have sometimes been forced to endure a lot.

A special thankyou to Ann Cunneen and Lucy Tylman, who generously provided their copy-editing skills.

A special thankyou also to Paul and Anne Cullerton and their family for their magnificent hospitality and generosity, and their invaluable help with my research.

Thankyou to baby Nina, whose good behaviour *in utero* helped me to finish this production so I could focus on hers.

Above all I wish to thank Jim and Zoe Dyball, who over the long process of writing this work have become central to my life. Their love, good humour and support have been unflinching. I could not have completed this project without them.

This work is dedicated to Jim, with all my love and gratitude.

## Note:

As mentioned in the Introduction, a discussion of four different versions of the same novel can be confusing, particularly since many people, including Barnard and Eldershaw, have referred to the work using a variety of names. Here, abbreviations have been used where appropriate: *TTT* refers to the 1983 Virago edition, *TT* is the 1947 Georgian House edition, *ML ms* is the Mitchell Library typescript, and *P ms* is the privately held typescript of the novel. The English Phoenix House edition is a reprint of the Georgian House edition and so is also referred to as *TT*.<sup>1</sup> The 1984 American edition by Dial Press is an reprint of the 1983 Virago edition and is not further referred to in this study.<sup>2</sup> The phrase “the novel” or *Tomorrow*, is used when the passages described are interchangeable between the different texts, or when the work is being referred to in general and inclusive terms. Other names used to refer to the work have been kept when documentary material is being quoted. The page numbers cited are the same in both the 1983 and the 1947 edition, unless indicated otherwise.

---

<sup>1</sup> London: Phoenix House 1948, in association with Georgian House, Melbourne. See Appendix Six for dustcover details.

<sup>2</sup> New York: The Dial Press, Doubleday, 1984.

# Table of Contents

**Introduction** i.

## **Chapter One: Politics, Nationhood and Narrative**

Part One: Voices of the World In Flux 1.  
Part Two: Choosing Patterns and Scorning Them 22.  
Part Three: Little World Left Behind: History and  
Nationalism 38.

## **Chapter Two: Reading, Expectation and Disappointment**

Part One: The Difficulty of Reading Utopia 50.  
Part Two: 'How Do You Know The Reader Is Going To  
Play Your Game?': Aspects of Reception 70.  
Part Three: The Wreckage of Established Institutions 98.

## **Chapter Three: Publishing, Ideology and the Marketplace**

Part One: 'Are you willing to risk your reputations?':  
Edgar Harris and the Publicity Censor 117.  
Part Two: 'My heartbreak novel' 137.

## **Chapter Four: Authorship, Authority, Ownership**

Part One: 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow Was Different': Reconsidering Aspects of the Collaboration	160.
Part Two: Further Speculations	190.

## **Chapter Five: The Textual Jigsaw**

Part One: The Manuscripts	205.
Part Two: The National Security Act and Virago	224.
Part Three: An 'Authoritative Edition'?	257.

<b>Conclusion</b>	270.
-------------------	------

## **Appendices 1 – 6**

## **Bibliography**

# Introduction

On 21 October 1943, Marjorie Barnard wrote to Eleanor Dark that, “our very large novel *To-morrow and To-morrow and To-morrow* is at last finished.”<sup>1</sup> It was the fifth novel that Barnard and her collaborator Flora Eldershaw had written together and it had taken about two and a half years to write.<sup>2</sup> The book, “A great enormous hulk of a thing”,<sup>3</sup> had been composed in a time of dire political and social upheaval. In the year of its completion the allied troops were still fighting Japanese forces north of Australia. *Tomorrow* was, as Barnard put it, “a desperate effort to see where we are going.”<sup>4</sup> The novel’s multifaceted narrative reflected the complexity of this task, as it contained fictional explorations of history, politics, philosophy, art and science within its covers.

Most Australian literary and history scholars have some familiarity with M. Barnard Eldershaw — which was the pseudonym under which Barnard and Eldershaw collaborated — and *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, the last novel they wrote together. Marjorie Barnard and Flora Eldershaw’s collaboration was one of the most prolific in Australian literary history and has been the subject of two major scholarly studies.<sup>5</sup> The historical novel *A House Is Built* was their first work together and won the prestigious *Bulletin* prize with Katharine Susannah Prichard’s *Coonardoo* in 1928. The pair went on to write

---

<sup>1</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 21 October 1943, Eleanor Dark’s papers, NLA MSS 4998.

<sup>2</sup> This time frame is based on reports that work on the novel commenced in May 1941. See for instance Louise E. Rorabacher, *Marjorie Barnard and M. Barnard Eldershaw*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973: 66. As will be discussed, the revisions done after the book returned from the censor took a further two years.

<sup>3</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, [?March 1944]. Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn With You*, Ed. Carole Ferrier, Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press, 1992 (hereafter *As Good As A Yarn*): 112.

<sup>4</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 1 January 1947. Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 156.

<sup>5</sup> See Louise E. Rorabacher, *Marjorie Barnard and M. Barnard Eldershaw*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973; Maryanne Dever, ‘Subject to Authority: A Study of M. Barnard Eldershaw’, Unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1993.

three more novels together, *Green Memory*, *The Glasshouse* and *Plaque With Laurel*, as well as many short stories, essays, lectures and several plays.

Some of the details of *Tomorrow's* censorship by the Melbourne Publicity Censor in 1944 and its publication in 1947 by Georgian House are also well-known, because of Barnard's account in *Meanjin* in 1970, and the Virago publication of the novel in 1983. As Barnard wrote in 'How *'Tomorrow and Tomorrow' Came to be Written*':

In 1947 it was published . . . Post-war shortage caused delay but this was not so serious. Worse, the publisher in a fit of (now quite incomprehensible) panic submitted the manuscript to the censor. He was not required to do so and there was nothing subversive in the text, unless it was some opinions expressed in character. Thus invited, the censor heavily-pencilled the latter part of the book . . . The mutilated body is now deposited in the Mitchell Library, Sydney. I knew nothing of the censoring until the eve of publication. We were then faced with an alternative, to accept the book in its altered form or forgo publication altogether.<sup>6</sup>

This was the first published account of the censoring of *Tomorrow*. Barnard further explained that "[o]ne more surprise was in store" when the Georgian House edition appeared: "The volume appeared with one *'Tomorrow'* lopped off the title: three would not fit conveniently on the spine."<sup>7</sup> The account was also noteworthy because it claimed for the first time that Flora Eldershaw had not been involved in the creation of the novel. Barnard wrote that "[t]he collaboration broke down almost from the beginning"; Eldershaw had not felt the same compulsion as Barnard to write it, and in any case both writers had been drawn into the war effort, with Eldershaw living in a different city for the greatest part of the novel's composition.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written', *Meanjin* 3, 1970: 329-30.

<sup>7</sup> Marjorie Barnard: 330.

<sup>8</sup> Marjorie Barnard: 329.



These details in Barnard's account were supported by the publication by Virago Press in 1983 of the "full uncensored text" of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* — with the extra 'Tomorrow' restored to the title. By comparing the typescript in the Mitchell Library (the "mutilated body" referred to above) with the 1947 Georgian House edition, the Virago edition recovered a list of passages "which were deleted from the previous published edition and have been restored in this one."<sup>9</sup> Anne Chisholm's introduction to the edition refers to "Barnard Eldershaw" and "the two women who wrote [*Tomorrow*]", but she also implies that it was Barnard who wrote most of the book, stating of Barnard:

Then in 1942, at a depressing point both in her life and in the course of the war, with the support of Flora Eldershaw but without her day to day collaboration, she began to write *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*.<sup>10</sup>

As this study documents, Barnard's article and the most recent edition of *Tomorrow* were crucial in solidifying the public story of the novel and its editorial history. Since 1983 most authoritative accounts, such as this one in *The Oxford Companion to Australian Literature*, have confirmed the primary authorship of Barnard and the status of the Virago edition as the full text:

*Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, a novel by the collaborating writers known as 'M. Barnard Eldershaw', was published in 1947. Marjorie Barnard, who was the predominant author, described the circumstances of its writing and publication in *Meanjin* (1970). Wartime conditions resulted in an abbreviated title and other excisions by an over-zealous censorship and it was not until 1983 that the novel was published in full with its complete title.<sup>11</sup>

As Knarf muses in *Tomorrow*, however, "Event, immediately it is past, becomes a changing simulacrum at the mercy of all the minds through which it must seep if it is to live" (p.17). Most of the history of *Tomorrow* that is recounted above

---

<sup>9</sup>'Notes On Cuts', M. Barnard Eldershaw, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, London: Virago Press, 1983: no page number.

<sup>10</sup>Anne Chisholm, introduction to *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, 1983: xi.

<sup>11</sup>*The Oxford Companion to Australian Literature*, second edition, eds. William H. Wilde, Joy Hooton, Barry Andrews, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994: 750.

can indeed be called into dispute. This study will argue that, although a version of *Tomorrow* was submitted to the publicity censor in 1944, the cuts that were made were not severe. The two authors then worked on revising the book for the next two and a half years, making further cuts to the typescript now in the Mitchell Library, and rewriting some sections; the manuscript version of these has now been lost. As an examination of the Mitchell Library typescript<sup>12</sup> will demonstrate, it is clear that Flora Eldershaw contributed significantly — in an editorial capacity at the very least — to *Tomorrow* before it went to the censor. Other correspondence suggests that she may have been solely responsible for later revisions, incorporated into the 1947 Georgian House edition.

Moreover, the 1983 version of *Tomorrow* is not a completely new edition.<sup>13</sup> The majority of the edition — 285 pages in total — is photo-offset from the 1957 Georgian House edition.<sup>14</sup> Only 168 pages in the 'Afternoon' section of the novel have been reset. Most of the reset 168 pages correspond with the 144 pages of typescript that were sent to the censor. However, some of these reset pages in *TTT* also restore deletions on pages of the ML ms that were not seen by the censor. As will be elaborated, all pages seen by the publicity censor were stamped in the corner with the date 17 March 1944. All deletions that were probably made by the censor were in red pen and were consistently neat and horizontal.<sup>15</sup> However, the editors of the Virago edition have considered *all* markings on ML ms to be the work of the censor and have thus reinstated them. Many markings on ML ms are in blue pen, black pen and pencil, and it is likely that Barnard, Eldershaw and the Georgian House editors are responsible for many, if not all of them. The Virago edition thus gives the inaccurate impression that the censorship was extreme and that the censor explicitly intended to weaken left-wing and pacifist elements at the climax of the narrative.

---

<sup>12</sup> Hereafter referred to as ML ms.

<sup>13</sup> Hereafter referred to as *TTT*.

<sup>14</sup> Hereafter referred to as *TT*.

<sup>15</sup> This is discussed further in Chapter Five. See p.225.

This study builds on recent work by two scholars who have also contested Marjorie Barnard's claims to sole authorship of *Tomorrow*, and Virago's claim to have published the complete and uncensored version of the novel. Maryanne Dever, firstly, questioned Barnard's claim that the collaboration had "broken down almost from the beginning . . . by reason of war and geography", and suggested that Eldershaw was visiting Sydney "with some degree of regularity" during the period in which *Tomorrow* was written.<sup>16</sup> Dever also noted Eldershaw's hand in emendations on ML ms and reiterated reports that Eldershaw had "put everything she's got into it" and that *Tomorrow* was "the novel Eldershaw valued most."<sup>17</sup> Documents analysed here confirm that Eldershaw was indeed in the same city as Barnard for much of 1942-44, when the bulk of the novel was composed. A close analysis of ML ms also reveals that in fact nearly all handwritten emendations in the first half of the typescript belong to Eldershaw.

This study also presents new material, not subject to previous scholarly analysis, which gives support to the impression that Barnard sought in her later years to refashion herself as the only author of *Tomorrow*. In 1999 after the death of Barnard's companion, Vera Murdoch, a new typescript version of the novel was discovered. It is likely that this typescript was composed in early 1957, in an attempt to have the novel republished by Viking Press in New York. In this case Eldershaw, who died in 1956, could not have contributed to it. In addition, documents found with the typescript support the suggestion that Barnard and Eldershaw did quarrel in 1949 and that from that time onwards, their friendship changed, both professionally and privately. This probability is significant given the likelihood that it permanently affected the collaboration.

---

<sup>16</sup> See Maryanne Dever, 'The Case for Flora Eldershaw', *Hecate*, 15, No.2, 1989: 46.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

Ian Saunders has presented a study of some of the Virago reinstatements and has noted that the ML ms “with its missing pages, alternative versions, and many-coloured deletions, is rather more like — in the words Knarf uses to describe history — ‘an enormous jigsaw puzzle.’”<sup>18</sup> Here, some of Saunder’s observations will be extrapolated from, to consider the ways in which this typescript might have been constructed, and to compare ML ms with the published versions of the novel. Saunders has also observed that the first 248 pages of the Virago edition are a “photographic reproduction of the corresponding pages in the 1947 Georgian House edition.”<sup>19</sup> In fact, as stated above, 285 pages are photo-offset from *TT*. The present study looks at the edited and censored passages in detail, and notes some of the omissions that have resulted in *TTT* because of the photo-offsetting. Most remarkably, some mildly obscene passages in the first volume of ML ms, possibly censored by a Georgian House editor, have not been included in the 1983 “full uncensored text”.

This study also develops an argument made by Robert Darby: that the publicity censor who cut *Tomorrow* was following the guidelines set out in the wartime censorship regulations under the National Security Act.<sup>20</sup> Thus, the censor did not deliberately set out to weaken provocative aspects of *Tomorrow*’s plot, though in some instances this may have been the result. Rather, the official censorship of *Tomorrow* mechanically removed specific details about Australia’s relationship with the Axis and Allied powers, and some references to censorship, because they contravened the stipulations in the ‘Chief Publicity Censor’s General Directions’. The first two sections of the last chapter will examine the

---

<sup>18</sup> Ian Saunders, ‘The Texts of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*: Author, Agent, History’, *Southern Review: Literary and Interdisciplinary Essays* 26.2. July 1993: 246.

<sup>19</sup> Saunders: 244-5.

<sup>20</sup> See Robert Darby, ‘Censored. . . and again. . . and again: Marjorie Barnard’s struggle to publish pacifist arguments, 1939—’47’, unpublished paper for the History of the Book in Australia conference, RMIT, 21-22 November 1997.

colours and styles of excisions on ML ms and analyse the censor's cuts in relation to the Consolidated Censorship Directions of 1943.

As Ian Saunders remarks: "there is an obvious contradiction in relying on the communicative security of a text while simultaneously contending that all claims to such security are suspect."<sup>21</sup> The typescript of *Tomorrow* that was discovered in 1999, and is currently privately owned,<sup>22</sup> is considered in detail only at the conclusion of this study, because its existence raises conundrums which need full examination on their own. In addition, the alternative history of *Tomorrow's* texts that is posed above — that is, that Eldershaw made a significant contribution to the novel's composition, and that the Virago edition does not represent the complete uncensored text — has many implications. As will be argued, a complete edition of the novel such as the authors might have wished has never been published. P ms almost certainly represents the final authorial intentions of Barnard, so it is tempting to view it as the most desirable copytext for the much needed future edition of *Tomorrow*. However, as will be seen, all extant texts of *Tomorrow* — including P ms — are partial, and it is impossible to determine conclusively either the authorship of the novel, or the intentions of the author/s.

There is indeed a problem then with insisting on the need for a satisfactory edition of *Tomorrow*, and simultaneously asserting the impossibility of an edition that represents an original text or final authorial intentions. However, this study intends to do both. The first three chapters of this work aim to steer a path through this contradiction. Some previous material on *Tomorrow* is presented in these chapters, in order to then analyse new material that has become available. In Chapter One, this study begins by looking at the difficulty of locating *Tomorrow* within a novelistic genre or tradition. It then speculates on the

---

<sup>21</sup> Saunders: 241.

<sup>22</sup> Hereafter referred to as P ms.

reasons for *Tomorrow's* diverse and conflicting reception, suggesting that there are connections between its reception and its censorship. It is argued that *Tomorrow's* generic impurities reveal it to be a novel that is representative of a historical moment in which new concepts of Australian identity, nationhood and culture were being adopted, discarded and reshaped. *Tomorrow* was written at a time of crisis in Australian — and global — history, when the future was uncertain but still positively hoped for. Within the novel solutions are grasped at, although they remain unrealised. This chapter argues that it is not possible to identify a single ideological influence in *Tomorrow*. In significant ways, it can be aligned with other works of its period and milieu — particularly those of Eleanor Dark and Christina Stead — but in anticipating some of the concerns of the postmodern and post-structuralist movements of the 1960s and '70s, it also departs from them. The ways in which patterns in *Tomorrow* are 'chosen and then scorned'<sup>23</sup> are examined, particularly in the treatment of nationalism, race, Marxism, pacifism and scientific utopianism. It is contended that *Tomorrow's* lack of firm reference points has contributed to its difficulty in finding a readership, and to the contradictory manner in which it has been interpreted.

*Tomorrow's* complex narrative structure also contributes to the way in which cohesive positions put forth within it are undermined. As *Tomorrow* is a novel inside a novel, the representation of 'fact' in both narratives is partial and untrustworthy. M. Barnard Eldershaw's voice is filtered through Knarf, who is also a co-author of *Tomorrow*. Thus, it is difficult to identify a solitary teller of the tale, or to locate an authoritative version of events. There are obvious parallels here with efforts to present a single voice within the Barnard Eldershaw collaboration, and with the search for an authoritative text of *Tomorrow*. It is contended in this study that authorship, censorship, history, editorial authority and reconstruction are as pertinent within the novel as they

---

<sup>23</sup> See *TTT*: 204.

are extra-textually. Many passages within the book have an uncanny relation to events in its editorial history. For instance, in the early pages of *Tomorrow*, Ord is embroiled in an argument with another archaeologist over the “authorship” of the Brooding Anzac. The two debate whether it was “by a Dutchman named Hoff” or by “Raynor, an Englishman”. Knarf however doesn’t believe “that either of them had sound evidence, this was just a game they played, building such patterns as they could conceive out of the fragments of evidence that they had”(p.17). As discussed further below, this tension between creative scholarship and scientific accuracy is a recurring theme in *Tomorrow*. Attempts to determine conclusively authorship of *Tomorrow* or to solve the related problem of locating a final authoritative text face comparable conflicts between presenting “fragments of [hard] evidence” and pursuing the possibilities of a more discursive mode of scholarship.

In the first section of Chapter Two, *Tomorrow* is considered in relation to utopian literature and theory. Utopian theory is used as a tool here because of its attempts to reconcile the gap between social reality and notions of the ideal. This is pertinent thematically to *Tomorrow*, which compares two societies that are ultimately seen to be dystopian. As will be seen, utopian impulses also underpin aspects of *Tomorrow’s* publication history, as the book has been frequently promoted as representing and upholding a certain set of values and ideals. Moreover, a consideration of *Tomorrow* in relation to utopian literature can help to throw light on its varied reception. It is argued that, although *Tomorrow* cannot be considered a traditional utopian novel, as it does not present a blueprint for a happy society, it is still a utopian work in the sense that its subject matter deals with perceived oppositions between ‘reality’ and imagination. As Peter Ruppert argues, because utopian literature is inherently dialogic, engaging us “in a dialogue between social fact and utopian dream”, it is

particularly open to conflicting and diverse readings.<sup>24</sup> This understanding of utopian literature and its effects offers several frameworks through which to view the reception of *Tomorrow*. Those who have read the novel expecting to find a coherent presentation of a socialist future, for instance, will inevitably be frustrated. The question is then considered of whether it is possible to read *Tomorrow* in a way that mediates between the historical realities described and the imaginative dreams of a better society initially offered in the depictions of the twenty-fourth century. Several fundamental problems with this hypothesis emerge. As will be discussed, life on the Tenth Commune in the twenty-fourth century is soon revealed to be irretrievably flawed. In addition, Knarf and Ord's interjections often dictate how a passage should be interpreted, which works to restrict readings of the 'inner' novel of *Tomorrow*. Their discussions mean that the act of reading and interpretation become themes within the novel itself.

The latter sections of Chapter Two look further at the divergent readings of *Tomorrow* by offering a reception history of the novel. Reader-oriented criticism is pertinent here, because it demonstrates the close relationship between the ways in which the novel has been read and the ways in which it has been published. This approach lays the groundwork for Chapter Three, which examines the publication history of *Tomorrow*. A chronological collation of *Tomorrow's* reviews also reveals some of the preoccupations in Australian cultural life over the past sixty years. The study begins by presenting the marginalia of Miles Franklin's copy of *TT*, as the notes it contains from Franklin, J.B. Miles and Marjorie Pizer expose certain critical trends and attitudes of the 1940s. In the 1940s and '50s, *Tomorrow* was usually criticised for the speculative aspects of its narrative, but praised for what was seen as its "social realism."<sup>25</sup> Responses by different intellectual groupings are examined.

---

<sup>24</sup> See Peter Ruppert, *Reader in a Strange Land: The Activity of Reading Literary Utopias*, Athens; London: The University of Georgia Press, 1986: xi

<sup>25</sup> See definition of this term in Chapter Two, 'Aspects of Reception', footnote 8.



Broadly speaking, those with conservative affiliations tended to be concerned about *Tomorrow's* break with novelistic conventions, while those aligned with the Communist Party disliked its lack of "realism", in the Marxist sense of an awareness of history, class consciousness and revolution. These responses were in sharp contrast to those in the 1970s and '80s. The final section in this chapter looks at the ways in which the novel was recontextualised in relation to the emergence of science fiction, and the effect of new Marxist, feminist and post-structuralist readings. Later reviewers commonly focused on issues extraneous to the novel, such as its censorship, its relevance to current political and social concerns and the nuclear arms race. This period also saw a shift away from attempts to identify the perspective of the author/s. Unpublished correspondence between Clem Christesen, Marjorie Barnard and Robert Burns is reproduced here because it exemplifies this shift and presents Burns' foreshadowing of a more post-structuralist reading of the novel.

Material in this chapter highlights the fact that readings of *Tomorrow* have not only affected its publication, but also its censorship. Chapter Three discusses the way that Edgar Harris, the Georgian House representative, appears to have read the novel. Harris conducted all correspondence between the publishing company and Barnard and Eldershaw, and his letters to the writers are considered here in detail. It emerges that Harris only informed the writers that their novel would be censored after he had already submitted it. More remarkably, it appears that the submission was voluntary. According to Harris's son, Brian, the size of the work was a problem. It was over 200 000 words and it was difficult to justify printing such a tome during war-related paper shortages.<sup>26</sup> In addition, as will be discussed, it was not the censor who objected to the majority of the speculative aspects of the novel, but the publishing house. As Harris wrote to Barnard, he was worried that the futuristic element of the novel would detract from what he

---

<sup>26</sup> Personal communication August 1999.

saw as the most powerful and effective narrative: the story of the life of a Sydney working class family living through the Depression and World War Two:

Our view is that the main part of the book, covering the period 1924 - 44, is far too important to suffer because of faulty prophecy. You may not regard this part of the book as prophecy, but may be using it only as a means of building up your case.

If this section of the book about which we are doubtful were allowed to stand, we believe that the book would have a brief life, though perhaps a hectic one. On the other hand, your picture of those years between the wars is so magnificently done that we feel that it is of permanent value, and should not be made to suffer by your speculations being confounded in a few months or a few years.<sup>27</sup>

While later readers of *Tomorrow* may have found the concerns of Harris and Georgian House to be unfounded, the reviews of the first edition of the novel tended to confirm a preference for the “picture of those years between the wars”. It is probable that Georgian House’s inability to market *Tomorrow* as a social realist text contributed to its early failure to find a wide audience. Chapter Three also looks at the cover and dustcovers of both editions; at the implications of “lopping off” a ‘Tomorrow’, and at the different lists of other publications that are advertised within both editions. Georgian House’s cover and dustcover promote their historical realist fiction. Virago’s cover, on the other hand, speaks to a markedly different audience and generation. In addition to promoting the “full uncensored text”, the cover detail pulls the focus to the outer novel of *Tomorrow*: that is, the narrative about the twenty-fourth century. The fact that Virago is a feminist publishing initiative is also made explicit. The back cover blurb also markets the novel as one that comments on current social concerns, particularly left-wing politics and the nuclear age.

It will be made clear in this study that the reception history of *Tomorrow* and its production history are intricately intertwined. While readers of the 1940s and

---

<sup>27</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944, Marjorie Barnard’s papers, ML MSS 451/5.

readers of the 1980s were reading different versions of *Tomorrow*, which influenced the divergence of their responses, it is equally the case that the varied responses of Georgian House and Virago to *Tomorrow* dramatically contributed to variations in the texts. The last section in this chapter focuses on Barnard's long struggle to get *Tomorrow* republished. Barnard faced particular difficulty over the fact that although some publishers were willing to reprint the Georgian House edition, no one would "come at the expense of re-setting."<sup>28</sup> Letters are presented here in support of an argument developed in Chapter Five: that it is likely that editors at Virago were working from photocopies of ML ms rather than viewing the original. The fact that there are emendations on the censored pages in several different pens and hands is consequently overlooked. Some letters discussed here further suggest that Barnard allowed the Virago publication to go ahead because of a misunderstanding. However the evidence available is conflicting and partial, and it is likely that Barnard's deteriorating physical and mental health contributed to some of the confusion.

The first three chapters demonstrate that a study of readers' responses and the interconnections between readers, authors, editors and censors offer a fresh perspective on the documents that are examined in the latter chapters of this work, particularly the archived papers of Marjorie Barnard and Flora Eldershaw and ML ms, which have been the subject of analyses by other scholars. What emerges is a more comprehensive understanding of the social factors involved in the writing and the production of the texts of *Tomorrow*. While the evidence presented suggests that Barnard and Eldershaw did indeed collaborate on the writing of *Tomorrow*, it also points to the necessity of considering the broader collaborative acts that contributed to the appearance of all of the *Tomorrow* texts as they exist in the present. Jerome McGann suggests that all "[t]exts are also

---

<sup>28</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Tim Curnow, 10 January 1979, Barnard's uncollected papers.

the locus of complex networks of communicative exchanges",<sup>29</sup> but the texts of *Tomorrow* exemplify a more complex interaction than most. While the intentions of Eldershaw and Barnard need to be considered, the intentions of Edgar Harris and the Virago editors have significantly altered the physical appearance of *TT* and *TTT*.

The history of *Tomorrow's* editing and publishing involves many prominent figures in Australian literary history, including Miles Franklin; Frank Dalby Davison; Nettie, Vance and Aileen Palmer; Clem Christesen; Patrick White and Drusilla Modjeska. In ways that will be specified, the contributions of these writers have affected the public perception of the novel and its author/s. There are many co-authors of *Tomorrow* therefore, including those who have made unacknowledged contributions to final typescripts and published editions. The latter section of Chapter Three and Chapter Four explores how Barnard was belatedly reinvented as the solitary author of *Tomorrow*. In part, this was due to Vera Murdoch's and Barnard's claiming of the role. However, in the 1980s it was also convenient to document and market the life of a single woman who had fought the censor and won. In this case, the popular media resorted to the simpler and more attractive version of one authoritative story, rather than considering the number of voices and perspectives that had been effaced. As McGann remarks, the "dynamic social relations which always exist in literary productions" are "critically simplified through this process of individualization."<sup>30</sup> In the case of *Tomorrow*, this process of individualisation has been particularly devastating, as the early death of Eldershaw not only meant that she did not participate in last two extant versions of *Tomorrow*, but also that she has not participated in the production of meaning that surrounds them.

---

<sup>29</sup> Jerome McGann, 'What Is Critical Editing?' *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship*, 5, 1991: 24

<sup>30</sup> Jerome McGann, 'The Problem of Literary Authority', *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1983: 81.

After the close examination of the extant texts in Chapter Five, the possibility of a future edition of *Tomorrow* remains to be considered. An argument between Knarf and Ord is referred to throughout this study, as it pinpoints the dialectic between empirical research and the instability of multiple textual traces. On pages 204-6 in both published editions of the novel,<sup>31</sup> Knarf and Ord quarrel over their different methods of representing history. As Knarf puts it to Ord:

You . . . as historian and archaeologist, unearth a heap of rubble. Every shard is, I agree, for the sake of argument, authentic, but the whole is still a heap of rubble, and as such remains the preserve of historians and archaeologists. To replace its original significance you must reconstruct . . . You contend that there is only one legitimate approach, and that that is through the canons of exact scholarship. I contend that imaginative reconstruction is equally valid, and, as a means of communication, more potent. It is a method of shaping chaos so that it becomes assimilable to the human mind.

As will be seen, this speech explains and attempts to justify some of the alterations made in ML ms pertaining to speculations about the end of World War Two. Knarf claims he has taken licence with world history because of his belief in the imaginative truth of fiction. As is now known, this may also be a hint within the text that the earlier version of events was cut by the censor. However this passage also summarises the divergent approaches of Ord and Knarf. Ord sees himself as “a scientist, a lover of exact truth” and believes he is in opposition with Knarf, who is a poet and “a man of imagination” (p.374 *TTT*). The conflict between Ord’s faith in “brick-by-brick disquisition[s]” and Knarf’s favoured “imaginative reconstruction” underlines many narrative sequences in the novel. When Knarf reads out his descriptions of Sydney, for instance, Ord recognises that Knarf has constructed this picture out of a mixture of history, fable, dream and desire. It is the interweaving of fact and imagination that conveys such a vivid and marvellous scene to Ord, as Ord eventually reluctantly concedes.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> The significance of the inclusion of this passage in *TT* and *TTT* is discussed in Chapter Five, pp.220-2.

<sup>32</sup> See Chapter Two, pp.52-3.

Moreover, the struggle and the dilemmas that Knarf and Ord experience over their respective reconstruction projects — Knarf with his novel and Ord with the *Brooding Anzac* — provide correlations for the task of examining the texts of *Tomorrow*, and for exploring the possibilities for reconstruction. Analysing the past editions of *Tomorrow* and the constituents of a more satisfactory edition necessitates finding the best copytext and pursuing all empirical evidence available. Such excavation work, however — to extend the analogy — offers only further “bricks” amongst the “heap of rubble”. The recovering of new material offers neither a privileged reading of *Tomorrow* nor a perfect text.

The challenge here is to present “the entire history of the work as it has emerged into the present”.<sup>33</sup> That is, *Tomorrow's* authors; its audience; the universe in which the work was created and the network of interactions between all of these factors need equal consideration. An early plan of this project included a drawing showing the texts of *Tomorrow* at the centre of a moving circle, with arrows signifying that each level of meaning in the novel was also connected to an issue concerning the novel's production. Ultimately, this project also pertains to the history, politics and form of the Australian novel in the latter part of the twentieth century. It reveals not only that “[t]he novel is the organ of becoming, the voice of the world in flux”(p.80), but also that this novel contains many voices, within an ever-fluctuating landscape.

---

<sup>33</sup>Jerome McGann, ‘The Problem of Literary Authority’: 93.

# Chapter One: Politics, Nationhood and Narrative

*The crisis of capitalism, the rise of fascist dictatorships or, more generally, of totalitarian regimes, the fear of impending war, the rapid development of science and technology, the sense of depersonalised control by way of monopoly capitalism and mass communication systems, all constitute the “fantastic realities” of the decade, which, by threatening the individual so massively, precisely displaced him from the centre of the field of vision . . . [The] pressure delivered by such a situation forced the novel to expand in an attempt to find a strategy for engaging directly with the large processes of society which form and control the individuals within it.*

Peter Widdowson, 'Between the Acts: English Fiction in the Thirties', *Culture and Crisis in Britain in the Thirties*, eds John Clark et al, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1979: 31-5.

# **One: Voices of the World In Flux**

*"The novel is an organ of becoming, the voice of a world in  
flux."*

*Tomorrow: 80.*



Any comprehensive examination of the editorial and reception history of *Tomorrow* needs to consider the reasons for the censorship of the 1944 typescript. If *Tomorrow* had not been censored, none of the extant versions of the novel, which form the focus of the latter half of this study, would have been created. Later chapters address the methodologies employed by the editors and censor of *Tomorrow*, and speculate on the ideologies and assumptions that underpinned their actions. However, the censorship itself implies that the very act of reading *Tomorrow* was seen by authorities in 1944 to have a challenging and potentially subversive effect, although, as will be seen, not by the censor alone. Thus, this chapter aims to look more closely at aspects of the content and structure of *Tomorrow* that have contributed to the difficulty of placing this novel within a particular historical and cultural milieu. The second section in this chapter will address some of the problems involved in forming a cohesive interpretation of *Tomorrow*, in order to offer reasons why the experience of reading it can be a provocative and unsettling one.

This chapter refers to *Tomorrow* in relation to modernism and postmodernism, which are both notoriously slippery and inexact terms, used to describe imprecise periods in the cultural history of the twentieth century. It has been argued that it is even more difficult to define the delineations of Australian modernism and postmodernism.<sup>1</sup> As Julian Croft notes, the contemporary meaning of modernism

---

<sup>1</sup> For many reasons, including the fluctuating and varied relationship that Australian artists had with Europe — particularly in relation to the two world wars — and the repercussions of the Ern Malley affair, Australian modernism began slowly and was often only noted in sporadic instances until at least the 1960s. Examples of Australian postmodernism, seen for instance in the novels of Peter Carey, Brian Castro and Marian Campbell, did not occur with any frequency in fiction until the 1980s, and were then often viewed as continuous with modernist works, with few apparent distinctions between these two categorisations. See Julian Croft, 'Responses To Modernism', *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*, eds. Bruce Bennett and Laurie Hergenhan, Ringwood:

“often depended on just when a culture became aware of changes in the sensibilities and preoccupations of its artists and was moved to use the word to describe them.”<sup>2</sup> Despite these difficulties, it is useful to consider the ways in which *Tomorrow* could be seen to conform to and evade modernist and postmodernist conventions. The most recent criticism of the novel has tended to focus either on its engagement with the modernist tensions within social realism and ideology, shared with other Australian novels written in the same period, or on the novel’s illustrations of postmodern concerns, such as its interrogations of authority, authenticity and subjectivity. Thus, some of the difficulty in interpreting *Tomorrow* arises because it cannot be categorised comfortably as a work of its period or, despite some of its material, as a work which satisfactorily anticipates the postmodern and post-structuralist cultural movements of the 1960s and ’70s.

It is therefore necessary to clarify the ways in which the terms “modern”, “postmodern” and their conjugations are used here. “Modern” refers to the qualities that *Tomorrow* shares with some other Australian works written in the same period: a concern with the problems of industrialisation, the modern state, technology and the authority residing in institutions like the monarchy and the church; a consciousness of political, social and psychic breakdown; and an artistic response that experiments with the stability of standard genres, styles and techniques. These works are characterised by the hope, which is often desperate, that a heightened or even a utopian solution might be found.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the Australian “modernist” novels that are cited here express faith — however muted

---

Penguin, 1988: 409-429. Also Teresa Dovery, ‘An Infinite Onion: Narrative Structure in Peter Carey’s Fiction’, *Australian Literary Studies*, 11.2, 1983: 195-204.

<sup>2</sup> Croft: 410.

<sup>3</sup> See entry under ‘Modernism’, *The Icon Critical Dictionary of Postmodern Thought*, ed. Stuart Sim, Cambridge: Icon Books, 1998: 319.

— in the power of literature, and in their own power to influence, ignite and transform. While theorists debate whether the postmodern can be seen as an extension of and a continuation with the modern, or a radical rupturing within it, for the purposes of the argument here, the distinction can be seen as the giving up of hope in finality.<sup>4</sup> As will be discussed, this sensibility is evident in *Tomorrow* at the points where the hope of locating an authoritative voice is abandoned in favour of pluralism. The temporal disorder portrayed in the book, and the consciousness of the artifice and fragmentation of the text, in its displacement of the conventions of history and literature, can also be seen as postmodern. Crucially, the points at which it is difficult to separate the text from the 'real' world are seen here as postmodern qualities of *Tomorrow*: is Knarf's story a novel or is it 'real' history? Postmodernism is also distinguished here by a recognition of and an interest in the rampant pace of consumerism and the influence of the media in problematising attempts to determine reality.<sup>5</sup> While these definitions are obviously not exhaustive, the aim here is to explore and extend the attempts to place the novel according to these broad understandings of cultural delineations, before proffering reasons as to why these attempts have been partial and unsatisfactory.

In 1970, Marjorie Barnard wrote a short piece for *Meanjin* titled 'How *Tomorrow* and *Tomorrow* Came To Be Written.' As will be seen in more detail, it is unfortunate that we must rely almost exclusively on Barnard's accounts of the novel's inception: Eldershaw's early death, and her less prodigious correspondence habits, have meant that comparatively few of her comments about *Tomorrow's* creation have survived. While in recent years Barnard's claims to exclusive

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Anthony Easthope, 'Postmodernism and Critical and Cultural Theory', *The Icon Critical Dictionary of Postmodern Thought*: 21.

authorship of *Tomorrow* have been queried, the majority of critics and readers have accepted the piece as an accurate summation of the novel's creation.<sup>6</sup> For most, it was also the first account of the novel's censoring. In particular, scholars have attended to Barnard's explanations of how the charged atmosphere of war provoked her to consider "the whole problem as I saw it in a novel instead of an ideology, creatively rather than politically."<sup>7</sup> Her account of how *Tomorrow* had grown "out of the anguish of the times", influenced not only by the catastrophic years of World War Two, but also the years of the Great Depression, relates to ideas that are expressed in the book itself: that the chaos and upheaval of these decades affected the ways in which it was possible to write about them. The confines and the flexibility of novelistic conventions are also explored; as Ord suggests, the largeness of the processes of society necessitated a corresponding expansiveness of form:

You did well to choose the antique form of the novel. It was the typical form of the period; large, rich, confused, intricate, it needed an elastic, free, inclusive form. Strange how form sculptures to period, have you noticed? . . . The novel is the organ of becoming, the voice of a world in flux . . . the way we say things is so much more significant than what we say. The forms betray us. In times of struggle and becoming, the words are released, the forms break of their own inadequacy. Literature ceases to be an art with canons, it becomes a hungry mouth. The novel was a mouth, sucking avidly at life (p.80).

This passage has often been quoted by critics and scholars, perhaps because of the way in which it elucidates an argument similar to one made by Marxist theorists such as Lucien Goldman, that "the collective character of literary creation derives from the fact that the *structures* of the world of the work are homologous with the

---

<sup>6</sup> See for instance *The Oxford Companion to Australian Literature* 2nd ed. Ed. Joy Hooton, William H. Wilde, Barry Andrews, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994 (1985): 750.

<sup>7</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written', *Meanjin*, 3, 1970: 328. As will be discussed in later chapters, the first edition of the book had a title with only two 'Tomorrows'.

mental structures of social groups or in intelligible relation with them.”<sup>8</sup> Both quotations suggest that, as the mind of a creative artist is affected by the fluctuations of the world around him or her, the social and historical milieu in which a literary work is written crucially influences the structure of the literary work. Thus, “form sculpts to period”, as Ord puts it. Ord then proposes that the novel is the definitive literary form of the mid-twentieth century: both the times and the novelistic structure are diverse, “rich, confused, intricate.” In addition he submits, as Barnard does, that the potentially inconclusive and polysemic qualities of a novel allow it to break free from restrictive canons and conventions.

The implication then is that the period from 1930 to 1950, as well as the art forms that grew out of it, held dynamic potential for change and for innovation, because of the dialectical struggles that were involved. Ord’s large and ambitious claims for novels are also, by association, made for *Tomorrow* itself, or at least for the section of *Tomorrow* that comprises Knarf’s novel. However, such optimistic conclusions do not necessarily arise from other passages in *Tomorrow*; we hear that “The whole world was sick” (p.317) and that the 1930s were “the graveyard of lost causes”, and an era that was “so full of endeavour and so empty of imagination” (p.135). Ord only ambivalently favours the expressive power of novels: while he admits that Knarf’s novel “had its own sort of truth” (p.241), he also worries that the novel will bring unproductive chaos to his society rather than valuable insight (p.374 TTT). Perversely, however, these inconsistencies support Ord’s and Barnard’s opinions on the strength of the novelistic form. *Tomorrow* is a novel which contains

---

<sup>8</sup> Lucien Goldmann, *Towards A Sociology of the Novel*, trans. Alan Sheridan, London: Tavistock, 1975: 159.

many contradictory and conflicting positions, which make it a difficult work to read and a difficult work to summarise adequately, but which also give it a fullness and complexity of perspective that evades propaganda or one-dimensional ideology. The work is not only a literary history, like Barnard Eldershaw's earlier *A House Is Built*, or a science fiction novel, or a work of political literature. It is also a domestic novel about love and marriage, a speculative and anti-scientific fiction of the future and, as the quotation by Ord indicates, an examination of the novelistic form itself.<sup>9</sup> In combining all of these genres, structures and subjects, *Tomorrow* not only gives a voice to "a world in flux" but offers many voices. As such, it conforms to Bakhtin's definition of the novel as a "diversity of social speech types . . . and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organised."<sup>10</sup> Rather than favouring or privileging a singular perspective, a dialogue between conflicting social interests and positions is created.

As critics like David Carter have suggested, this polyphonic quality of *Tomorrow*, with its self-reflexivity and its hybridity of form and subject matter, could be seen to place the novel with other Australian novels written in the 1930s and 1940s. Carter has argued in several papers that *Tomorrow* expresses "the great insight of the period's major novels": "The microcosm of the individual reflected the

---

<sup>9</sup> In 1940, Marjorie Barnard was given a grant by the Commonwealth Literary Fund to work on a novel about Australian history. The fact that the project of *Tomorrow* obviously became more ambitious and diverse was attacked many years later by William Charles Wentworth in parliament: "How is it that, when a fellowship is granted for an historical research work, a trashy, tripey novel with a Marxist slant [*Tomorrow* and *Tomorrow*] appears in its place . . .". See Fiona Capp, *Writers Defiled: Security Surveillance of Australian Authors and Intellectuals 1920-1960*, Ringwood, Vic.: McPhee Gribble, 1993.

<sup>10</sup> M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981: 262.

macrocosm of society.”<sup>11</sup> Thus, the voices and experiences of “little fishes in a maelstrom” (p.342-3 *TTT*) are seen to be reflected in the grosser machinations of politics and war. According to Carter, literary intellectuals such as Barnard and Eldershaw, Eleanor Dark and the Palmers viewed the novel as the only art form that could contain “an uncontrollable excess of ideologies”:

It was the novel’s very project to synthesise the disparate ethical, historical and political knowledges of the present; above other literary forms and modes of knowledge, the novel could reconnect the individual and the social, the humanist and the materialist, by speaking of both at once.<sup>12</sup>

*Tomorrow* was not the first novel in which Barnard Eldershaw explored the potential for novels to contain a range of differing viewpoints. Two of their previous works of fiction had also explored the role of the writer — particularly that of the novelist — and had questioned the interaction between art and the society in which it was formed. *The Glasshouse*, published in 1936, is explicitly concerned with the sea voyage of the writer Stirling Armstrong. It is constructed as a kind of latter day *Canterbury Tales*, with the tales of individual passengers recounted over the duration of the journey. However, the travellers do not tell their stories themselves: Stirling, a fiction writer, imagines their stories for them. Through the stories that Stirling writes about the ship’s passengers, the novel explores the relationship between life and fiction and the necessity of ordering the world by writing about it. The narratives that Stirling creates are often contradicted when she encounters her inspirations face to face. In a section titled ‘Variations on a Theme’, for instance, the character of a young doctor is portrayed as sensitive,

---

<sup>11</sup> David Carter, ‘Documenting and Criticising Society’, *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*: 385. “Current History Looks Apocalyptic”: Barnard Eldershaw, Utopia and the Literary Intellectual, 1930s-1940s’, *Australian Literary Studies*, 14. 2, 1989: 181.

<sup>12</sup> Carter, “Current History Looks Apocalyptic”: 180.

cosmopolitan and restrained. However, the doctor on the ship is older, more cynical and has an affair with a young married woman. Stirling recognises that 'The Doctor's Story':

was not his story . . . just a pattern fitted down on life like those cutters in fancy patterns that you use for stamping out biscuits.<sup>13</sup>

A portrayal of the "true" doctor is mediated through Stirling, who is aware that what she chooses to represent is often quite arbitrary. What emphasises this revelation is the double fictionality of the characters in *The Glasshouse*; by highlighting the artifice of Stirling's creations, and juxtaposing them with alternative interpretations, we become aware of the artifice of the overarching narrative as well.

*Plaque With Laurel*, published the following year, is more overtly concerned with the function of literature in society. The novel's action is set around a three-day literary conference, which provides opportunity for an extended colloquium on the purpose of art, the relationship between critics and writers, the definition of national literature and the role of the writer. One of the central characters, the dead Richard Crale, is a proto-Knarf figure, depicted as a genius with a visionary scope beyond the range of ordinary individuals. Like Knarf, Crale managed to write books that have "everything in them", that have an imaginative power that extends beyond mere didacticism or a reflection of the writer's immediate reality.<sup>14</sup> One of M. Barnard Eldershaw's lectures in a series they wrote on 'Some Contemporary

---

<sup>13</sup> M. Barnard Eldershaw, *The Glasshouse*, London: George Harrap, 1936: 157.

<sup>14</sup> M. Barnard Eldershaw, *Plaque With Laurel, Essays Reviews & Correspondence*, Ed. Maryanne Dever, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1995: 10.



Australian Novelists', created before the inception of *Tomorrow*, is titled 'The Writer and Society' and also emphasises the social function of the creative writer:

The writer is a full citizen and the obligation on him of taking part in affairs is if anything a little greater than for other men because he has a means of communication and the power of binding and loosing thought and emotion.<sup>15</sup>

In all of these works and not just *Tomorrow*, Barnard Eldershaw were exploring the idea that the individual's "microcosms" were in some way analogous to society's machinations, and that personal effort, particularly the effort of the artist, could have large and broad-ranging effects.

Carter groups *Tomorrow* with novels like J. M. Harcourt's *Upsurge* (1934), Katharine Susannah Prichard's *Intimate Strangers* (1937), Kylie Tennant's *The Battlers* (1941), Jean Devanny's *Sugar Heaven* (1936) and Christina Stead's *Seven Poor Men of Sydney* (1934), arguing that all of the writers of the above works concerned themselves with the "heightened debate over cultural meanings: a reformulation of the relations between fiction and society, individuals and society, and not least intellectuals and society."<sup>16</sup> Despite their stylistic experimentations, the works by other authors with which *Tomorrow* has been compared have a particular ideological leaning; while this varies between the promotion of Communism by Jean Devanny and Eleanor Dark's left-wing liberalism, they are all, ultimately, works that favour the philosophies and applications of socialism. This cannot be said of *Tomorrow*. It contains a damning critique of capitalism, but it also expresses grave doubts about the viability of a socialist future. However,

---

<sup>15</sup> Barnard Eldershaw, 'The Writer and Society', *Plaque With Laurel, Essays Reviews & Correspondence*: 225.

<sup>16</sup> Carter, 'Documenting Society': 371.

while *Tomorrow* shares with these works — and with Barnard Eldershaw's earlier novels — an engagement with the modernistic concerns of representation and the reconfiguring of ideas of culture, an emphasis on these commonalities effaces many of *Tomorrow's* differences. Both Carter and Ian Reid, for instance, compare *Tomorrow* with Eleanor Dark's *The Little Company*, which is perhaps the novel closest to *Tomorrow* in terms of preoccupations as well as intellectual ambition and complexity.<sup>17</sup> Strengthening this comparison Carter also posits, as does Drusilla Modjeska,<sup>18</sup> that Dark's writing career paralleled Barnard Eldershaw's — “through *Waterway* to *The Little Company*.”<sup>19</sup> Dark's novel certainly shares *Tomorrow's* interest in the interactions between personal lives and global history; both novels endeavour to illustrate the many-sided individual and collective experiences of war by employing a range of narrative styles. However, Dark's novel focusses on a small group of people from a similar socio-economic group: a family in the upper middle classes. It does not include the diversity of voices and opinions contained in *Tomorrow*, which follows not only the working class Munsters, but also the privileged Ramsays and voices of dissent like those of Timmy Andrews and Peter Hally. Moreover, while *The Little Company* and *Tomorrow* both explore the value of literature in times of crisis, *The Little Company* does not contain the meta-narrative of *Tomorrow*, which, through the conversations between Knarf and Ord, interrogates passages of the central story as they are presented. *The Little Company* views events retrospectively, considering past events in the life of a family, but unlike *Tomorrow* it does not offer projections into the future and thus contains

---

<sup>17</sup> See Carter, 'Documenting Society': 383 and Ian Reid, *Fiction and the Great Depression: Australia and New Zealand 1930—1950*, Port Melbourne: Edward Arnold, 1979: 79-80.

<sup>18</sup> Drusilla Modjeska, *Exiles At Home: Australian Women Writers 1925-1945* [1981], North Ryde: Angus & Robertson, 1991: 241.

<sup>19</sup> Carter, "Current History Looks Apocalyptic": 181.

neither a comparable futuristic element or the “novel-within-a-novel” structure which contributes to *Tomorrow's* multi-layered perspectives.

As argued above, *Tomorrow* elaborates on the abiding interest in relationships between writers, novels and society that was seen in earlier novels by M. Barnard Eldershaw. It has been noted by other critics that *Tomorrow* represents a “culmination of a series of visions of Australian society” and that some of its concerns are foreshadowed in Barnard’s pamphlet ‘The Case For The Future’ and her short story ‘Dry Spell.’<sup>20</sup> However, *Tomorrow* does not just differ from these earlier works in terms of scope or in the number of different viewpoints that it manages to encapsulate. It is unlike any previous work by M. Barnard Eldershaw, or the works noted above, because it does not conclusively articulate faith in the truth of fiction or in any particular philosophical or political ideology. Many positions are convincingly articulated, but as Ord comments, patterns are chosen, but then scorned (p.204). Most obviously, *Tomorrow* is also unlike other work by M. Barnard Eldershaw because of its futuristic projections. All of their previous work, with the possible exception of the final pages of Barnard’s short story ‘Dry Spell’, deal with a more or less recognisable world. However *Tomorrow* can be categorised as belonging to the realms of science fiction, which is, as Darko Suvin puts it, “a literary genre defined, first of all, by the setting up of a radically different location for the relationships of its figures.”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Respectively, Maryanne Dever, ‘Subject to Authority: A Study of M. Barnard Eldershaw’, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1993: 243. Robert Darby, ‘While Freedom Lives: Political Preoccupations in the Writing of Marjorie Barnard and Frank Dalby Davison, 1935-1947’, Ph.D. thesis, Australian Defence Force Academy, NSW, 1980: 440.

<sup>21</sup> Darko Suvin. ‘Science Fiction and Utopian Fiction: Degrees of Kinship’, *Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction*, London: The MacMillan Press, 1988: 33. Suvin argues that utopian literature also falls under this definition.

There is in fact no other Australian novel that was written and published in this period that has comparable scope and formalistic innovation. As Nan Albinsky and Van Ikin have noted, there are not even any satisfactory comparisons in Australian science fiction, particularly in this historical period, when this genre suffered from a paucity.<sup>22</sup> Recent critics, most notably Ian Saunders, imply that the work anticipates the postmodern and post-structuralist cultural movements of the 1960s and 1970s.<sup>23</sup> However, *Tomorrow* cannot be seen as an archetypically postmodern text, even while it anticipates many postmodern preoccupations, eschewing final conclusions, singular answers and authoritative voices. The awareness shown in *Tomorrow* of the artificiality of fiction resembles that of much later works, like Calvino's *If On A Winter's Night A Traveller* or Borges' *Labyrinths*, but although *Tomorrow* bears similarities to these works, in total it resembles them very little.<sup>24</sup> Much of the narrative in *Tomorrow* strains towards finding "patterns" in ideology, history and fiction, identifying with nationalistic icons like the Brooding Anzac and prioritising the ultimate "truth" of liberty. In terms of categories, therefore, *Tomorrow* rests uneasily between several generic and stylistic conventions.

---

<sup>22</sup> See Nan Bowman Albinski, *The Well-Ordered Paradise: Utopian Fiction By British, American and Australian Women*, Ph.D. Thesis, Monash University, N.S.W: 28. Van Ikin, 'Introduction', *Australian Science Fiction*, Ed. and Intro. Van Ikin, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1982: xxviii.

<sup>23</sup> Ian Saunders, 'The Texts of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow: Author, Agent, History*', *Southern Review: Literary and Interdisciplinary Essays* 26.2, July 1993: 257-259. Saunders argues that the textual history of the book also illustrates "problems concerning the nature of the authentic historical voice" but he also indicates that the narrative disruption and the interrogation of author and agency support his contentions.

<sup>24</sup> Italo Calvino, *If On Winter's Night A Traveller* (English translation), London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981; Jorge Luis Borges, *Labyrinths* (English translation), London: Penguin Books, 1970.

It is thus necessary to explore in detail the ways in which *Tomorrow* differs from its contemporaries. It needs to be asked how M. Barnard Eldershaw produced a novel that contained many atypical factors — both in relation to their previous work and to the work of others — given that they, or at least Ord, contended that form, if not subject matter, “sculptures to period”. While it is not possible to pinpoint all definitive influences on the writing of *Tomorrow*, there are several significant factors that have not been addressed in detail by other critics of the novel. The nationalistic sentiments have been previously noted,<sup>25</sup> but the significance of the tribute to Henry Lawson, and the unconventional approach to the portrayal of invasion anxieties have received less attention.<sup>26</sup> The conflicting treatment of Marxist and pacifist philosophies also needs further examination, as does *Tomorrow's* analysis of H.G. Wells's influence on scientific utopianism. Additionally, while M. Barnard Eldershaw's collaboration and the issues of authority that arise from it have been covered extensively in previous scholarly work, some of the complications surrounding notions of authority and authorship *within Tomorrow* are worthy of further discussion.<sup>27</sup> An acknowledgment of these influences on the creation of *Tomorrow* helps to solidify an understanding of its unique position in Australian literary history. It is also crucial to the progression of the argument here, as it will be posited in later chapters that the complexity of the novel's narrative and argument has contributed to its conflicting readings and varied reception, and to its censorship.

---

<sup>25</sup> See for instance Jill Roe's comments on *Tomorrow* and the Anzac myth in 'The Historical Imagination and Its Enemies: M. Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*': 247.

<sup>26</sup> Jill Roe notes some similarities between British invasion literature and *Tomorrow* in 'The Historical Imagination and Its Enemies': 245.

<sup>27</sup> Chapter Four of this thesis deals specifically with controversies surrounding the authorship of *Tomorrow*. Also see Dever's thesis.

The Starving Poet of King's Cross, a creation of Knarf's (and of M. Barnard Eldershaw), is emblematic of the stylistic and formal influences on writers who were living through the upheaval of World War Two and its aftermath. The trajectory of The Starving Poet also illustrates the pressures which incite the poet to break with convention, and to push beyond the beliefs that Carter attributes to Barnard Eldershaw and other writers in their 'circle': that is, a belief in the abilities of the literary artist to unite intellect and senses, and that culture and politics should be intertwined.<sup>28</sup> Because both this character and the novel in which he appears conform to well-recognised modernist conventions and then break away from them, the 'case' of the Starving Poet can be seen to be metonymically related to some of the contradictions contained within *Tomorrow* itself. As a writer, the poet begins by recording details in a style that is easily compared to that of other artists of the period. However, as the war progresses, his work becomes both increasingly larger in scope and more fragmented, before he concludes that his words are useless when confronted with the immediacy of violence and is finally silenced.

When we are first introduced to the Starving Poet, he is a "disciple of the new mechanic beauty, seeing old things in guise of the new and the new in terms of the old" (p.131). He sees nature in the mechanistic underbelly of the city: newsboys seem like seagulls, cars like beetles and the larger buses and trams like great, prehistoric creatures. The poet exemplifies the idolatrous attitude of the Futurists to the machine: to the "holiness of wheels and rails", to "those places inhabited by

---

<sup>28</sup> Carter, "Current History Looks Apocalyptic": 187.

the divine”— trains, bridges and tunnels — to “modern pulsating cities”.<sup>29</sup> The concrete and machine-driven city is seen as organic, but the machine is also seen as analogous to nature. The positive regard for machinery, reflected in the work of artists like Fernand Leger and F.T. Marinetti, is a perspective that can be seen as distinctly European, and atypical of most Australian literature of this period, although some wonder — as well as antipathy — towards the cityscape can be seen in Christina Stead’s Sydney novels. The Starving Poet’s lyrics, one can surmise, are typical of the work of those who still believe in the possibilities of technological advancement.

The Starving Poet then disappears from the narrative for two hundred pages, until Australia’s involvement in World War Two is about to reach a climax. Now the poet is “touched to poetry” as he had not been before: “He had played so long at being a poet and now he was caught in it”, as if the dramatic events of war have released formerly inaccessible insights (p.314 *TTT*). Belatedly, it is revealed that the Starving Poet had, until this point, been neither starving nor a poet. However it is possible that the Starving Poet is actually a referent within the text for all genuine writers, in the same manner that, as we are told, Harry is “Everyman”, and so the Starving Poet in the first passage is not necessarily the same individual mentioned thereafter. We are shown how the critical social and political situation releases a flood of images and words in hitherto unpoetic individuals. The Starving Poet conceives of a symphonic poem of creation and destruction that is “not so much an epic” but touches on archetypal symbols of life and death, conceivably resembling Eliot’s ‘The Wasteland’ or Higgins’ ‘Mordecaius Overture’ in its ambitious scope

---

<sup>29</sup> Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, ‘The New Religion-Morality of Speed’, *Marinetti: Selected Writings*, ed. and intro. R.W. Flint, trans. R.W. Flint, Arthur A. Coppotelli, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1972: 96.

and in its urge to contextualise the war and its sufferings in “age-old images” (p.315 *TTT*).<sup>30</sup> His poetic technique is also affected, becoming less formalised and more organic, echoing the images that he grapples with. His work shows the markers of common modernistic devices and preoccupations: “the recurrent act of fragmenting unities . . . the use of mythic paradigms, the refusal of norms of beauty, the willingness to make radical linguistic experiment.”<sup>31</sup>

We are then told that the poet begins to withdraw from the world around him, becoming increasingly self-referential and entangled in the creations of his own mind. As with Septimus Smith in *Mrs Dalloway*, multitudinous meanings bloom in insignificant objects that are hidden to other people.<sup>32</sup> It is as if the circumstances that he wishes to understand are so overwhelming that his consciousness moves beyond them; in an effort to deal with the horror of the present he is forced into a new, enclosed and solitary reality. At this point it would appear that the poet’s work is more akin to the interiority of late twentieth century work where, to quote J.G. Ballard, “the gaps between the bars are the sutures of one’s own skull.”<sup>33</sup> The Starving Poet is now no longer engaged in any project that could be seen to relate to the politics or culture of his particular society and historical positioning. His work has either become universal, in that it relates to all things, or completely nihilistic, in that it relates to nothing at all. He has pushed his grasp of the poetic form to its limits. Finally, towards the end of Knarf’s novel, the Starving Poet

---

<sup>30</sup> Bertram Higgins, ‘Mordecaius (To Guido Baracchi)’, *Quadrant*, 15. 6, 1971: 5-10. First published privately, Melbourne, 1932 as ‘Mordecaius Overture’.

<sup>31</sup> Michael Levenson, ‘Introduction’, *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*, ed. Michael Levenson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999: 3.

<sup>32</sup> Virginia Woolf, *Virginia Woolf: Three Great Novels*, London: Penguin, 1992: 26. (*Mrs Dalloway*, London: Hogarth Press, 1925).

<sup>33</sup> Quoted in Krishan Kumar, *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987: 404.



must leave the city before he is incinerated. Faced with the threat of physical annihilation, the poet no longer values or even remembers the Spring Symphony, because "he was brought face to face with what he conceived to be reality" (p.407 *TTT*). The "politics of the real" have again intruded upon the abstract life of art and the Starving Poet has failed to reflect the physical imperatives of his position in his work. It is then as if the poet has been reminded of some of the directives of socialist realism, which influenced Australian Communist writers like Jean Devanny and Katharine Susannah Prichard. Poetry, instructed Soviet critics like Nikolai Bukharin, necessarily has a definite function and a direct relation to society:

It is highly ridiculous how certain bourgeois theoreticians . . . keep reiterating surprisingly vapid and tedious arguments to the effect that art in general and poetry in particular have no relation at all to practice, to "interest", to will . . . The objective, and also active, significance of the social function of poetry . . . is to assimilate and transmit experience and to educate character, to reproduce definite group psychologies.<sup>34</sup>

Some of the pages of the Starving Poet's poem, as they rise into the fiery air, seem for a minute to have a physical life themselves: "others rose and eddied, sank, rose again each time higher, like a ballet when the intoxication of the music begins to work" (p.407 *TTT*). However all of the words are eventually destroyed in the fires. In the face of apocalypse, contrary to Bukharin's position, it is implied that words cease to have meaning or value. "Poetry", writes W.H. Auden, "makes

---

<sup>34</sup> Nikolai Bukharin, 'Poetry, Poetics and the Problems of Poetry in the U.S.S.R', *Soviet Writer's Congress 1934: The Debate on Socialist Realism and Modernism in the Soviet Union*, Maxim Gorky et al., London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977: 196-7. *TTT* was also criticised by Katharine Susannah Prichard for failing to adequately represent the Marxian dialectic. See Chapter Two, p.84.

nothing happen."<sup>35</sup> While the author of the words appears to escape, he is no longer a poet, but part of the faceless mass fleeing the city.

While the Starving Poet experiences the heightened hallucinogenic sensations of Virginia Woolf's anti-hero, the sentiments that Septimus Smith utters shortly before his death are not repeated in *Tomorrow*: "it might be possible that the world itself is without meaning."<sup>36</sup> There is no passage in *Tomorrow* that suggests that the world might be devoid of any meaning at all, even if words fail. Crucially, the world does go on, even while art falters and dies. The pages in *Tomorrow* that follow the exit of the Starving Poet express a desire for apocalypse in the traditional sense: that is, the promise that destruction will "uncover" a new beginning. While the poet has retreated, the narrative that he is a part of continues:

[There] would have to be something more, a new pattern of life would have to be born unless the Australian people were going to live amongst their ruins for ever. The destruction of the city was only a symbol, an act of repudiation of all the city had come to mean, a gesture single in all its complexity, and a solution only in so far as by destroying the accepted mould it forced men to create another. (p.415 TTT)

Ben speculates that "a new pattern of life" will be born out of the ruins. However, Knarf's world in the twenty-fourth century indicates that human society has only completed a grand historical cycle, and has returned to an adulation of the machine, like the one that the Starving Poet begins with. While the forms have changed, many patterns are essentially repetitive, and the problems concerning "science" and the concentration of power remain. Humanity has survived, but poetry has not (p.141), and the continued existence of other art forms is open to question, at least

---

<sup>35</sup> W.H. Auden, 'In Memory of W.B. Yeats', *Seven Centuries of Poetry in English*, ed. John Leonard, 3rd ed., South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994: 105, l. 36.

<sup>36</sup> Virginia Woolf: 98.

in the rural environment of the Tenth Commune. Knarf doubts that anyone will “even have the curiosity to turn the leaves” of his book (p.21). Julian Croft remarks that:

[An] essential belief in something . . . distinguished Australian modernism from that of Europe . . . even in the desperate years of the 1930s and 1940s, there remained a certainty that one had to press on even in the face of modernist despair.<sup>37</sup>

However, while complete despair is not expressed in *Tomorrow*, many sections of the book convey an ultimately less hopeful impression than the modernist works that Croft refers to. For the Starving Poet, both a withdrawal from the world and a direct confrontation with it threaten the survival of poetry. Knarf hopes that in writing about a former world in which poetry existed, some aspects of its vibrancy will be rekindled. However, aspects of both Knarf’s novel and the novel in which he exists articulate pessimism not only about the physical survival of art, but about whether it is possible to continue with any faith in its significance.

A scene between Archie and Paula recounts an ontological crisis, brought about by the war, which can be compared to the Starving Poet’s final failure to relate his words to his experience. Archie tells Paula about a time when he took a girl to the pictures while on leave from the war:

It was a flying picture with all the usual thrills and victories and handsome young actors in flying suits. It was all so shoddy and unreal that he’d caught a glimpse through it of the unreality in himself and in all of them. They had to make it unreal so that they could bear it, just as the picture was making it unreal for the audience so that they could bear the reality, “a sort of double ricochet, you see”. (p.355 *TTT*)

---

<sup>37</sup> Julian Croft: 427.

Here, Archie experiences the condition that was later to be termed 'hyper-reality' by Jean Baudrillard.<sup>38</sup> That is, Archie perceives that the reality of the war has entirely disappeared beneath the seductive simulations on the screen. The picture has not only lessened the harshness of the truth: most of the audience have an intimate and knowledgeable connection with the representation of war on the screen but none with the war itself. Thus, the separation between image and reality collapses and it is no longer possible to tell the difference between the two. Just as the Starving Poet comes to live only in his conception of the world, the movie audience, "intent white blobs sucking in the soothing syrup", live in a simulacrum. For Archie, the experience is a profoundly pessimistic one; the movie allows a complete escape from the violence of the real, so that his experience of the war is completely blotted out by "handsome young actors in flying suits." An awareness of the "phantasmagoria" (p.46) perpetuated by consumerism is expressed in other parts of Knarf's novel. In the earliest section of Knarf's story, for instance, it is observed of a Friday shopping night in Sydney that: "These are not real things the people are buying, they are tokens. This is not a late shopping night for the public's convenience, it is a ritual, an orgy . . . It is a mystical sharing in the world's plenty, because there is no sharing" (p.47). In a later section, two men stare longingly at the chocolates in a confectioner's window before realising that the delicacies are made of wood: "There is so much and so little valued" (p.188). This effacement of the real through the commodification of objects can be seen as an example of the condition of postmodernity. Both passages are not just a critique of capitalist consumption and exploitation, but a critique of cultural commodification.

---

<sup>38</sup> See Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, trans. Sheila Faria Glaser, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Archie's epiphany points to a crisis in art, where art is no longer representing reality but replacing it.

We can also see examples of the inability of Knarf's novel to fully represent the global catastrophe it aims to describe at points where semantic sense breaks down. As will be discussed comprehensively in later chapters, some of the most fragmented passages are the result of an inaccurate piecing together of texts by the Virago publishers. As future chapters will demonstrate, it is questionable whether a reading of poorly edited passages can be considered legitimate. Nevertheless, the version of the book that many readers have encountered, and have understood to be as complete as possible, gives the impression that it is so difficult to convey a comprehensive vision of war that a meaningful narrative is unattainable. On page 249 in the Virago edition, for instance, the subject matter veers between Harry Munster's worries with his son, the Russo-Finnish war, the passing of the National Security Act, making "a cult of short hair" and, with some irony, the "canons of reason". There are no apparent logical connections between these subjects, and while this effect was caused by careless editing, the effect is still one of a postmodern pastiche, randomly juxtaposed, with generic and grammatical permutations, and at best an arbitrary significance. Such a passage is not an example of the experiments with realist fiction that Carter examines, but can be read as a complete rupturing of a belief in the ability of fiction to reflect reality.

## **Two: Choosing Patterns and Scorning Them**

*“And why should you choose the very moment when you are  
using a pattern to tell me you scorn it?”*

*Tomorrow: 204*

The difficulty of maintaining cohesive narratives is also tackled thematically in *Tomorrow*. The novel in its entirety is concerned with the problems involved in dismantling faith in the grand narratives of science and capitalism. The irony at the thematic heart of *Tomorrow* is that the aspects of the socialist utopia that are dreamt of and longed for by many characters in the twentieth century are accomplished in the twenty-fourth century, but this accomplishment has stifled liberty, substituting for the oppression of capitalism the oppression of totalitarianism.<sup>1</sup> The classless society which Sid Warren fights for has eliminated basic deprivation but, as anticipated and feared by Ruth Munster, it has also fallen prey to "ruthless idealism"(p.380 *TTT*) and a highly controlled and hierarchical society has re-emerged. In *Tomorrow*, socialism, like capitalism, appears to contain the seeds of its own destruction. Thus, one of the central problems in the novel is how to overthrow one totalising and authoritative ideology without replacing it with another.

This problem is articulated most eloquently in a surrealist passage that sits oddly in the middle of 'Little World Left Behind', and which parodies a loss of belief in absolutes. In the scene, the dying Olaf Ramsay has an encounter with "God, Son and Ghost", who bears an uncanny resemblance to H.G. Wells. In his febrile state Olaf has been worrying about how "so much was happening or just going to happen in the world" (p.164). He is distressed about the way that the wrong people keep on dying, and that a war has never been fought for 'Everyman', who for Olaf is embodied in Harry Munster. Olaf decides therefore that he needs to see "some one in authority" (p.167). God as H.G. Wells assures Olaf that although he is still running

---

<sup>1</sup> There is an echo of Ren's criticism of his scientific technocratic society in the first section of Knarf's novel when we are told that Harry "always advocated scientific method and the higher standard equipment in the Co-operative." However, Ally tells him that it is not enough to have enough to eat: "Enough to eat. Well, so we ought to have. No one gets any fun out of enough. It begins after that." (pp.62-63)

the show, he is operating on one “plain ruling”: the Law of Cause and Effect. Olaf protests that God is speaking “as if the situation were reasonable”, but, as it eventuates, God cannot do anything, because “he was the image of our thought, the leader we chose.” Later in the conversation, God seems to Olaf Ramsay to suggest the face not only of H.G. Wells, but also Bernard Shaw, Winston Churchill and Hitler. God in his various likenesses has been revealed then, not as a fraud, but as someone without omniscience and power. Olaf bleakly realises that it is after all not possible to see someone in authority, because “if God couldn’t keep a clear head, who could?” It is also clear that, at least for Olaf Ramsay, all leaders have ultimately interchangeable faces. If H.G. Wells/Shaw/Churchill/Hitler/God — as well as the “god” of science and rationality — are all revealed to lack the power that others attribute to them, then much more than allegiance to them is lost. When the “whole world” is dying, all human knowledge appears to be on uncertain ground. As Knarf says, “Man’s creation had gone past him, he was bound on a mechanic wheel and the wheel was due to plunge downward, carrying him with it (p.90).

The reference to Wells here is particularly significant. It is possible that Barnard Eldershaw intended the reference as a wry tribute, given that Wells had spoken to the Fellowship of Australian Writers in the summer of 1938-39, just as they were first planning to write *Tomorrow*.<sup>2</sup> However, given the negative portrayals of the technocratic Tenth Commune, this reference is more easily seen as a criticism of Wells’s promotions of a scientific utopia in works like *The First Men on the Moon*, *When the Sleeper Wakes* and *A Modern Utopia*. While there were few Australian fictional responses to H.G. Wells written in this period, Yevgeny Zamyatin’s *We* and Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* were acknowledged reactions against Wells, and, in the latter case, against the English scientists J.B.S. Haldane and J.D. Bernal, who

---

<sup>2</sup> See David C. Smith, *H.G. Wells, Desperately Mortal: A Biography*, New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1986: 350.



were prominent in the 1920s.<sup>3</sup> As has been noted frequently, *Tomorrow* also anticipates the portrayal of mind control in George Orwell's *1984*, although on the Tenth Commune the use of authority is much less overt. As Krishan Kumar writes:

[H.G. Wells] had in particular little influence — except as a target — with the new generation of thinkers who had been fashioned by the disillusioning experience of the world war. For them it was grotesque to see reason and science as the great deliverers of humanity . . . In popular parlance, 'Wellsian' meant, quite simply, the complex mechanized society of the future run by a scientific elite.<sup>4</sup>

With the economic depression of the 1930s and the rise of dictatorship and fascism, it was difficult to maintain faith in ideological organisations, whether they pertained to science, rationality, god or politics. The passage in *Tomorrow* indicates that, for Olaf Ramsay, the turmoil of world war ensures that H.G. Wells can no longer be regarded as "God" — but his potential replacements have equally little authority. The Wellsian fantasy of an efficient, systematic scientific utopia is under attack in *Tomorrow*, as the many negative portrayals of the "tabulated and docketed" Technical Bureau demonstrate (p.454), but this is not all. Olaf Ramsay's hallucinations articulate a deep mistrust in the grand narratives of religion, socialism and fascism, but most particularly in the grand narrative of science.

The word "science", however, is used extremely broadly in *Tomorrow*. Frequently, "science" is associated with any totalising power or ideology; at various points the word is a signifier for violence, power, elitism, rigidity, a lack of individualism and an allegiance to an exclusively rational view of the world. In 'Symposium' for instance, Oran, who exhibits complete trust in the ability of science to explain and order everything, thinks to himself: "The great bright shining machine which he

---

<sup>3</sup> Kumar: 224-242.

<sup>4</sup> Kumar: 224-5.

served with such pleasure in its mechanical efficiency had, as its avowed object, to keep alive and in comfort this soft-witted trash. The machine was for itself and whatever impeded it must go" (p.227). For Oran then, science is a grand narrative in the sense of Jean-Francois Lyotard's critique: that is, it "denies the validity of all other explanations, laying sole claim to the truth."<sup>5</sup> Ultimately, a condemnation of "science" in *Tomorrow* is a condemnation of the Enlightenment view that reason can rely on a firm founding in deciding between truth and falsehood. Thus, in *Tomorrow* a scepticism is expressed towards all grand narratives and those who claim authority in the name of them.

In its evasion of singular ideologies, and rejection of a Marxian dialectic, *Tomorrow* appears influenced by Andersonian pluralism, John Anderson's description and advocacy of a plurality and complexity of social forces.<sup>6</sup> However, in *Tomorrow* social pluralism is not espoused as a possible system: on the contrary, Ren's attempt to introduce greater democracy into his society reveals only that choice can lead to indifference, or an inability to choose. The possibilities for a genuine democracy are treated with some scepticism in *Tomorrow*, both in the twentieth and twenty-fourth century narratives. The incident with the votometer leaves the future of democracy and the future of liberty uncertain. Ren intends the votometer to record "the unadulterated will of the people", but the result, in effect, indicates that the people have no will. In the concluding paragraphs of *Tomorrow* Knarf stresses the necessity of continuing to struggle for liberty, but no clear definition of liberty is given. The descriptions of Ren's failure to incite an enthusiasm for democracy amongst his neighbours also appear indebted to the Andersonians' argument that representative models of democracy, requiring only that citizens vote

---

<sup>5</sup> *The Icon Critical Dictionary of Postmodern Thought*: 261.

<sup>6</sup> A.J. Baker, *Anderson's Social Philosophy*, Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1979: 40.

occasionally, lead to a passive citizenry.<sup>7</sup> The inhabitants of the Tenth Commune demonstrate this shortcoming in the apathy they display regarding the proposal to allocate some power away from the central governing body, and to give the workers and private citizens a voice (p.37). While Ren claims that “We must bring back liberty, because life is poor and narrow without it” (p.36), the majority of the population seem content to have their liberty curtailed. They are, in effect, a characterisation of John Anderson’s ‘The Servile State’, where the people have traded struggle, questioning and anti-authoritarianism for a form of socialism that allows complete governmental control over their affairs.<sup>8</sup>

In its reaction against scientific, centralised, totalitarian regimes, *Tomorrow* has most in common with *Brave New World*. *Brave New World* was written a decade earlier than *Tomorrow* and it is likely that Marjorie Barnard, if not Flora Eldershaw, read it, given Barnard’s interest in Huxley’s works.<sup>9</sup> A small but significant reference supports this possibility. The Savage in *Brave New World*, who has learnt about ‘advanced’ civilisation through his access to a tattered copy of *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, experiences an epiphany during his solitary initiation into manhood in the Mexican wilderness. There is a description of him “looking into the black shadow of death” that concludes, “Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow . . . He had discovered Time and Death and God.”<sup>10</sup> Apart from the obvious parallel with the Macbeth allusion in *Tomorrow*, the passage also resonates with Ren’s own moment of reckoning and ‘coming of age’ in *Tomorrow*; like the Savage, Ren confronts death and finds solace in history. Both young men,

<sup>7</sup> Analysed in John Docker, *Australian Cultural Elites: Intellectual Traditions in Sydney and Melbourne*, Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1974: 134.

<sup>8</sup> See Mark Weblin, ‘Professor John Anderson 1893-1962 Lecture Notes and Other Writings’, <http://setis.library.usyd.edu.au/anderson/index.html>.

<sup>9</sup> See for instance Modjeska: 108-9.

<sup>10</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, London: Chatto & Windus, 1932: 114. Seemingly coincidentally, Huxley also published a book called *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow, and Other Essays*, in 1956 (New York: Harper).

over the course of the novels in which they feature, become suspicious of the salvations that 'advanced' scientific society offers. Ultimately, they both come to reject commonly accepted notions of progress and civilisation, although neither of them faces clear alternatives.

More pertinently, however, both books describe a world where the price of material plenty and peace has been the entrenchment of hierarchy, and the lack of personal choice, freedom, and change. Both books promote the idea that it is the mechanised, dehumanising aspects of society that are at fault, and the fanatical adherence to a particular ideology; neither socialism nor capitalism escapes critique. In *Brave New World*, left wing fanatics are parodied through the use of names: Polly Trotsky, Sarojini Engels, Herbert Bakunin and Bernard Marx, while capitalists are ridiculed through the mock-worshipping of Ford.<sup>11</sup> In *Tomorrow*, capitalism is condemned in numerous passages, such as this one, in which Knarf describes how the overwhelming competitiveness of twentieth-century life led to people hating one another:

Out of their blind rage, irritation, discomfort, the people fashioned schisms. There was hatred between the United Nations, the plutocracies feared and hated Soviet Russia, Russia returned it with a warrior hate. (p.317 TTT)

However, as Illil points out, violence has not been eliminated in the supposedly socialist and peaceful twenty-fourth century as much as it has been submerged. She contends that a slavish attendance to the machine is in itself a form of violence: "Slow, cold, scientific violence". "Violence isn't only wounding and killing people", she claims (p.225). On the contrary, violence is "the ruthless use of power in any context and by any means." It is a society that still relies on military power to control citizens, as Ren discovers during the community election (p.437

---

<sup>11</sup> See Kumar: 243.

TTT). Moreover, according to IIII, ferocious competition still exists. People are afraid of saying anything critical in case they do not “make the grade” to get into the “ruling class” (p.225), a curious admission in what is supposedly an egalitarian society, even though it has been implicitly clear before this point that it is not. Many of IIII’s words are echoed in *Brave New World’s* Bernard Marx’s sentiments, as he struggles against the restrictions imposed in his society against privacy, monogamy, emotional openness, physical deformities and ageing. As with IIII, Bernard Marx lives in a world where stability and material plenty have been achieved, but the price of non-conformism is great. Eugenics, a popular if controversial subject in socialist circles pre-World War Two, is also practiced in both societies, with chilling effects. The Australia of the twenty-fourth century does not monitor reproduction to the same extent as at the ‘Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre’, but IIII is not permitted to bear children because one of her lungs is “unorthodox”:

Nobody ever hears anything about the sick people and the mad people. There are plenty of them, though, all herded out of sight in nice, scientific, fool-proof prisons, weeded out and kept separate so that they’ll die off and the world will get cleaner and cleaner. (p.427 TTT)

Despite these many comparable sentiments, however, the portrayal of “science” in *Tomorrow* is ultimately more negative than in *Brave New World*. In *Tomorrow*, there is no consideration of a scientific methodology or mind-set that is anything other than restrictive or didactic. *Brave New World* targets Wells’ scientific optimism more overtly than *Tomorrow*, but Mustapha Mond concedes towards the end of *Brave New World* that “every discovery in pure science is potentially subversive.” There are two ways to regard science, Mond suggests, and they bear little relation to one another; one is questioning, innovative and dangerous to stability, while the other is purely propaganda, designed to maintain orthodoxy and

control.<sup>12</sup> This is not a distinction that is made in *Tomorrow*, where science becomes an absolute authority. The reason for this blanket condemnation, somewhat ironically, can possibly be traced to the influence of another of Huxley's works, *Ends and Means*. Barnard had been reading the book during the Spanish Civil War and had reported that the book was like "a chock under my mind".<sup>13</sup> In the introduction to the book, Huxley argued that humanity had always shared common utopian goals, but had mistakenly believed that good ends could justify bad means:

There are some who believe — and it is a very popular belief at the present time — that the royal road to a better world is the road of economic reform. For some, the short cut to Utopia is military conquest and the hegemony of one particular nation; for others, it is armed revolution and the dictatorship of a particular class. All these think mainly in terms of social machinery and large scale organization.<sup>14</sup>

These three "short cuts" are all explored in *Tomorrow*. Economic reform has been achieved in the twenty-fourth century, and the other possibilities are portrayed in the recounting of World War Two and in Sid Warren's Communist party. However, Huxley contends that all of these methods have led to "the clash of contradictory opinions, dogmatically held and acted upon with the violence of fanaticism"<sup>15</sup> and this is borne out in *Tomorrow*, where all such allegiances are ultimately suspect — and all fanaticism is linked to a dogmatic, rational and scientific frame of mind. However, while Huxley explores the limitations of science in *Ends and Means*, he is not as dismissive as M. Barnard Eldershaw in *Tomorrow*, as will be seen.

The other alternative road to "liberty, peace, justice and brotherly love"<sup>16</sup> proffered in *Tomorrow* is pacifism, expressed through Paula, Bowie, the Professor,

<sup>12</sup> Huxley, *Brave New World*: 181.

<sup>13</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Nettie Palmer, 29 April 1938, Palmer Papers [NLA MSS 1174/1/5380-1].

<sup>14</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Ends and Means*, London: Chatto & Windus, 1937: 1.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

Arch Castles and the Peace Party. The speciousness of attempting to achieve peace through war is seen in the resulting somnolence and undercurrent of violence in the twenty-fourth century. Huxley argues that “the end cannot justify the means, for the simple and obvious reason that the means employed determine the nature of the ends produced”<sup>17</sup> and this sentiment is echoed in some of the concluding paragraphs of *Tomorrow*:

Power has always devoured liberty. Because liberty has always called power to its aid it has perished. It has armed itself and fought, only to die of its own violence. Men have thought that liberty and competition could exist in the same world and that war could serve liberty. And so they have defeated themselves. It is the means that should decide the end. (p.455 *TTT*)

The implication in this conclusion is that Knarf and Ren’s society has failed partly because it was founded on the violent struggles of the twentieth century, and that it continues to fail because violence has become entrenched in the structures of power, even while the bloody manifestations of war have been eliminated. Here, connections to the pacifist arguments that Barnard began in ‘Liberty and Violence’ and in an unpublished pamphlet, ‘The Case for the Future’ can be detected.<sup>18</sup> This is the prophetic tenet of *Tomorrow*: if liberty is fought for in the present, then the path to the future is a linear and predictable one; even if the forms change, violence will be enshrined. As Barnard puts it in the final paragraph of ‘The Case for the Future’:

Violence begets violence, ‘justifies’ repression at home and aggression abroad. It can never lead to plenty and security for the mass of the people or to good reciprocal international relations.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Huxley, *Ends and Means*: 9.

<sup>18</sup> M. Barnard Eldershaw, ‘Liberty and Violence’, 1939. In M. Barnard Eldershaw, *Plaque With Laurel, Essays Reviews & Correspondence*: 251-7. Marjorie Barnard, ‘The Case For The Future’, 1941 [Marjorie Barnard’s uncollected papers].

<sup>19</sup> Barnard, ‘The Case For The Future’: 35.

However, the debt to Huxley and the commonalities with Barnard and with Barnard Eldershaw's earlier pacifist non-fiction can be overstated. Maryanne Dever for instance notes that the essay written for *Writers In Defence Of Freedom*, 'Liberty and Violence', reveals "the considerable influence of [Barnard Eldershaw's] reading of Aldous Huxley's *Ends and Means*", and that the ideas expressed in the essay "find parallels in the philosophical underpinnings of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*."<sup>20</sup> Robert Darby argues that *Tomorrow* is primarily about liberalism and pacifism and that *Tomorrow* is an imaginative and novelistic extension of 'A Case For The Future':

The greatest advantage of treating the issue of pacifism in the form of a novel instead of a pamphlet was that it provided the openness that a pamphlet could not, or "the maximum room", as Knarf puts it (*Tomorrow* p.44).<sup>21</sup>

In *Tomorrow*, Darby contends, Barnard wished to "establish the validity of the pacifist case while explaining why it failed". He suggests that the book is "not a simple advocacy of pacifism", but "more like a laboratory experiment in which several competing ideologies fight it out".<sup>22</sup> Nonetheless he maintains that "the novel is a working out of the logic put forward in Barnard's letters and pamphlets" and that one of the central theses is identical to that in 'A Case For The Future': "violence breeds violence and war leaves a people with neither the energy or the will for reconstruction."<sup>23</sup> Darby's suggestion is that *Tomorrow* is a reworking of these ideas, rather than an extension of them that varies qualitatively as well as quantitatively. However, Darby's statements cannot be considered a summation of the central tenets of *Tomorrow* because, in addition to the fact that *Tomorrow* thoroughly explores subjects besides pacifism, the book does not describe the

---

<sup>20</sup> Dever, *Plaque With Laurel, Essays Reviews & Correspondence*: 250.

<sup>21</sup> Darby, *While Freedom Lives*: 451.

<sup>22</sup> Darby, *While Freedom Lives*: 503.

<sup>23</sup> Darby, *While Freedom Lives*: 510.



successful adoption of any pacifist philosophies and does not convincingly promote faith in them.

It is the case that the malaise of violence and war is agreed upon in all of the works noted above: *Ends and Means*; 'Liberty and Violence'; 'The Case For The Future'; and *Tomorrow*. However, the nature of the solutions that are advocated differ widely. Most of Huxley's book is devoted to the promotion of a Buddhist form of non-attachment and an embracing of the mysticism that, according to Huxley, allows "direct insight into the real nature of ultimate reality",<sup>24</sup> a focus that characterised his later works. In a long chapter titled 'Beliefs', Huxley considers a scientific picture of the material world, the mind and life's history on the planet, before dissecting some of the fundamentals of Western philosophy and exploring the possibilities of "non-personal consciousness":

The experience known to selves who choose to fulfil the ethical and intellectual conditions upon which it is possible for an individual to pass to another level of being, is not their own emotion, their own volition, their own knowledge, but an unnamed and perhaps indescribable consciousness of a different kind, a consciousness in which the subject-object relation no longer exists and which no longer belongs to the experiencing self.<sup>25</sup>

*Tomorrow* does not describe this kind of transcendence as a solution to the problems besetting the world of Harry Munster or the world of Knarf. It is possible to discern tentative echoes of Huxley in such phrases as "Means is end in becoming" (p.456 TTT) and in the moments when Knarf and Ren appear to lose themselves in the drift of passing centuries, but this is not expressed forcefully enough for *Tomorrow* to be seen as a novelistic rendering of Huxley's philosophies, or for Huxley's cosmological framework to be seen as a possible resolution of the problems of violence that are explored in *Tomorrow*.

---

<sup>24</sup> Huxley, *Ends and Means*: 3.

<sup>25</sup> Huxley, *Ends and Means*: 296.

'Liberty and Violence' and 'A Case For The Future' also posit solutions that do not convince, or are not seen, in *Tomorrow*. Firstly, 'A Case For The Future' is succinctly prescriptive where *Tomorrow* is not. In the final paragraphs of this document, Barnard states clearly that, because the root cause of war lies in competition, it is essential to socialise the means of production, a project that is best served through governance by the Labor Party:

For Australia, the most natural and serviceable road towards this goal is through the Labour [sic] Party, brought to power by constitutional means and supported in power by an informed and progressive public opinion.<sup>26</sup>

The writing of this pamphlet was completed during Barnard's brief membership of the Labor Party, which explains its strong promotion here.<sup>27</sup> However, there is no such unequivocal recommendation for any political party in *Tomorrow*. The differing political positions between *Tomorrow* and 'A Case For The Future' can possibly be attributed to Eldershaw's participation in *Tomorrow*, as Eldershaw was never a member of the Labor Party and did not share many of Barnard's pacifist convictions.<sup>28</sup> The sympathetic characters in *Tomorrow's* twentieth-century narrative unanimously condemn "competition, competitive living, and its natural result in competitive dying" (p.297 *TTT*), and thus they could be considered to represent a range of left-wing perspectives. While it is narrated that there was "a Labour [sic] Government in office" in the period leading up to Sydney's invasion,

---

<sup>26</sup> Barnard, 'The Case For The Future': 35.

<sup>27</sup> Barnard joined the Labor Party on 13 February 1940. See Palmer Papers, [NLA 1174/1/5703]. The 'Case For The Future' was with the printers by 20 March 1940. [Documents in Marjorie Barnard's uncollected papers]. The pamphlet was submitted to the State Publicity Censor and publication was not approved. See Robert Darby, 'Censored. . . and again. . . and again: Marjorie Barnard's struggle to publish pacifist arguments, 1939 '47'. Unpublished paper for The History of the Book in Australia Conference, RMIT, 21-22 November, 1997.

<sup>28</sup> For a brief discussion of Barnard and Eldershaw's disagreements over pacifism, see Darby, 'Censored . . . and again . . . and again': 6.

this makes little positive difference to the situation in Australia or abroad: "as usual the margin of political power was with the monied interests" (p.363 *TTT*). As the crisis culminates, "the vestigial government in office" (p.370 *TTT*) becomes a common scapegoat for left and right wing contingents. Both sides have no faith remaining in the existing democratic forms or, it can be assumed, in the conventional political parties and offices. Finally, the elected Labor government becomes completely superfluous: "Canberra, the synthetic stronghold of democracy had no longer any being" (p.371 *TTT*). In this narrative, any party brought to power by pre-existing constitutional means offers no solution.<sup>29</sup>

'Liberty and Violence', written a year earlier than 'A Case', promotes no political party but suggests a Gandhi-esque approach: "Not acquiescence, but passive resistance and the refusal to resort to violence come what may."<sup>30</sup> Such "passive resistance" is comparable to the position entreated by Arch Castles' Peace Party in *Tomorrow*:

Men of good intention of every race and colour unite and you will possess the world. Stop fighting and preparing to fight. Seek allies among your enemies . . . Stop this thing that is destroying us all, make the world new on the widest basis, your own hearth. Refuse to compete, refuse to fight. (p.364-5 *TTT*)

Crucially, however, this campaign is not successful. We are told that many citizens invest their last dregs of optimism in Arch Castles' mission to Japan but the reason that they do so is that "a people, suspicious to saturation point, tired of trying to think, snatched at it" (p.364 *TTT*). The Professor notes that faith shown in the

---

<sup>29</sup> In *TT*, the first edition of *Tomorrow*, Labor is not named as the party in power before the government falls; there is instead an incompetent and unnamed "Leftist Government" (p.376 *TT*). The point is still made that at this historical moment: "Governments entered upon commitments that had little relation to majority will. A mask of unreality was set upon events. Both sides, all sides, accepted alliances as moves in an intricate tactic without moral commitment" (p.369 *TT*).

<sup>30</sup> M. Barnard Eldershaw, 'Liberty and Violence': 256.

mission seems like “a revivalist meeting”, because it is “pure and unreasoning”; pacifism in this context is yet another unthinking ideology (p.365 *TTT*). In one of the many ironic scenarios in which *Tomorrow's* narrative is closely mirrored by its editorial history, the intended recipients within Knarf's novel do not see the words imploring them to stop fighting, because Castles dies; the intended recipients of *TT* did not read them, because they were censored.<sup>31</sup> Thus, the pacifist message is silenced both intra-and extra-textually.

In Castles the people see the simulacrum of a hero, rather than an actual one (p.367 *TTT*). The mission fails and the finale is inconclusive, but no logical reasons are given, only that “black disaster had overtaken the expedition” and thus the remaining hopes for peace were lost. The other campaigners for peace in *Tomorrow*, Paula, Bowie and the Professor, are revealed as having inadequate strength in their convictions, and as being out of touch with the physical reality of war. In blackout rehearsals, Paula considers whether she would be frightened if the war was real and not make believe. However, because of her class and economic standing, she is able to remain at a remove when the violence comes to Sydney: “She could talk eloquently and passionately about the war, but still it wasn't her war, her grief, her responsibility” (p.353 *TTT*). Ultimately she escapes safely, long before the ordinary people flee, in a powerful car (p.379 *TTT*). Bowie, after ineffectual years in prison as a conscientious objector, is employed as part of the Labour Camps to assist Sid Warren in the final stages of the destruction of the city. However, Bowie by this time is hardly the archetype of a dedicated pacifist; he is half-mad and part of the “wastage”: “Not for them the future” (p.402 *TTT*). Bowie's final symbolic act is to throw down his pick because “it's bad to destroy things”, thus distinguishing himself one last time from the militant Communists.

---

<sup>31</sup> See Chapter Five, p.246.

However, we are told that his action had no significance (p.403 *TTT*). The Professor also leaves the city with little thought of his former political convictions: "His human relations had always been too suave, too detached, to have meaning in any but an ordered world . . . there was nothing to struggle for" (p.393 *TTT*). The philosophical flaws in the views of these pacifists are not obvious, even if in the context of *Tomorrow* they exist at all, but in each of the cases above it is implied that the people embodying the views are not up to the task, because they cannot make the connections between theory and praxis. Because they abandon their views, no models of praxis are offered.

These characters and scenarios cannot be seen as advocating the pacifist philosophies expressed in 'Liberty and Violence' or elsewhere. It is clear that the pacifist approach has not worked, but there is little analysis: Knarf says only that "slow honest growth" was needed instead of a miracle (p.373 *TTT*). Initially, rather than feeling committed to pacifism, Arch experiences a sensation of unreality. In the lead-up to the mission he has again been conscious of a complete collapse in distinctions between the real war and the image; when an aeroplane is caught in the searchlights he sees not a death machine, but the beauty of the spectacle (p.366 *TTT*). He feels himself swinging over the abyss, because he feels no relation to his own life and only an uncertain one to the Peace Party's last project: "Weakly he pitied himself as one driven inexorably beyond the boundaries of the known world, seeking the impossible in the impossible" (p.367 *TTT*).

Ruth Munster, who is allied with the quite different ideologies of the Communist Party, is also conscious of an abyss. Upon realising that her lover is untouched by the "imaginative horror" of the destruction (p.403 *TTT*), she experiences the desire to jump from the A.W.A. Tower into the burning mass below. We are told that

the origin of this desire is not hysteria, but “the same hard and bitter logic that had brought her so far” (p.406 *TTT*). Ruth has reached the limit of ideological solutions; like Archie she is aware of the void that lies beyond certainty and is tempted by the vertigo that comes from the knowledge that “every gap, even a short one, opens out onto another gap, every chasm empties into the infinite abyss.”<sup>32</sup> This is a postmodern awareness that recognises the impossibility of locating certainty and determinacy. As Calvino puts it: “Vertigo is everywhere . . . It seems a bottomless pit. You feel the summons of the void, the temptation to fall.”<sup>33</sup> However at the last moment Ruth steps back from the edge and Arch Castles feels himself irrevocably committed to his cause, even though he feels that his mission will fail and Ruth knows that her future is also doomed: “in front of her eyes there was a vacuum” (p.381 *TTT*). Like Knarf she has come to believe that “the destroyer could never be the builder” (p.406 *TTT*). Nevertheless, Arch and Ruth both cling to the last vestiges of order and identity, even while they know that they are unreachable. In these respects, they are representative of impulses that can be seen in *Tomorrow* as a whole: like Knarf, they choose a pattern and scorn it, but nonetheless persist after faith in the patterns has been broken.

---

<sup>32</sup> Calvino: 69.

<sup>33</sup> Calvino: 72.

## Three: Little World Left Behind: History and Nationalism

*"By the way, what have you called this book."*

*"Little World Left Behind."*

*Like a stone buried in sand, Ord half remembered the words from a different context. "That isn't yours, is it?"*

*"It's a translation. I lifted it from the ancients." Knarf repeated it in the original English.*

*"Henry Lawson."*

*Tomorrow: 170*

In *Tomorrow* it is obvious that while the Communists may have succeeded in destroying most remnants of the old society, they are not the only dominant group in the future. Knarf's story finishes not long after the international right wing coalition lands at Broken Bay and there are no descriptions of what occurs after the Sydney Communists set fire to the city and the inhabitants flee. However, in the twenty-fourth century Riverina, the bark and slab houses of the white colonials have been discontinued. The buildings are modelled on the flimsy wood and paper houses "from the north" and the men on the coast have the "orient in their faces", more than the inlanders, who, Knarf surmises, must still have some of the "Pioneer blood" in them: "Blood mixed slowly even after all this time" (p.8). Apparently this "wasn't a thing anyone talked about" and Knarf does not see fit to ponder or discuss it further himself (p.8). While *Tomorrow* is in part a story about an Asian occupation of Australia, it is referred to so casually it is almost dismissed. It is also implied that resistance by the Australian population to invasion was limited.<sup>1</sup> Sentences like the ones below were not available to readers of the 1947 edition of *TT*, as they suggested that the Australian population might be passive about conceding defeat to Japan:

Japan was ready to promise self-government to all the Asiatic people in her sphere of influence, she was willing to give the British Commonwealth of Nations rights of trade. What did England want but trade? . . . The Japs were human beings after all. They'd been staunch little allies in the last war. The tales about their frightfulness were only propaganda . . . Are we going to bear malice for ever because of Pearl Harbour? (p.360 *TTT*)

---

<sup>1</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen on 29 May 1958, presumably in response to the suggestion that her speculations in *TTT* had included the invasion of Australia by Asian forces: "Yes, in *To-morrow and To-morrow and To-morrow* Flora and I tried to envisage what would happen after the cataclysm when Australia had been subjected to two great forces of science and Asiatic overflow." [*Meanjin* Archives, Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne].



Jill Roe contends that *Tomorrow* is the best [Australian] portrayal of “anxieties which culminated in fear of invasion in 1942”,<sup>2</sup> but this view is not supported by Knarf’s narrative, nor by the description of the mixed race inhabitants in centuries to come. On the contrary, the invasion is described in *Tomorrow* in relatively benign terms: there is no bloodshed and no destruction of property. The ‘International Police’ that land at Broken Bay are composed of British, American and Japanese forces (p.371 *TTT*): thus the focus that is emphasised is the attempted overthrow of the left-wing by the right, rather than the overthrowing of one race by another. This sets *Tomorrow* apart from most other Australian literature about invasion. William Lane’s *White or Yellow? A Story of the Race War of AD 1908* (1888), Thomas Roydhouse’s *The Coloured Conquest* (1904), C.H. Kirmess’s *The Australian Crisis* (1909), John Hay’s *The Invasion* (1968) and John Marsden’s *Tomorrow, When The War Began* series (1993-2000) all combine the theme of Australian invasion with description of conflict between white settlers and Asians.<sup>3</sup> However, despite thematising the invasion of white Australia, many insistent voices in *Tomorrow* claim that real divisions are caused by inequities in power and property, and not by race. As Bowie puts it:

The Jap isn’t the real enemy. He’s a man like any other. The system of the present world forces him into war as it does us. We’re fighting for the system not for our country. (p.301 *TTT*)

The portrayal of a future community of mixed race inhabitants not only undercuts conventional invasion narratives. It also subverts common Australian nationalistic ideals of the 1940s. As Bernard Smith remarks, “nationalism in its heightened forms is usually identified with the dominant ‘race’ of the nation”.<sup>4</sup> Thus, in times

<sup>2</sup> Roe: 245.

<sup>3</sup> For some of these titles see Van Ikin, ‘Dreams, Visions, Utopias’, *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*: 264.

<sup>4</sup> Bernard Smith, ‘The Facist Mentality in Australian Art and Criticism’, *Communist Review*, June 1946: 182.

of war, it is not unusual for nationalism to transform itself into racism. The special 'crisis' edition of *Meanjin* in 1942, for instance, revealed that many writers felt that defining an Australian character and a native Australian literature was crucial to the survival of the nation. For writers such as Vance Palmer, the war crystallised the importance of finding an Australian character and defining what it was that connected white Australian settlers to the landscape and what made the continent their home.<sup>5</sup> However, all the writers who contributed only sought to find what was quintessentially Australian in what was white, even while they stressed the importance of moving away from European models. This does not suggest that the writers were uniformly racist, but it does reveal them as exclusively preoccupied with searching for significance amongst aspects of the dominant white culture. Palmer, for instance, suggested that Lawson, O'Dowd and Joseph Furphy helped Australians to find "an Australia of the spirit" that was quite distinct from, as he put it, "these bubbles of old-world imperialism", but this image was focussed on the idea of the "sardonic, idealist, tongue-tied" Aussie bushman. He lamented the fact that "we"—by implication white colonials— "have no monuments to speak of, no dreams in stone, no Guernicas, no sacred places".<sup>6</sup>

While *Tomorrow* does not neatly conform to racially-related invasion narratives, it initially seems to endorse conventional symbols of white Australian nationalism, like Henry Lawson and the Anzac soldier. In some senses, the descriptions of the Brooding Anzac in *Tomorrow* are attempts to redress the lack of "dreams in stone" that are written about by Palmer. Knarf feels that the stone figure "had survived holocaust and time, not by chance, but because of some inherent quality in itself" (p.15). The quality is that of the Anzac soldier, which is seen to embody endurance, courage and the common man. In this case then, the representation of the soldier

---

<sup>5</sup> See Vance Palmer, 'Battle', *Meanjin*, 8, 1942: 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

has managed, at least for Knarf, to recapture the significance of the original; he imagines that the stone is in fact alive, and that the sculpted exterior encases a heart of flesh (p.16). The fact that the Anzac statue has survived implies that the icon of the Gallipoli soldier is the cultural key that eludes Palmer. The statue represents egalitarianism, the active influence of Australian people in the wider world, and an uncompromising, unflinching spirit. It is also a creative work of art that demonstrates the survival and the possible permanence of history and culture. Knarf is at his most optimistic when contemplating the statue; for him it proves that humanity can constantly renew itself, provided the "strength and temerity" of the Anzacs survive (p.15). As a mythological icon with qualities that transcend specific times and places, the statue represents the vital possibilities of history, of the present being enlivened because of its active engagement with the past and the future. Harry Munster, looking at the Cenotaph at the dawn service on Anzac Day in Hyde Park, believes that "a revolution might begin here" (p.123). Harry, who is closely identified with the memorial, is portrayed as embodying many of the same qualities. At various points in Knarf's narrative, Olaf Ramsay, Ruth and Ben all recognise Harry as Everyman, and associate Everyman with the Anzacs: "He was the whole of a man. All that expenditure of courage, patience, fidelity, to win that. The gentleness of human dignity" (p.167). Olaf and Ruth also compare Harry with Jesus, presumably because in this context Jesus is also a symbol of the indomitable, ageless essence in "everyman".

Knarf creates the figure of Harry Munster in the same spirit in which he regards the Brooding Anzac: as a memorial to the past and as a sign of hope for the future. However, despite seeing the Brooding Anzac as a "touchstone" for his book (p.18), he recognises that the Anzacs were "defending the symbol of death and sacrifice, which was all they had to defend, against death and destruction" (p.15). Knarf

immediately acknowledges the flawed romanticism of this, and the values of the Anzacs do not offer any social blueprints for the future of Knarf's world, if Knarf's analysis of the problems in his society are accepted. A struggle against violence, "inertia and vested power" (p.456 *TTT*) leaves little place or reason for upholding the vestiges of the Anzac culture. Moreover, associations with nationalism, power and organised religion perpetuate the totalising ideologies and grand narratives that have been described with suspicion elsewhere in *Tomorrow*. The frieze of men that contains the figure of the Anzac is destroyed in the same blast that kills Harry; the Brooding Anzac and Harry are both blown out of context and out of history in the same moment (p.327 *TTT*). In the twenty-fourth century, few are aware of the statue's significance, not only because few people have a knowledge of history, but also because the shrine of which the statue is a part is in fragments and recreating the original piece is almost impossible. No one is even sure of its authorship (p.17). The Brooding Anzac, therefore, is yet another pattern that seems chosen by Knarf and by M. Barnard Eldershaw to illuminate aspects of nationalism, history and culture, but its meanings are tentative and fragmented at best. The 'truths' that it embodies appear too outdated to be useful, its context is unknown and its origins are controversial.

The homage to Henry Lawson is also explicit in *Tomorrow*, which could be interpreted as another attempt to draw a connection between ideas of national tradition and culture. In *Australian Writers Speak*, a collection of talks arranged for the Australian Broadcasting Commission by the Fellowship of Australian Writers, Barnard claimed that Lawson and Furphy were at the forefront of the Australian literary tradition, one that began in the bush, "in a floating mass of stories and legends and songs".<sup>7</sup> Knarf declares his identification with Lawson in

---

<sup>7</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'Our Literature', *Australian Writers Speak*: 99.

naming his book after one of Lawson's short stories, 'Little World Left Behind', and by suggesting that he and Lawson lived at comparable points in historical cycles: "He lived in a dawn too. The beginning and the end were so close together. He was part of them both in the little world he never left behind" (p.170). In an early draft of *Tomorrow*, Knarf's novel was named 'If Man Grew Up', a title also connoting a youthful, naive world, existing close to the genesis of a historical era.<sup>8</sup> In her talk on Australian literature, Barnard emphasised the long oral tradition that Lawson drew on and argued that this tradition has continued:

The stories of Henry Lawson, which remain the pattern of Australian short stories, came direct from the bush school. Their lineage is clear. His genius accepted and shaped a tradition, and in turn drew its response from that tradition.<sup>9</sup>

This talk was part of a series which, like the *Meanjin* edition discussed above, sought to explore and define the roles and the meanings of Australian writers and literature in a time of war. The unconscious bush beginnings of what Barnard called 'authentic Australian literature' were fuelled, she argued, by the characters of white Australian rural legends: the drovers, the shearers, the sundowners and the yarners around the campfires. It is therefore significant that in the twenty-fourth century of *Tomorrow*, it is nineteenth-century drovers, shearers, sundowners and fossickers that Ren sees, and not the urban dwellers of the mid-twentieth century. His visions are reminiscent of those in 'Dry Spell', when the narrator sees lines of old swaggies walking through an apocalyptic city.<sup>10</sup> These are the characters of Lawson's stories and poems, and their presence suggests that this particular strand of legend interconnects different periods in history. Like the Brooding Anzac, the

---

<sup>8</sup> See ML ms Vol.1, p.230, l.27.

<sup>9</sup> Barnard, 'Our Literature': 102-3.

<sup>10</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'Dry Spell', *The Persimmon Tree and Other Stories* [1943], London: Virago Press, 1985: 155-6.

characters of Lawson's Australia offer a continuum, as they populate Knarf's world in a ghostly, mystical fashion:

When cattle stampede in the night they say "It's the Pioneers." Sometimes, it is said, they pass through on a moonlight night, you hear the rustle of sheep's feet in the dust, the creak and clatter of riders, and even men's voices singing in an archaic dialect, and in the morning there will be broken fences and eaten out paddocks but not a mark in the dust of the road. (p.8)

However the allusion to Lawson's story 'Little World Left Behind' in *Tomorrow* is not a straightforward one, because it bears little direct relation to Knarf's novel, or to *Tomorrow* as a whole. It is a story about a country town — possibly Eurunderee as Knarf suggests — that remains "drearily, hopelessly, depressingly unchanged" after many years, although life in the city has moved on.<sup>11</sup> Despite the monotony, apathy and general narrow-mindedness of this town, one character impresses the narrator of the tale with her pluck. She "looked her narrow ignorant world in the face — and 'lived it down'".<sup>12</sup> The story describes lives of constancy and expresses a begrudging admiration of endurance in the face of little positive change, but the general impression is of stagnancy and boredom. While there are no obvious parallels between this story and Knarf's, the two narratives share the theme of encasing a world within many other worlds: the country life within the larger world, and the individual imaginative life existing within a collectively-shared reality. The idea that the histories of personal lives move at a pace that is disparate to global history is also common to both. However, the shared title is still a curious one, given that Knarf's story stresses the vastness of the world that he is describing as well as its turbulence and flux. It is more credible that the title refers to the enclosed, unchanging Tenth Commune, and that Knarf wishes to imply that his own

---

<sup>11</sup> Henry Lawson, 'Little World Left Behind', *Henry Lawson: The Master Story-teller: Commentaries on His Prose Writings*, ed. Colin Roderick, London; Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1985: 371.

<sup>12</sup> Lawson: 373.

world is desperately in need of a more expansive outlook. This would also strengthen Knarf's many suggestions, most prominently given in the last line of *Tomorrow*, that he lives at the beginning of time, rather than at the tail-end of progress (p.456 *TTT*).

However, this begs other questions about the portrayal of historical continuity and change in *Tomorrow*. The book itself is a playful exercise in the vicissitudes of time: Knarf reads his novel to Ord in less than a day, but many decades of history are enfolded within it. Like Scheherazade, Knarf reveals stories within stories, and the time within the stories is much more vast than the hours that pass in the narrative of which he is a part. Occasionally, Ren and Knarf also appear to access a mythic time, where the past and the present co-exist. The mysterious presence of Lawsonian ghosts in the twenty-fourth century could evoke a sense of eternity, and the possibility of a link between the past, present and future. However the ghosts, or visions, also seem to wander without a sense of time, still elusively seeking "the North-West Passage" of utopia (p.442 *TTT*). Knarf is the only character in the novel who makes a conscious effort to define the significance of these anachronistic figures in his own century. Rather than emphasising continuity, the interventions by the diggers in Knarf's century could be seen as a disruption of the sense of meaningful, linear time, decontextualised to the point of absurdity. It is not clear therefore whether Lawson's ghosts can provide productive inspiration, or whether they are just meaningless repetitions out of fragments of the past. Additionally, the appearance of historical figures in *future* history — that is, Knarf's world — undermines the notion that *Tomorrow* is a work of historical fiction that relies on facts and a chronological recounting of events.

The title 'Little World Left Behind' also reinforces the fact that the greater part of the narrative of *Tomorrow* is a story inside a story. The interaction between Knarf's world and 'The Little World Left Behind' provides a double-filtering of social reality; thus the representation of 'fact' in both worlds is untrustworthy. Knarf argues for the 'truth' of imaginative reconstruction, but like the archetypal postmodern images of a Chinese box or a hall of mirrors, it is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between what is intended to be a realistic representation and what is largely the work of the imagination. As Knarf reminds himself, "History is a creative art, a putty nose. You can make what you like out of it" (p.17). In this respect, *Tomorrow* can be considered "historiographical metafiction" in that it is "both intensely self-reflexive and yet paradoxically also lay[s] claim to historical events and personages".<sup>13</sup> It questions the totalising form of traditional historical construction, but also recognises that both literature and history are kindred narrative forms, necessarily fragmented, hybrid, partial and suspect.

The crucial difficulty with these indeterminacies is that the significance and purpose of both Knarf's project and M. Barnard Eldershaw's is thrown into doubt. 'Little World Left Behind' can be regarded as an attempt to record a period of history, as an interweaving of memory, conjecture and imagination, as all of these and as none. Ultimately, we cannot be certain if *Tomorrow* conveys, as Carter suggests, a fully comprehensive picture of a turbulent historical and cultural era or if, like the work of the Starving Poet, the meaning has been effaced in endless reflections, and the points of reference have been lost. By the end of 'Little World Left Behind', Ord feels that Knarf's project to reignite a creative imagination and a

---

<sup>13</sup> Susana Jaen Onega citing Linda Hutcheon, 'Introduction' in *Telling Histories: Narrativising History, Historicising Literature*, ed. Susana Jaen Onega, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995: 1.



faith in art has been successful. However, because of uncertainty about what *Tomorrow* ultimately represents, it is doubtful whether the book as a whole succeeds equally.

Many ideological positions are clear in *Tomorrow*: the problems of capitalism, the necessity of peace, the importance of enduring creative symbols and the commonalities shared by people through different historical periods. However, solutions are not found to the difficulties that beset human beings in any of the historical periods that are recounted. Ren hopes to build a revolution, and thus for society to improve and progress, but his own society has reached a dead end, through following a linear and scientific model of progression. The staleness of historical repetition is also revealed in the parallels between the past and future worlds: Knarf repeats Harry Munster's marital mistakes, Ren is more alienated from his father than Ben is from Harry and, most overwhelmingly, people continue to believe that peace can be bought with violence and control. There are few ways out of these empty circles, except, Knarf suggests, through reigniting imagination and rediscovering liberty. Carter argues that what the novel cannot envisage is a political theory and practice, or the means in which social organisation might be articulated.<sup>14</sup> but what is grasped for and missed is greater than this. *Tomorrow* questions whether history can be written, whether fiction can be truthful and whether authority can be confidently located. It questions in fact whether meaning can be found in history, art or literature at all.

While many Australian modernist novels sought to redefine ideology, particularly left-wing ideology, *Tomorrow* aims for a world that transcends the confines of these discourses, but what appears conclusive often only leads to further questions. Like

---

<sup>14</sup> Carter, 'Current History': 186.

Lawson's pioneers, wandering around the world of the twenty-fourth century, out of time and place, too many concerns in *Tomorrow* lack firm reference points. As with the frieze of which the Brooding Anzac was once a part, Knarf's "history" cannot recreate original significance: only partial contextualisation can be found. As will be seen, this is reflected in the editorial history itself, where sense and completion must often be pieced together out of fragments. The Starving Poet survives and, as we are told, "the earth remains" (p.456 *TTT*), but we do not know if Knarf's book is ever read or ever absorbed by those in the future or whether it has all been a pointless flight of fantasy. The following chapter elaborates on the difficulty of reading a book in which many commonly understood narratives are chimerical, and cohesive arguments must often be intuited out of patterns that have been taken up and scorned.

Finally, it is necessary to ask again how M. Barnard Eldershaw managed to write a book about the period in which they were living that is so unlike their previous work and unlike works of others. It is not possible to answer this conclusively, but the argument above provides some possibilities. In her later life, Barnard often insisted that *Tomorrow* was not a political work, an assertion that left many interviewers incredulous.<sup>15</sup> It is possible that the reason that Barnard denied the primacy of the political message in *Tomorrow* was because what was aimed for was greater and more complex than the recounting of any specific ideology. As discussed in Chapter Four, the relationship that is described between Knarf and Ord could reflect Barnard and Eldershaw's own debates: the pragmatic versus the discursive, the ideological versus the imaginative and the historical versus the speculative. Thus, the input of two minds rather than one could have influenced the production of

---

<sup>15</sup> See for instance, unpublished interview with Marjorie Barnard by Bruce Molloy, 26 July 1973, p. 355, Appendix to Bruce Molloy, 'Some Political Aspects of the Australian Novel, 1930-59', MA Thesis, University of Queensland, 1974 (ML MSS 2809 Add on).

a work that often holds several contradictory positions at once. As has been seen, the representation of history, ideology and art is complicated by the “novel within a novel” structure of the novel. It is likely that the desire to speculate on the future led the historians inadvertently into science fiction and into extending their understandings of historical dialectics forward as well as backwards in a manner that is not easily comparable to other works of Australian fiction. Lastly and most obviously, the book was censored, and thus, as will be seen, some of the complications of its editorial history became woven into the text. Through accidents in history and circumstance, *Tomorrow* became a book that explores the production of Australian novels, as well as the impossibility of writing a truly utopian one.

## Chapter Two: Reading, Expectation and Disappointment

*“A literary work is not an object which stands by itself and which offers the same face to each reader in each period. It is not a monument which reveals its timeless essence in a monologue. It is much more like an orchestration which strikes ever new chords among its readers and which frees the text from the substance of the world and makes it meaningful for the time.”*

Hans Robert Jauss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory',  
*New Literary History* 2, 1970: 10.

# One: Difficulties With Reading Utopias

*“And this book he had written, so unlike anything else he had ever written, or that anyone had written for a couple of hundred years at least . . . It was going to trouble and perplex and anger people, and make trouble for Knarf.”*

*Tomorrow: 240*

The first section of this chapter aims to explore some of the ways in which *Tomorrow* can be considered in relation to utopian literature and utopian theory. As the following section will elaborate, *Tomorrow* has been subject to a diverse and conflicting range of readings. It is profitable to examine the ways in which *Tomorrow* relates to utopian/dystopian<sup>1</sup> models because the way in which *Tomorrow* illuminates the difficulties in imagining and representing utopia exposes some of the difficulties in interpreting the novel itself. *Tomorrow* cannot be considered a utopian novel in the traditional sense: that is, it does not present a blueprint of a harmonious, happy and peaceful world where all current societal problems have been resolved.<sup>2</sup> Despite this, the question of how to align *Tomorrow* in relation to utopian/dystopian models has been of abiding interest to a scholarly and general readership. Robert Burns for instance called it "a sort of anti-Utopian vision"; Jill Roe considered it "neither utopian or anti-utopian", and David Carter argued that it was both utopian *and* anti-utopian.<sup>3</sup> As will be seen in later chapters, utopian motivations have also underscored some of *Tomorrow's* publication history. Those who sought to promote the book frequently did so because they perceived that the book represented and upheld a certain set of values and ideals. The Virago publishing house, for example, was explicitly utopian in that it sought to challenge and overthrow patriarchal norms through redressing the control of printing, writing and scholarship. *Tomorrow* was a suitable project for such a venture,

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'utopia' here simply means 'good place' (although as discussed in this section, it can also mean 'no place'). Here the word 'dystopia' (bad place) is favoured over 'anti-utopia', which suggests a work that parodies the notion of utopia.

<sup>2</sup> Giving a comparable definition, Krishan Kumar writes: "To live in a world that cannot be but where one fervently wishes to be: that is the literal essence of utopia . . . Utopia describes a state of impossible perfection which nevertheless is in some genuine sense not beyond the reach of humanity." In Krishan Kumar, *Utopianism*, Buckingham: Open University Press, 1991: 1-3.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Burns, 'Flux and Fixity: M. Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow & Tomorrow*', *Meanjin*, 24, 1979: 320; Jill Roe, 'The Historical Imagination and Its Enemies: M. Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*', *Meanjin*, 43 (2), June 1984: 245; David Carter, "'Current History Looks Apocalyptic': Barnard Eldershaw, Utopia and the Literary Intellectual, 1930s-1940s', *Australian Literary Studies*, 14, No.2, 1989: 175.

because it was seen to contain subversive political ideas, and to have been unjustly silenced and forgotten. Republishing the novel promoted a radical agenda, potentially changing dominant paradigms about what was available and saleable in the literary marketplace. However, reading *Tomorrow* often evaded or disappointed expectations. The novel's conflicting narrative threads and voices, and the resonant interactions between them, mean that it is difficult to isolate a utopian theme within the text without noting how other narratives contradict and undermine it.

As has been seen, *Tomorrow* critiques notions of scientific progress, adherence to technology, mechanical reasoning and a faith in grand narratives. Various authoritative discourses are dismantled in the text: those of capitalism, Marxism, pacifism and nationalism. Thus, if utopia is considered to be a prescription for ameliorating present problems, it might seem dubious to consider *Tomorrow* as a utopian text. The final section of *Tomorrow* describes Ren wandering through the evening countryside of the Riverina and invoking the imaginary dreamworlds of utopia: he seeks "that Utopia, New Atlantis, Ultima Thule, those Islands of the Blest, that North-West Passage. . . ." (p.441-2 TTT). However, he does this at a moment when practical solutions have eluded him. *Tomorrow* offers neither a straightforward blueprint of an ideal society nor proposals for rational, pragmatic alternatives to existing organisation. Both of the societies that are portrayed are deeply fissured with power inequities, oppression and violence. As more recent critics and reviewers have noted, gender inequities and familial alienation also repeat well-worn patterns.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, as has been discussed, no clear path into the future is offered and so it is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine how the world of the twenty-fourth century might become an ideal one.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Ian Saunders' comments on this, "The Most Difficult Love': Expectation and Gender in Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*", in *Constructing Gender: Feminism in Literary Studies*, ed. Hilary Fraser and R.S. White, Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press, 1994: 199-221.

In Knarf's world the survival of a rich and dynamic artistic imagination is also uncertain. David Carter argues that "the final site of utopian images in *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* is the figure of the novelist and novel writing itself." He contends that an "ideology of the novel" is revealed in *Tomorrow* because it articulates specific ideas about culture and novel writing that uphold literary artwork as the "pre-eminent mode of non-alienated, self-creating labour".<sup>5</sup> This argument is problematic if it is considered that Knarf is the utopian figure and that it is his novel that exemplifies utopian art. Knarf is a fictional character, and thus faith in the authority and ideological frameworks of his story is undermined. Knarf's creation is invented by another author, who, in a different sense, is also an invention.<sup>6</sup> The encasing of Knarf's narrative inside a larger novel creates ambivalence and inconclusiveness, so that it is ultimately uncertain whether his novel is a serious attempt to encapsulate the complexities of historical imagination, or whether it is a complicated game of speculation. Secondly, as the next section will elaborate, it is not certain that Knarf's book will be received by anyone other than Ord: the society in which the novel has come into being is static, rational and largely uncreative (p.21). By Knarf's own reasoning, his book will not be complete until it is read and received "into the world" (p.18) and it is difficult to regard an incomplete form as ideal and utopian.

Despite these difficulties, Knarf's book eventually reveals qualities to its recipient, Ord, that might be considered utopian. 'Little World Left Behind' finally stuns Ord out of his complacency and his dismissal of the inaccuracies of fiction because it is ambiguous, open-ended and unsettling, with an interleaving of myth, fantasy and the

---

<sup>5</sup> David Carter, "Current History Looks Apocalyptic": 187.

<sup>6</sup> Notions of authority and authorship in regard to *Tomorrow* are explored in more detail in Chapter Four.



solid artefacts of history. Gradually, Ord is persuaded not only of the validity and importance of the imaginative artist, but also that such an artist's work holds the key to rediscovering liberty: "It was so real that it might burst right open the whole mild convention of modern writing, even touch the bedded-down imagination of a slothful generation" (p.240). In the final pages of 'Afternoon', Ord comes to realise that, contrary to an earlier argument, where he has criticised Knarf for his tendency to twist and play with facts (p.205), Knarf's novel contains a fuller and richer vision of history than Ord has been able to recreate 'scientifically':

In the depth of this mirror he had seen the image of life from a new angle. He had spent a life time studying this period, exhuming it detail by detail, with scientific care, and now he saw it fresh and living in the light of a creative imagination and it was desperate and ugly and sweet and full, in a way the careful, measured life of today was not. (p.415-6 TTT)

At this point, Ord resolves his conflict with Knarf over the validity of meticulous reconstruction versus imaginative storytelling. This is a conflict that reappears in interconnected forms throughout *Tomorrow*: binaries between reality and imagination; the pragmatic and the discursive, and the scientific and the artistic are frequently referred to. As argued by Peter Ruppert amongst others, these tensions are typical of the utopian literary genre. The word "utopia" combines the meanings of "no place" and "good place", juxtaposing objective reality ("the world as it is") with imaginative projections ("the world as it could be"). The tension between these two states potentially creates a dynamic in a literary work that enables the reader to question both the world in which they live and the ways in which it might be transformed. Thus utopian literature can be seen as dialogic, engaging us "in a dialogue between social fact and utopian dream."<sup>7</sup> Ruppert argues that although utopian texts might initially be seen as reductive, static literary forms, they can

---

<sup>7</sup> Peter Ruppert, *Reader in a Strange Land: The Activity of Reading Literary Utopias*, Athens; London: The University of Georgia Press, 1986: xi

also be regarded as “threshold or boundary texts . . . designed to resonate between opposing genres and interpretations.”<sup>8</sup> While *Tomorrow* does not portray a utopia, it is concerned with the paradoxes involved in envisaging one, interrogating utopian/dystopian models and playing with common utopian themes. As with utopian literature, notions of “real” and “ideal” worlds are juxtaposed within the text. However, the contrasts between utopia and dystopia become fluid when Knarf compares the two worlds with one another. Thus Knarf’s book, ‘Little World Left Behind’ deals with utopian themes and poses some utopian questions, but it is the way in which this narrative is framed in *Tomorrow* as a whole that both casts light on notions of utopia and complicates the interplay between the binaries mentioned above.

The world that Knarf describes, that of Australia in the mid-twentieth century, is usually seen by readers as profoundly dystopian: it is a world defined by capitalism, alienated labour, unemployment and exploitation of the working classes.<sup>9</sup> The city of Sydney is frequently portrayed as a mechanised monster, a physical manifestation of capitalism and greed that crushes individuals like Harry slowly to death: “The wheel had turned and dragged them down, not accident that could be retrieved, but the working of a force beyond their conception as well as beyond their control” (p.112). The city of Sydney symbolises the consumerist, competitive society: synthetic, cruel and impersonal. The faces on the street can seem one and the same, as if they have been absorbed and assimilated into one voracious whole (p.112). Despite these fundamental flaws, Knarf and Ord perceive that the twentieth century may have contained qualities that their own world is lacking. Twentieth-century Sydney is dystopian because of its violence,

---

<sup>8</sup> Peter Ruppert: 35. See also David Carter, “Current History Looks Apocalyptic”: 175.

<sup>9</sup> See for instance Drusilla Modjeska’s description, *Exiles At Home: Australian Women Writers 1925-1945*, North Ryde, Angus & Robertson, 1991 (1981): 245.

exploitation, suffering and waste, but its diversity, complexity and struggle render it a far more vibrant world than the somnolent twenty-fourth century. Knarf believes that his own people do not know peace because they take it for granted, whereas life used to be more “fiercely indented” (p.13). He asserts that the Australians of the twentieth century had, without recognising it, “pride and courage and independence”: qualities that Knarf feels are lacking in his present time (pp.12-3). The twentieth century also contains poetry, which is seen to exist only precariously in the twenty-fourth century. It is implied that even language has become more logical in Knarf’s time; the language spoken in the world that he recreates has “a curious evanescent beauty . . . the whole system of linkage and cadence poetic rather than logical” (p.141).

Crucially, the world of which Knarf writes, despite its dystopian qualities, contains imaginative vigour. It is a world that he has created from the little he knows of history; as such it is as much a reconstruction of his dreams and desires as an approximation of “fact”. Knarf describes the centre of Sydney on a Friday night as teeming with life and ragged beauty; the parks, the shops, the expanse of harbour, the suburbs and the “shooting motor cars” are drawn in such vivid detail that Ord exclaims, “That fabulous city . . . that fabulous city” (p.47-8). Ord’s exclamation indicates that he finds Knarf’s vision of the city alive and marvellous, but also that it is the stuff of dream, or fable. In a scene in Knarf’s novel, detailing the blackout rehearsal, Paula, Bowie and the Professor notice that they are seeing a strikingly new aspect of the city. Someone suggests that the convention of what the city usually looks like is “so stuck in the mud of our imaginations that we don’t see it,” and another person adds that “[there] are thousands of cities here, everyone has one to himself . . . There’s a solid core of bricks and stone, but in itself it is meaningless. Over it the city of the imagination is laid, layer upon layer . . .” (p.284 *TTT*).

closure and revelation. Paula cannot bear to know that there is not a well at the world's end, because it would mean there could be no regeneration or resolution. Knarf's vision of the twentieth century does therefore contain some utopian impulses. The world portrayed is one where social reality and fantasy are juxtaposed, exposing multiple and contradictory visions. While the "real" world is frequently nightmarish, it also allows dreams to flourish. Utopia is not realised, but it is still perceived by many characters to be possible.

Concomitantly, Knarf's world initially seems to portray a realisation of utopia, but its failings are gradually revealed. The social structure is typically utopian, focussing on community; the application of reason and science to social institutions; a centralised and cooperative redistribution of production; a balanced relationship to the natural world and a prioritising of leisure over work.<sup>11</sup> The descriptions of the Tenth Commune resemble those of a pre-industrial settlement, in which the countryside and the settlement appear as separate entities; there is a keen sense of the natural world surrounding the small, human-made environment.<sup>12</sup> At first glance, it is a setting which owes more to Morris' *News From Nowhere* than *Brave New World*. As Knarf observes people riding into the Centre to vote, he imagines "the courtyards of distant farms, the smell of coffee and hot cakes in the air, the horses stamping . . ." Although this vision is juxtaposed with "the glass and metal of speeding watermobiles", Knarf's perspective emphasises the timeless quality of his society: "Citizens coming in from their farms to vote in the city would not have looked much different, nearly three thousand years ago, riding over the thymy hills of Greece" (p.27). We are told that this social organisation is global, a "world

---

<sup>11</sup> See David Carter, 'Current History Looks Apocalyptic': 175.

<sup>12</sup> See Donatella Mazzoleni, 'The City and the Imaginary', trans. John Koumantarakis, *New Formations: A Journal of Culture/theory/politics*, No.11 Summer 1990: 97 "Up until the Industrial Revolution, the relationship between 'city' and 'country' was clear, as was its belonging to and situating itself within a 'countryside'."

federation of economic non-national states" (p.223); however, many scenes set on the Tenth Commune depict simplicity and sensual pleasure, like this passage that describes the lunch at the 'Symposium':

There were baskets of deep brown varnished rolls, some sweet and some savoury, flavoured with the good bitter herbs of the countryside. There were cheeses, white, brown, pale yellow, marbled green; platters of poultry, whole birds, steamed and roasted, wrapped in lettuce leaves and so tender that they would fall apart easily in the fingers; shelled eggs in a bed of dark green cress; bowls of dark honey in the comb, tasting of gum blossoms . . . (p.216)

The passage evokes a sense of harmony with an Arcadian natural environment; the simplicity and abundance of the food suggests that this is a small community that can live off the land with an absence of food processing and mass production.

However it soon becomes clear that Knarf's society in the twenty-fourth century is ambiguously utopian at best. Liberty is not only threatened by a slavish allegiance to science, as discussed in the last section, but through the satisfaction of longing and deprivation. As acknowledged in utopian literature and theory, desire itself is not ultimately possible, because once it is realised, it ceases to exist. Fulfilment, peace and harmony risk stagnation and boredom, and in Knarf's world, the vibrancy and complexity of a historically aware and creative imagination is missing. Ren expresses this problem eloquently to his father:

I know the theory. It sounds all right, but it isn't. Man's first need is to eat. His second need is to be clothed and housed, and so on throughout all the items of the good life . . . The good life can only be assured by the specialists, they are the guardians of civilisation . . . That would be all right if it were all. But it isn't. All these things that we get, the minimum standard of well-being, isn't the good life. Not all of it, anyway. (pp.32-3)

Thus, in this section of *Tomorrow*, it becomes apparent that the possibility of utopia is doubtful. On the Tenth Commune it is not only that the wrong ideologies have been

upheld; the situation suggests that the end-point of any grand narrative is stupefaction. The stagnant life in the twenty-fourth century is described on several occasions as a closed narrative from which its occupants, or characters, cannot escape. A man participating in the 'Symposium' speaks of society having reached a "state of saturation": "We're in a dead end now" (p.223). Illil remarks that they are "[enclosed] in our fairy tale" (p.218) and Ren declares that: "There aren't any words that haven't been spoiled. We live too late. Everything has happened before and happened wrong and the world is full of ruts" (p.428 *TTT*). Knarf's world therefore parodies the possibility of utopia: what has been envisioned as desirable by twentieth-century Marxists is reduced to static, unproductive closure. The perils of resolving all contradictions and conflicts are revealed: a utopian narrative risks becoming repetitious, lifeless and reductive. As Ruppert notes:

Conceived of as one-dimensional dreamworlds, utopias delineate unearthly visions of peace and perfect harmony, homogeneous regions of order and precision and happiness, that seem to provide us with comforting reassurance. In the process, they appear to ignore difference, to reduce multiplicity and diversity, and to exclude choice, conflict, complexity, history.<sup>13</sup>

The characters in the twenty-fourth century do not only attribute the failures of their society to the dullness produced by the resolution of conflict. As was discussed in the last chapter, the privileging of scientific discourse has become synonymous with bureaucratic power. Knarf sees this situation as related to the lack of creativity and vitality in his world: in 'running the machine', imagination has suffered and "the material side of life outstrips the spiritual" (p.223). The negative qualities of "science", as discussed in the previous section, exist in both the world of the twentieth century and the world of the twenty-fourth. In Harry Munster's capitalist world, the machinations of power operate from hidden sources

---

<sup>13</sup> Peter Ruppert: ix.

as they do in Knarf's socialist one, removed and abstracted from the everyday activities of working individuals.

Both of the worlds that are depicted in *Tomorrow* thus subvert conventional utopian visions. Harry Munster's society is imaginative and dynamic, but lacks an egalitarian and peaceful social organisation. Knarf's society emulates the practical blueprint of a socialist utopia, but lacks imagination and dynamism. The difficulty for readers of *Tomorrow* is that the end results are much the same: the entrenchment of violence and power. The vision of the future is in some ways as dystopian as the past, as from certain perspectives the past and present societies depicted are more attractive than what is envisaged as lying ahead. Moreover, despite the emphasis on cause and effect in *Tomorrow*, it is not clear how the more positive aspects of the twenty-fourth century society, like the elimination of material poverty, have developed out of the chaos of the twentieth century. As Raymond Williams has noted, when a transition to utopia is described as occurring on familiar geographical ground, there is a potential to realise historical agency:

When utopia is no longer an island or a newly discovered place, but our familiar country transformed by specific historical change, the mode of imagined transformation has fundamentally changed.<sup>14</sup>

Thus, argues Williams, a text such as Morris's *News from Nowhere* indicates a shift from earlier utopian visions because utopia is described as being fought for, rather than merely projected or discovered: "Between writer or reader and this new condition is chaos, civil war, painful and slow reconstruction."<sup>15</sup> While in *Tomorrow* it is suggested that Knarf's world of economic plenty would not have been created without the wars, right-wing invasions and apocalyptic actions of the

---

<sup>14</sup> Raymond Williams, 'Utopia and Science Fiction', *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays*, London: Verso Editions & NLB, 1980: 205.

<sup>15</sup> Williams: 204.

communists in the twentieth century, much of the destruction of the old world depicts a breaking down of codes and rationales without an articulation of possibilities for the new. Libraries and universities are emptied, landmarks are defaced and marriages are spurned in favour of “the black market of love” in the Botanical Gardens.<sup>16</sup> The cutting of electrical power in this time of flux recalls the magic of the first blackout and how “[the] incidence of light and shadow were utterly changed, building a new fantastic city” (pp.395-6 *TTT*),<sup>17</sup> but this is a vision without details or foundation, and it lasts only until Sydney is burnt to the ground. We are told that the new world is created after the land “had lain dead, virtually deserted” and allowed to rejuvenate for over a century (p.19) but not how or why this rejuvenation comes about. While readers are encouraged to be aware of the continuum between the twentieth-century and the twenty-fourth, no prescription is offered on how one might journey from one to another. While a familiar landscape is given, many recognisable landmarks have gone. The imaginative possibilities offered for creating utopia from recognisable historical, social and geographical realities are therefore limited.

The other crucial difficulty for readers of *Tomorrow* is that the complicated narrative structure also restricts the utopian possibilities that are offered. The “novel within a novel” structure of *Tomorrow* is shared with many utopian fictions, where utopias are often seen as enclosed worlds, encircled by walls or by sea and separated from known realities by time, space and unexplored dimensions of the mind. As discussed in Chapter Three, the cover of the Virago edition of

---

<sup>16</sup> See Ian Saunders: 213. It is also worth remembering that the section of *Tomorrow* that describes the breakdown of twentieth-century Sydney society is contained in the portion of the novel that was censored; conceivably, this contributes to the impression of fragmentation and codelessness.

<sup>17</sup> See Anthony Stephens, ‘The Sun State and its Shadow’, *Utopias: Papers from the Annual Symposium of the Australian Academy of the Humanities*, ed. Eugene Kamenka, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1987: 16. He argues that all utopias contain within them a “shadow” or a dystopia.



*Tomorrow* depicts the walled medieval town of Mirmande, providing aesthetic associations with the isolated and picturesque Tenth Commune of the future. Darko Suvin likens the typical utopian narrative structure to a wonderful play set within the world stage, with a description of the known world encasing the inner narrative description of the utopia. Thus Suvin argues that a utopian text is in constant implicit dialogue with the 'normal' expectations of a reader.<sup>18</sup> A reader of utopian literature needs both to compare the representation of the realistic "world stage" to the world in which he or she lives and to consider the relationship of the projected ideal world to both of them. Any reading of a utopian fiction therefore involves a constant tension between the reality of the reader and the two visions of reality that he or she is presented with.

However, in *Tomorrow* it is not the recognisable "world stage" that is portrayed in the overarching narrative, but the unfamiliar and ambiguously utopian future of the twenty-fourth century. It is twentieth-century Sydney that is under greater historical, political and social scrutiny, and because the twentieth century is presented as a world that has long since passed it potentially "estranges" the reader. In comparing the known world to a projected alternative reality, normative social behaviours, rituals and institutions become defamiliarised and strange, allowing new insights to flourish.<sup>19</sup> Marjorie Barnard's statement on the outbreak of war that "Current history looks apocalyptic"<sup>20</sup> has often been quoted, perhaps in part because it expresses the unusual temporal placing of readers of 'Little World Left Behind' and readers of *Tomorrow*, and an intention to make the present strange. History is not usually considered to be current, as it concerns itself with past

---

<sup>18</sup> Darko Suvin, 'Science Fiction and Utopian Fiction: Degrees of Kinship', *Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction*, London: The Macmillan Press, 1998: 41.

<sup>19</sup> Darko Suvin, 'Defining the Literary Genre of Utopia: Some Historical Semantics, Some Genealogy, a Proposal, and a Plea', *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979: 54.

<sup>20</sup> Cited in Drusilla Modjeska: 115. See also David Carter: 175.

events, and what is current cannot logically be apocalyptic, unless one can see an end-point arising from present circumstances. However, the earliest readers of *Tomorrow*, who read manuscript versions during the World War Two, experienced a treatment of current or recent events framed as ancient history. The perspectives of Knarf and Ord allowed enough distance from the current situation for a broad critique to be possible, and for conclusions to be drawn about the inevitable apocalyptic outcomes arising from “cause and effect”. The way that this historical lens refracts is necessarily dependent on the placing of different readers in time, and is thus a factor in the varied responses to *Tomorrow*. As will be seen in the next section, many early reviewers were preoccupied with whether the account of the twentieth century was ‘true to life’ and were frustrated by divergences. Readers in the early twenty-first century are more likely to view Knarf’s novel as a conventional historical fictional narrative, as the world described no longer bears as strong a resemblance to current reality. In this way an awareness of the constantly changing nature of the present can be heightened. We are told that as Knarf completes the writing of his novel,

the country before him had evolved from past to present in the changing light . . . his life had coordinated, with himself as pivot, the world of his imagination and the unresolved pattern of his life. He had laid three worlds on top of the other, like three plates, and each was his. (p.26)

The three worlds that Knarf has been able to lay ‘on top of the other’ are the past, the present and the future and he is the fixed centre of a fluctuating, imaginative world, binding three histories together as an author, a reader and as a historian. Each reader of *Tomorrow* also creates a fixed centre, with their present as the point of reference for the two fictional histories that are depicted.

The reversal of the typically utopian frame-within-a-frame structure in *Tomorrow* alters the potential for an open-ended narrative that has been observed in many utopian fictions by critics such as Ruppert and Suvin. Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, for instance, in fact looks forward: the future is imagined in order to cast light on American society in the 1890s. Bellamy's book could thus be read as functioning to educate readers of the 1890s about the possibility of introducing utopian values in order to alter the future of their society. Some more recent utopian fiction, like Marge Piercy's *Woman On The Edge Of Time*, stresses that utopia cannot be objectively known and set at a determined point in the future; it is up to individuals to constantly struggle against an ever variable horizon. Like these utopian fictions, aspects of dialogue in *Tomorrow* emphasise that the past, present and future are inextricably linked and that what happens in the future depends on the actions in the present: "It's not a matter of wanting, it's cause and effect. Certain types of thinking lead to certain types of action" (p.224). In *Tomorrow*, many aspects of the future are set and fixed, revealing that human society is doomed to endlessly repeat the struggle for liberty.

Readers of *Tomorrow* are also restricted in the ways in which they can mediate between the two worlds that are presented. Typically, travellers within the fictions of utopia must find a way to traverse the boundaries between their world and the alternative one. The narrators of *Looking Backward* and *News From Nowhere* fall asleep and find themselves in the future, while the narrator of *Utopia* voyages across the sea. The protagonist in *Woman On The Edge Of Time* discovers that she has access to an alternative dimension of consciousness that transports her into a possible future world. These fictional journeys reflect the self-conscious boundaries that are traversed by a reader of utopian literature, who negotiates the frame-within-a-frame structure of the text. A reader who is presented with a

number of inconclusive viewpoints and possibilities, Ruppert suggests, will suspend resolution and become an “active partner in the dialectical process of utopian construction.”<sup>21</sup> As *Tomorrow's* utopian visions are indeterminate and contradictory, this might suggest the potential for a reader of the book to create an imaginative alternative. However, this potential is not only constrained by the portrayal of an unalterable future in the novel, but also by the fact that Knarf is not only a character, but an author and reader, who mediates his text for us. He controls the experience of reading his account of the twentieth century by reading it aloud to Ord, altering the story, leaving bits out and commenting on others. As readers are privy to Ord's reactions to the story, it becomes more difficult for them to envisage alternative readings. On page 341 in the ‘Afternoon’ section,<sup>22</sup> Knarf tells Ord that he has written the tale of the journey of Arch Castles with “great élan”, but he withholds a reading of it, indicating that the book is far more vast than that which others have access to and teasing readers with the suggestion that they have been deprived of a good story. As with several other sections of *Tomorrow* which detail the commentaries between Knarf and Ord, Knarf displays here a self-conscious, self-mocking awareness of literary genre and literary construction:

I've written that first part in the style of the adventure romance of the day, objective, superficial, full of shifts and devices and moments of suspense, with a trace of satire . . .

Such a passage reminds readers that they are being manipulated, and that an awareness of the artifices of story-telling is needed. It is a passage that strongly suggests to readers how they should categorise and interpret some of the narratives that they are presented with, but it also reminds that this historical recounting is merely a story, and thus is not to be trusted.

---

<sup>21</sup> Peter Ruppert: 140

<sup>22</sup> Page 345 in the Georgian House edition.

It can be considered that there are several different ways of reading literary utopias. Firstly, utopias can be understood as 'straightforward blueprints' that map out an ideal society and that propose "rational, pragmatic alternatives to existing forms of social organisation."<sup>23</sup> People reading utopias with these understandings will characteristically look for an overt message, focussing on what the narrative "says". Therefore, they will either see these works as overly reductive and stereotyped, or as a model for peace and happiness: "Utopias, for these readers, are clearly intended for realisation and implementation."<sup>24</sup>

*Tomorrow* deflects this kind of reading by critiquing the blueprint that it offers. A reader who expects *Tomorrow* to deliver an inspiring model of a socialist, technologically advanced future will be inevitably frustrated: they are informed by Knarf, Ren and others that the model does not work, that it is out of date and that it is indeed a flat, simplified and dead-ended vision. As discussed, there are also few instructions on how one might get to utopia; the past, imperfect world might in fact be considered more desirable.

However, there are alternative ways of reading utopias, stressing "not so much concrete proposals for enactment as . . . projections of an imaginary time or place in which social conflicts and contradictions are only playfully resolved, cancelled, neutralised, or otherwise transformed."<sup>25</sup> It is possible to comprehend utopias as speculative myths that have the ability to mediate and resolve cultural tensions, and to anticipate better social possibilities in the future. Utopias can also be seen as "a critical defamiliarisation of existing social tensions that uncovering 'traces' of a

---

<sup>23</sup> Peter Ruppert: 151. The categories outlined here are particularly influenced by Peter Ruppert's application of reader-response theory to utopian literature in *Reader In A Strange Land*.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

potentially different future manifest in the present world.”<sup>26</sup> All of these readings rely on the reader’s consciousness of a relationship between historical reality and the imaginative dream of social life that seeks to modify or displace the reality.<sup>27</sup> The chapter structuring of *Tomorrow* encourages the direct comparison between the supposedly “ideal” world of the twenty-fourth century and the “historical reality” of the twentieth century; the novel jumps back and forth across centuries during the overarching time-frame of the day in which Knarf reads it. Thus, the invasion of Poland is juxtaposed with a vision of people from the Commune picnicking on the river bank (pp.212-5); the hills and air of the Riverina are the backdrop for a recounting of Russian and German invasions (pp.240-1); and the stench of a Sydney train on a summer’s day is contrasted with a smell of “baking bread and sun-dried linen” (pp.43-44). As we have seen, any seemingly clear division between the “good” and “bad” society in *Tomorrow* soon becomes clouded. The ways in which readers mediate between these two worlds are then dependent on how they view them in relation to their own present society. Expectations about an accurate depiction of Australia between 1924 and 1944 might well be disappointed — as might the hope for an accurate prognostication of the future — but a reader who views both worlds as speculative fictions can gain an alternative perspective on current societal conflicts and discordancies. Futures that are imagined out of this process are thus relative to individual cultural, political and historical positions. Such readings also recognise the dialectical qualities of Knarf’s novel and *Tomorrow*

---

<sup>26</sup> Ruppert: 151-2. For this latter point, Ruppert is relying on the work of Darko Suvin, who argues that utopian fiction is based on “estrangement arising out of an alternative historical hypothesis.” See Darko Suvin, ‘Science Fiction and Utopian Fiction: Degrees of Kinship’, *Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction*, London: The Macmillan Press, 1988: 33-43.

<sup>27</sup> However, as is discussed in the next section of this chapter, some readers of *Tomorrow* have not acknowledged or have dismissed the depiction of the twenty-fourth century, concentrating entirely on the twentieth century or “social realist” narrative strand. Here, there is a focus on readings which recognise the ‘novel within a novel’ aspect of *Tomorrow*.

that were described above: that is, they acknowledge “fact” and fiction; imagination and scientific rigour, and historical accuracy as well as speculation.

However, as discussed, other sections in the novel can undermine this process. While the visions of Sydney are made vivid and strange by their twenty-fourth century framework, the interjections by Knarf and Ord inform readers of the problems with this vision, and often dictate how they should be interpreted. More problematically, optimistic visions for the future are cauterised by the portrayal of a world that undercuts the possibility of realising utopia. Other readers, in failing to locate a utopia, and in identifying the text as speculative, might look for what *Tomorrow* illuminates about their own time. As will be seen in the following section, this approach is evident in several reviews of *Tomorrow*. However, serious attempts can be deflected by the novel’s insistence on the artifice and fallibility of storytelling. Thus, the framework of *Tomorrow* both opens up and restricts readings of the novel. The contrasting between two different societies interrogates objective utopian visions, but the conclusions offer few imaginative alternatives. The challenges that Knarf encounters in reconstructing a past and acknowledging the validity of imagination are paralleled with Barnard Eldershaw’s challenges in resisting didactic and monologic theories of utopia. In turn, these challenges contribute to the difficulty of finding a coherent reading of the novel.

The final pages of *Tomorrow* describe Ren walking outside the Tenth Commune and into the countryside beyond the settlement. He is also walking outside the rigid narrative of scientific rationality that strangles his own world, and he is beyond the narrative confines of Knarf’s story. There are few clues about how to proceed in this wilderness, but Ren’s father suggests that his task is to struggle for an imaginative, creative and non-totalising idea of liberty. A prescription for this

imaginative understanding is not given — only that like a blank piece of paper “[the] earth remains” (p.456 *TTT*). Readers are in the same position as Ord, piecing together the history and authority surrounding the Brooding Anzac, and Knarf, puzzling over the scattered remains of history. If they desire a positive conclusion, they must construct it out of an incomplete and inconclusive text, using speculation and imagination. Thus, it is inevitable that interpretations of *Tomorrow* that seek a conclusive utopian message within the text will also convey individual imaginative longings. Like Ruth and Archie, who persist despite losing faith in an ideological position, readers of *Tomorrow* can find themselves in the paradoxical situation of needing to construct a meaningful text out of contradictory fragments in order to demonstrate that resolution is not beyond their grasp. While several comprehensive utopian visions are acknowledged in *Tomorrow*, few, if any, can be realised.



## **Two: ‘How Do You Know The Reader Is Going To Play Your Game?’: Aspects of Reception**

*“How do you know the reader is going to play your game? He’ll probably run round in circles looking for the plot and feel disgruntled because he doesn’t find it.”*

*Tomorrow: 204*

As noted in the previous section, it is unclear whether 'Little World Left Behind' is received by anyone other than Ord in *Tomorrow's* fictional future, or whether Knarf's contemporaries consign it to literary and historical dustbins. Thus, as Knarf attests that his book must be shared with the outer world for it to reach its complete form, the success of his novel is uncertain. "A book is as implacable as an unborn child", Knarf believes, "a rising day, inevitable in its demands" (p.18). He contends that the reason that the novel 'comes alive again' (p.23) when he shares it with Ord is that Ord provides conflict, bringing out a fuller vision than Knarf is able to render in isolation. Thus, as Ord engages in conversation with Knarf and with the book, he becomes a crucial participant in the creation of the novel, because through this dialectical process the book is transformed. As Chapter Four will elaborate, Ord's queries, comments and interjections contribute to the creation of the novel, because Knarf changes his work as Ord reacts to it.

Knarf's belief in the need for his book to be read reflects Wolfgang Iser's argument that

The work is more than the text, for the text only takes on life when it is realised, and furthermore the realisation is by no means independent of the individual disposition of the reader . . . the convergence of text and reader brings the literary work into existence.<sup>1</sup>

However, in *Tomorrow*, we are given only a single response to Knarf's novel, and thus Knarf's novel could be said to be not fully realised, as it has not been subject to a plenitude of "individual dispositions". This section aims to expand on the range of responses that have been given to *Tomorrow* as a whole in articles and reviews, in order to explore the variety of ways in which it has been possible to read

---

<sup>1</sup> Wolfgang Iser, 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach', *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1974: 274-5.

*Tomorrow*. This is seen as foundational to the examination in the following sections of the ways in which readings of *Tomorrow* have affected its editing, censoring and publishing. Both chapters demonstrate that readers of *Tomorrow* have played a crucial role in the production of the novel. They also emphasise the social function of this novel, in that a reception history of *Tomorrow* indicates significant aspects of changing cultural assumptions and expectations regarding the role of literature and art in Australia.

Ord's interaction with Knarf's novel resembles the ways in which readers have reacted to *Tomorrow* as a whole, and the ways in which readers can be seen to react to texts more generally. Ord analyses the book in terms of how it fits his experience with the novelistic genre; he expands on some of the themes in terms of what he already knows about its historical setting; and he argues with the book when it does not conform to his ideas about how Australia in the twentieth century should be represented. As will be seen in this section, Ord is like many readers of *Tomorrow* in that he is frustrated when the novel does not meet his expectations of what a novel should contain and how a novel should be structured. He chastises Knarf for the novel's plotlessness and absence of the usual patterns and signposts, arguing that if readers cannot follow the book they will not read it (p.204). Knarf contends that if readers "do remember, that's all right; if they don't, that's all right too" (p.203). The reader, he says, is not his business (p.204).

While Knarf's lack of interest in his audience here could be seen to undermine his earlier conviction that his book needs to be read to be complete, his statements emphasise a belief that readers are free to interpret his book as they wish. *Tomorrow* as a whole has been interpreted diversely if not freely; as this chapter will demonstrate, it has proved resistant to definitive interpretation and has been

subject to widely conflicting readings. The previous chapter noted how *Tomorrow's* content and structure enabled disparate readings, pushing against the boundaries of novelistic conventions and setting the novel apart from other Australian literature of the 1930s and 1940s. As *Tomorrow* contains differing narrative threads and voices, combining domestic, political, philosophical, historical and speculative fiction, it is difficult to focus on one narrative thread without other aspects of the novel subverting it.

Obviously Ord, unlike other readers of *Tomorrow*, only receives part of the narrative of *Tomorrow*: in the remainder of the narrative, he is a character. Thus, his reading of Knarf's novel is influenced not only by the fact that he is receiving the novel in an entirely different context to other readers, but by his different comprehension of the boundaries of the novel. As argued in the previous section, the partitions that Knarf and Ord's conversations create between the different narratives significantly complicate the ways in which *Tomorrow* can be read. However, few reviews and articles — the published responses which will be looked at here — have attempted to examine the relationship between the different narrative threads: many instead concentrate on one or several aspects of the storyline to the exclusion of others. These selective readings frequently emphasise particular cultural and ideological evaluations, revealing as much about the situation of the readers as they do about the text itself. Some responses can be grouped according to what Stanley Fish might term "interpretive communities"; that is, it is possible to detect interpretive commonalities or norms between readings that can be defined in terms of history, culture and ideology.<sup>2</sup> Other

---

<sup>2</sup> See Jane Tompkins, 'An Introduction to Reader-Response Criticism', *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. Jane P. Tompkins, London; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980: xxi. Also Stanley Fish, 'Is There A Text In This Class?', *The Stanley Fish Reader*, ed. H. Aram Veese, Massachusetts; Oxford; Blackwell Publishers, 1999: 38-54.

readings appear more idiosyncratic, revealing something of the personal circumstances of the reader, and emphasising the various groups of expectations co-existing in a particular historical moment.<sup>3</sup>

Hans Robert Jauss's notion of a "horizon of expectations"; that is, "the set of cultural, ethical and literary (generic, stylistic, thematic) expectations of a work's readers 'in the historical moment of its appearance'"<sup>4</sup> is useful in considering the reception of *Tomorrow*, given that the reception took place over a fifty year period, and can be defined according to a broad range of expectations about art, Australian literature and cultural values. The early reviews and articles about *Tomorrow* were written in response to its first publication in 1947, and differ in evaluative method, emphasis and expectation from responses between the '50s and the '70s, and the responses to the new publication in 1983. *Tomorrow's* reception history makes it apparent that there are few aspects of *Tomorrow* that have been agreed on throughout its existence.

When considering the reception history of *Tomorrow*, it is necessary to take into account that at least five different textual versions of the novel have been read by different people at different times: the typescript and copies of the typescript that were read by Edgar Harris and Barnard and Eldershaw's friends; the first edition of the novel; the censored typescript; the revised typescript created by Barnard and the Virago edition of the novel. The censor himself read *Tomorrow* in a possibly

---

<sup>3</sup> Susan Suleiman makes this latter point in her Introduction: *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. Susan R. Suleiman, Inge Crosman, Princeton: Princeton University Press: 1980: 37: "It seems especially difficult [to consider works in relation to the "horizon of expectations"] without considering the possibility of *different* horizons of expectations co-existing among different publics in any one society. A work that appears totally unacceptable to one group of contemporary readers may appear as just the opposite to 'the happy few.'"

<sup>4</sup> Hans Robert Jauss, 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory', *New Literary History* 2, 1970: 14.

unique way: he read only 148 pages of the copytext typescript. As will be discussed, it is also likely that the Virago editors read only photocopies of the same 148 pages, which by then had been annotated by the censor and by others.<sup>5</sup> Thus, some of the varied readings of *Tomorrow* can be attributed to the fact that the text that was read was also variable. This chapter deals mainly, although not exclusively, with published responses by reviewers and critics to published versions of the book: the 1947 and 1983 editions. However, it will be argued that *Tomorrow* can be seen to have had a dialectical relationship with its readers and has thus been continuously evolving. The next chapter focusses on the largely unpublished responses of editors, publishers and the censor to *Tomorrow* and emphasises the way in which the reception history and the production of *Tomorrow* have affected one another: that is, while variations in the text have influenced the varied responses, these varied responses have also influenced variations in the text.

As will be discussed further, in demonstrating how readers selectively focus on material according to interest, alliance and familiarity with the subject, divisions between selectivity and censorship can become indistinct. According to Iser, readers of texts act as co-creators by supplying portions of it that are not written, but only implied:

whenever . . . we are led off in unexpected directions, the opportunity is given to us to bring into play our own faculty for establishing connections — for filling in the gaps left by the text itself.<sup>6</sup>

As shown in the following analyses and reviews, some readers of *TT* and *TTT* focussed on elements of the text which are barely discernible, or which are only apparent with some extrapolation. Additionally, as is particularly evident in the earlier

---

<sup>5</sup> See Chapter Three, p.

<sup>6</sup> Iser: 279.

readings, many readers only addressed the 'internal' twentieth-century narrative in the novel, or dealt very fleetingly with its more speculative aspects. The following chapter will show that, similarly, the novel's first publisher, Edgar Harris of Georgian House, favoured this emphasis, to the extent that he voluntarily submitted portions of the novel that did not conform to his ideas of an attractive, literary and saleable text to the publicity censor. Virago editors were also influenced by the notion of restoring a silenced, subversive text, and thus replaced all cuts that appeared politically provocative, to the detriment of the narrative flow of the novel, and possibly contrary to the intentions of its authors. While selective readings should not be equated with censorship, in the case of *TT* and *TTT*, preferred readings of the text physically affected the versions that future readers were able to see. It can thus be said that the ways in which the novel has been read have contributed to its censoring.<sup>7</sup>

While reactions of the novel vary widely, certain specific critical trends and methodologies relating to the chronological period in which they appeared can be identified. The responses to *TT* that date from 1947 to 1953, which will be examined first here, differ in terms of political affiliation, but generally share expectations about the sort of novel that *TT* should be and share some opinions about the ways in which *TT* departs from novelistic norms. *TT* was usually praised when it conformed to the confines of social or even socialist realism<sup>8</sup> and criticised for the segments of its narrative that veered off into speculation or into reflection about

<sup>7</sup> See also Robert Darby's 'The Censor As Literary Critic', *Westerly*, December 1986: 32.

<sup>8</sup> As David Carter has remarked, the terms 'social realism' and 'socialist realism' have often overlapped in Australian criticism. See 'Documenting and Criticising Society', *Penguin New Literary History of Australia*, Eds. Bruce Bennett and Laurie Hergenhan, Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1988: 381. Here Jennifer's Strauss's definition of social (rather than socialist) realism is apt: "non-lyrical, non-judgemental, concerned with the lives of 'ordinary' people". Jennifer Strauss, 'Literary Culture 1914-1939: Battlers All', *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*, eds Bruce Bennett and Jennifer Strauss, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1998: 124-25.

the novelistic form. In these latter instances, *TT* was seen as breaking away from generic expectation about what a novel should and should not contain, and thus it also subverted the standards of how “good” literature was structured. A survey of some of the reviews from this early period reveals the influence of key figures and publications in the literary field of the time — notably the *Bulletin* magazine, *Meanjin*, the ‘Palmer circle’ and the Communist Party — and also gives insight into the ways in which literary values were assessed.<sup>9</sup>

Miles Franklin’s annotated copy of *TT*, now in the Mitchell Library, provides an illustration of some of the early reactions of intellectuals on the left and is thus one of the few unpublished documents to be examined here.<sup>10</sup> As Franklin explained in a letter to Katharine Susannah Prichard on 20 November 1947,

We are having quite a bit of fun with *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*. It went to JB Miles from me with all my ribaldries thick upon it, and he added to them with deeper and more political, if less scintillatory observations. It became a game to me to find out the word ‘pattern’. JB Miles found a good many and marked them missed by MF. Then the book went to Marjorie Pizer, and she found several ‘patterns’ which she marked missed by both JBM and MF . . . I shd [sic] read the book properly to be sure I’m not doing it an injustice, but my snap judgement is that it is a great piece of composition but no creation.<sup>11</sup>

While the marginalia in Franklin’s book came about as a private joke between friends (the word “pattern” is marked at least 43 times), it is nonetheless a significant record. The book documents the comparisons that its readers made

<sup>9</sup> Self-evidently, a lack of records prevents the analysis of other less public and influential readers. While this study indicates some dominant critical, political and intellectual trends in relation to the reading of *Tomorrow*, it of course does not necessarily reflect the reactions of ordinary readers to the novel. The large majority of the readers here were also professional critics.

<sup>10</sup> The copy can be found in Miles Franklin’s printed book collection, ML MS 3691 KH 605. Carole Ferrier discusses some of the annotations in *As Good As A Yarn With You* (hereafter *As Good As A Yarn*), Ed. Carole Ferrier, Oakleigh:Cambridge University Press, 1992: 180.

<sup>11</sup> Miles Franklin to Katharine Susannah Prichard, 20 November 1947, Miles Franklin’s papers, ML 364/21/305.



between *TT* and other novels; their frustrations with its construction; their dim view of what they saw as historical inaccuracies and generic confusion and their approval of the portrayal of the economic Depression.

Pizer's, Franklin's and Miles's responses to *TT* are valuable because they show individual subjectivities that shaped their different readings of the novel, and also because they highlight collective understandings about interpretive literary conventions in the 1940s.<sup>12</sup> As Franklin, Pizer and Miles were all public figures, and details about their lives are known, it is possible to reflect on how their individual histories affected their readings of *TT*. John Branwell Miles's position as the General Secretary of the Communist Party is evident in the way that he focusses on criticisms of Russia and the party in the text, and his almost exclusive interest in the political aspects of the narrative. He was reputed to be an exacting and harsh critic: Jean Devanny reported that in 1933 he had returned a borrowed copy of her novel *The Butcher Shop* "with its margins scrawled through with jeering ribaldries."<sup>13</sup> Conversely, the poet Marjorie Pizer commented infrequently on political tenets of the novel, but was scornful of accounts of the Starving Poet in *TT*, exclaiming, "What romantic schoolgirl nonsense — & just what poets were not writing at this period" (p.320).<sup>14</sup> She was scathing when details seemed to her to be inaccurate or inconsistent, believing for instance that the inhabitants of Knarf's world carry electric torches rather than lanterns (p.460). As discussed below, she also appeared to agree with many of Franklin's opinions on the flaws in the literary content and construction of the novel. Miles Franklin's commentary is largely

<sup>12</sup> The work of several critics in the area loosely known as reader-response theory is pertinent here, particularly Stanley Fish's notion of an "interpretive community", Jonathan Culler's ideas on "literary competence" and Norman Holland's thesis that "interpretation is a function of identity." See Tompkins's 'An Introduction to Reader-Response Criticism': xvii-xxiii.

<sup>13</sup> See *As Good As A Yarn*: 14.

<sup>14</sup> Hereafter the marginalia in Miles Franklin's copy of *TT* are referenced in brackets according to the number of the page in this copy on which the annotations occur.

concerned with whether *TT* succeeds as a novel, an apt focus given her status as an Australian novelist. Franklin knew Barnard and Eldershaw personally through their work with the Fellowship of Australian Writers (FAW) and their shared literary circles. As discussed in several biographical accounts, Franklin had been hurt by what she viewed as Barnard Eldershaw's ridicule of some of her work in a Commonwealth Literary Fund lecture in 1945.<sup>15</sup> Conceivably, this contributed to some literary rivalry, and to some of Franklin's caustic remarks about *TT*.

Several pages in Franklin's copy of the book record disagreements over the political views espoused within the text. As noted above, JB Miles opposed many of the political comments and arguments articulated in the novel. On pp.39-140 of *TT* he labelled the position of the Peace Party as "pacifist bosh" and "rubbish", responding to the assertion in the novel that "[the] man you kill is no different from yourself, no better no worse" with the query "Who? Nazis." Pizer extended this conversation with her reply: "But is pacifism bosh? Men must abandon war." Both these remarks reveal that their authors regarded the sentiments expressed here as objective commentary, rather than as the opinion of a fictional individual living in an imagined future. Miles took issue with the political argument in other parts of the novel, contending that descriptions of the stagnancy of the twenty-fourth century are taken from Hillaire Belloc's *The Servile State*, and are too unoriginal to need reiteration (p.225). Miles did not appear to regard the novel as a forum containing many different opinions; his notes would suggest that he regarded *TT* as an unambiguous articulation of Barnard Eldershaw's political position. He

<sup>15</sup> See Marjorie Barnard, *Miles Franklin*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967:15: "She took any unfavorable [sic] criticism of her writing very much to heart. I had an unfortunate experience over this! I was giving the Commonwealth Literary Fund lectures in Australian literature at the University of Sydney. Miles, somewhat to my horror, arrived to listen to my lecture on her work. I am a sincere admirer of her writing and gave a fair, even enthusiastic account of it, but when I read some passages in illustration the students were convulsed with laughter. This so hurt and angered Miles that she refused to sit down to lunch with me and for a time diplomatic relations were broken off."

also appeared to regard the work as an accurate recording of history rather than as fiction — labelling Knarf's account of the left's reaction to Poland's invasion as “[a] lie” (p.243) — and he focussed on the long, impersonal accounts of World War Two, only infrequently commenting on sections of the novel that deal with personal relations. On p.323, in response to the descriptions of “the world in the years of fury” (p.322 *TT*), he wrote that there is “[n]othing about the reality of unity and effort”, disregarding the speculative aspect at this point in the book.

As a communist, Miles presumably disagreed with the distrust expressed in the book for a centralised State. He queried whether Knarf's world is really neo-Fascistic or a “terrified liberals' socialist utopia” (p.226) and mocked the use of the liberal historian Harold Laski: “Sure to like lackey Laski” (p.227). He also disputed the lines: “the State is the only channel of public action . . . Liberty is x, the unknown. No ten people will ever agree about it. Bring it into the fully rational field of state activities and you will at once have chaos” (p.232). In the margin beside these lines he has written “M.B.E. don't know the difference between freedom and anarchy!” Over the page Miles viewed Oran's comments about “this imponderable thing, public opinion” as “contempt for the masses” (p.233), perhaps not realising that Oran's elitist attitude is portrayed unsympathetically in the novel.

Pizer and Franklin occasionally proffered political responses, but concentrated more on style and language construction, possibly because they were both writers themselves. At times the literary if not the personal intimacy between Franklin and Barnard Eldershaw is evident: on one page, Franklin claimed that Barnard Eldershaw have used a phrase that was “hers” (p.188). The game to find the word “pattern” evidently became a source of frustration: as Franklin put it, she found:

“Too much pattern in this book, also too little, and also none at all, and that’s the complicated matter with it” (p.267). On the whole, both Pizer and Franklin appeared to have difficulty with the broad, repetitious and inclusive scope of the novel, and with some material that they found un-novel-like. On p.95, Franklin found *TT* to be, “not yet a novel” but rather “an [sic] historical essay or extended editorial”. The scene detailing Olaf Ramsay’s hallucinations was, she felt, “ a faltering in [the] middle of [the] novel, like the old fashioned one padded out with stories by travellers etc” (p.168). A political conversation on the beach is pronounced “a treatise-cum-sermon-cum farrago” (p.172). Other passages in the novel were seen to be disjointed: she felt some of the observations were described as “separate motifs — not assimilated into the stream of a novel” (p.190). In sum, many of her individual comments supported the impression that Franklin had given to Prichard: that the novel was “a great piece of composition but no creation.” On the final page she has written, “Some good patches but too few amid the many distended dry sandy wastes” (p.466).

All three readers expressed frustration with the loose structure and difficulty in remembering who the different characters were. On p.157, where there is a description of the Grants listening to the radio on their farm in Toongabbie, Franklin wrote: “Who are these people? I’ve forgotten. Do they come in earlier[?]”. Miles replies: “Some, yes . . . But its [sic] poor construction. Dragged in.” Franklin’s and Miles’s reactions anticipated Ord’s objections to the way in which Knarf reuses characters: “Well how in the name of fortune do you expect the ordinary reader to remember that?” (p.203 *TT*). In the margins beside Ord’s comment, Pizer assented: “It needed explanation.” As will be discussed in Chapter Five, it is likely that the pages in *TT* which follow Ord’s objection, in which Knarf attempts to justify the rambling nature of his narrative, were written after

the novel was cut by the publicity censor.<sup>16</sup> However, Franklin, Miles and Pizer found this passage irrelevant and did not sympathise with Knarf's explanations. Above Knarf's argument that "Life's an endless reticulation. I'm not aiming at a pattern. A pattern is jejune and naive", Franklin has written, "pretentiously unpatterned patterning of patterns" (p.204). Ord responds to Knarf with the question:

How do you know the reader is going to play your game? He'll probably run around in circles looking for the plot and feel disgruntled because he doesn't find it. (p.204 *TT*)

Miles replied in the margin, "Quite! Or bored" (p.219). Next to Knarf's assertions about his novel's construction, Pizer wrote: "A literary argument. Quite irrelevant." She repeated this criticism on a page where Knarf speaks again of "telescoping" history, asserting that his comments are a "lesson in literary construction" (p.368). These comments suggest that Pizer did not consider that the self-conscious, reflective aspects of *TT* were effective or appropriate in a novel. While Pizer expressed a desire for *TT* to be more "novel-like"; she also expressed annoyance with inaccuracies and internal inconsistencies, finding a description of a milk bar in 1924 (p.45) anachronistic. On a page that states that the Duke of York opened Parliament in Canberra in 1928, she has written: "He opened it in 1927. Can't they even be accurate . . . ?" (p.94). Evidently, Pizer felt that a fictional work still needed to express a realistic comprehension of history, a criterion considered essential in works of artistic value amongst left-wing intellectuals of the 1940s and '50s.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> See Chapter Five, p.220.

<sup>17</sup> See Patrick Buckridge, 'Intellectual Authority and Critical Traditions in Australian Literature 1945 to 1975', *Intellectual Movement and Australian Society*, eds James Walter, Brian Head, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1988: 204-5.

Boredom is complained of frequently by all three readers; a few pages after this “conversation”, Franklin wrote: “Very boring. No pattern.” Next to the lines, “Knarf felt his brain stuffed with an infinity of silken threads inextricably tangled”, Pizer added, “[so] is mine after all this.” Miles agreed: “M.B.E. are bogged down” (p.239). Franklin in particular appeared to feel not only that the book was sometimes difficult to follow, but that many passages were irrelevant to what she saw as the main story: the narrative concerning the life of Harry Munster. While she did praise the book, nearly all of her favourable comments are confined to the descriptions and analyses of the Depression; the legacy of the Anzacs; the political gatherings at the Domain; the details about the Munsters, and the historically accurate details about World War Two, like the bombing of Broome and the presence of American soldiers in Sydney. Only one passage concerning the twenty-fourth century attracted a positive response from Franklin: she assessed some of the conversation between Ren and Oran during the ‘Symposium’ as “good” (p.229). It can be speculated that Franklin, like Pizer, preferred the aspects of *TT* that resembled conventions that she was familiar with. Passages comparable to the ones that she praised appear in novels such as Tennant’s *The Battlers* and Mann’s *The Go-Getter*. These novels, like the section of *TT* about Harry Munster, critique capitalism and explore the plight of individuals struggling to survive in a competitive, materialist society, conforming to ideals of socialist realism.<sup>18</sup>

While the three readers expressed some similar expectations and disappointments regarding *TT*— they approved of the negative analyses of the capitalist system and

---

<sup>18</sup> As Jean Devanny wrote, genuine socialist literature must feature the “true — as against the imagined — characteristics of the working people” and it must feature “not only the worker’s problems but also their solutions”, ‘The Worker’s Contribution to Australian Literature’, *Australian Writers Speak: Literature and Life in Australia*, a series of talks arranged by the Fellowship of Australian Writers for the Australian Broadcasting Commission, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1942: 57-8.

disliked it when the book contained too many diverging threads — they also had different ideas about what was wrong and right with the novel. Miles interpreted the book according to the ways in which it espoused communist philosophy and found it lacking, not only because of its historical imprecision but because of its ambivalence. Unlike Franklin and Pizer he expressed little interest in the book's literary qualities. Pizer and Franklin approved of the book when it followed a conventional realist narrative, but had little tolerance for digressions and did not like the long historical/political passages to which Miles devoted his attention. Thus, the game to spot the references to "patterns" had an underlying significance, as the readers were also occupied in finding templates within the text that were familiar to them. In attempting to impose expected ideas of order on *TT* and often failing, Miles, Pizer and Franklin revealed assumptions about the place of politics in art, the ideal novelistic form, and the difficulties in distinguishing between imaginative and factual accounts of history. As argued in the previous chapter, readers of the novel who expected an accurate historical depiction of Australia between the wars, or a utopian vision of a socialist future, were likely to be disappointed, as was the case with these readers. Additionally, Miles, Pizer and Franklin were frustrated by the self-reflexive aspects of *TT*, which undercut their shared understandings about the way in which novels could be expected to operate.

Broadly speaking, other responses to *TT* in the 1940s and '50s can be divided between those who assumed that *Tomorrow* was a conventional historical narrative and looked for what it reflected about current social realities, as the marginalia in Franklin's book exemplify, and those who were interested in the novel's scope and the future possibilities on which it reflected. Like Marjorie Pizer, many of those who were interested in political readings — both from a right-wing and a left-wing perspective — were concerned with what they saw as *TT*'s inaccurate

representations. For instance, the correspondence of communist writers, Jean Devanny and Katharine Susannah Prichard, expressed irritation with *TT*'s failure to accurately express communist philosophies. On the 11 December 1947, Prichard wrote to Franklin:

Talking or arguing logically, that's what I find wrong with *To-morrow and To-morrow*, chiefly. If people will deal with communism, at least they shd know something about it. The Marxian dialectic does give a logical basis for thought, & the characters & conditions described by MB & FE have no relation to either Communist mentality or methods. I think that Flora, at least, intended to be sympathetic, but the result wd be damaging if anybody thought a nit-wit like her Communist could be responsible for Communist policy.<sup>19</sup>

Jean Devanny's correspondence also makes it clear that she disliked the book. To JB Miles, she wrote: "The book is such a hotch-potch of naive rubbish, politically, that an organised criticism was not worth while . . .".<sup>20</sup> *The Communist Review*, "the main organ of Party policy and Party philosophizing" in the 1940s and 1950s, never published any criticism on *TT*.<sup>21</sup> Significantly, *TT* received little public critical attention from the far left until the 1980s, when the political boundaries between right and left wing had shifted from those in the 1940s.<sup>22</sup> Concomitantly, *Quadrant*, the literary journal representing the Australian conservative intellectual movement from 1956 onwards, did not publish any material on *Tomorrow* until 2002,<sup>23</sup> despite the fact that it had been long

---

<sup>19</sup> Katharine Susannah Prichard to Miles Franklin, 11 December 1947, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 181-2.

<sup>20</sup> Jean Devanny to JB Miles, 21 March 1947. See *As Good As A Yarn*: 175.

<sup>21</sup> See David Carter's 'A Chronological List of Literary Material in *Communist Review*', *Australian Literary Studies*, 12, 1985: 94; 98-105.

<sup>22</sup> In the 1980s, Humphrey McQueen published two papers on *Tomorrow*: 'Memory and Imagination', *Social Alternatives* 8.3, 1989: 20-22, and '*Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*', *Island Magazine* 32, Spring 1987: 3-12. Buckridge comments that McQueen was one of the few representatives of the New Left to publish work on Australian literature. 'Intellectual Authority': 208.

<sup>23</sup> See Robert Darby, 'Dampening the Incendiary Ardour: The Roots of Marjorie Barnard's 'Dry Spell'', *Quadrant* 46.6, June 2002: 62-8. The article includes some discussion of *Tomorrow*.



recognised by other prominent journals and magazines such as *Meanjin*, *Southerly* and *Bulletin* — and later by *Overland*, *Hecate* and *Southern Review*.

*TT* asked too many questions of communism to be favoured by communists, but it was politically radical enough for conservatives to view it as promoting Communist policy, and to consider that it was not a balanced account of Australian history. In 1952, for instance', William Charles Wentworth suggested in parliament that *TT* potentially furthered communist ideas and was "a trashy tripey novel with a Marxist slant."<sup>24</sup> This was part of a long-running campaign of political pressure on the Fellowship of Australian Writers and the Commonwealth Literary Fund advisory board by Wentworth and Standish Keon, relating to accusations that the Fellowship was sheltering and favouring communist writers and that it had ceased to be representative of the Australian community.<sup>25</sup> While it is clear that Wentworth interpreted the novel in this manner specifically to promote his own argument, the fact that different readers could see the novel both as representative and unrepresentative of communist policies — and as critical and uncritical of these policies — illustrates the difficulty in reading *TT* in any single and conclusive way. It also illustrates the way in which some readers found it possible to interpret the book for specific ends.

In 1947, just after *TT* had been released, Barnard wrote to Eleanor Dark that the writer of the positive *Sydney Morning Herald* review of *TT* had managed to push it through "before Warwick Fairfax or the editor could see it and hand out a line. It was better than we could have expected from a conservative paper, now reviews go

<sup>24</sup> Hansard, 28 August 1952.

<sup>25</sup> See Fiona Capp, 'Policing Patronage: Vance Palmer, Judah Waten, Kylie Tennant and the Commonwealth Literary Fund', *Writers Defiled: Security Surveillance of Australian Authors and Intellectuals 1920-1960*, Ringwood: McPhee Gribble, 1993: 117-133. Also Carole Ferrier, *Jean Devanny: Romantic Revolutionary*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1999: 266-267.

according to politics.”<sup>26</sup> As Devanny’s comments emphasise, political aspects of *TT* did affect the nature and the sources of the responses it received. However, conservative reviewers were more likely to couch their objections to *TT*’s political commentary in terms of how it affected the ‘art’ of the novel, rather than to directly debate political positions. The *Sydney Morning Herald* review referred to by Barnard defended the possibility that the book “bogs down in the turgidity of political theorising” or that “quotations out of context may make propaganda” by stressing *TT*’s universality and realism.<sup>27</sup> Thus, it was implied that *TT* managed to overcome the handicap of its political commentary because of its literary qualities.

Similarly the conservative, nationalistic *Bulletin* published two reviews that indirectly criticised the politics of *TT* but overtly focussed on the book’s portrayals of Sydney, and on its value as a work of art. Somewhat ironically, *Bulletin* reviewers agreed with the Communist assessment that the characters in *TT* did not accurately represent their real-life counterparts. ‘Symbolic Fallacy’, a 1954 review in the *Bulletin*, considered that *TT* was flawed, because in naming Harry Munster as the Common Man, the book suggested incorrectly that the Munster family was representative of the Australian working class.<sup>28</sup> However, unlike Miles and Devanny, this reviewer also criticised the novel’s attempt to represent typical predicaments, feeling that the unique details of the Munster family had been effaced to make a political point. Both of the early *Bulletin* reviews, which were published in 1947 and 1954, argued that “sociology” damaged artistic expression. In casting Harry Munster as a type rather than as an individual, it was argued, *TT*

---

<sup>26</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 21 September 1947, Eleanor Dark’s papers, NLA MSS 4998.

<sup>27</sup> Shaun O’ Leary, ‘Fall Of The City Of Sydney’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 September, 1947: 13.

<sup>28</sup> J.C.H., ‘Symbolic Fallacy’, *Bulletin*, 16 June 1954: 2.

was a “propaganda novel” rather than creative literature.<sup>29</sup> The 1947 reviewer felt that characterisation in the novel suffered because of theorising:

*Tomorrow and Tomorrow* is one of those books, increasingly common in Australian writing, which seem to be made by Leftist writers for an audience of Leftist writers . . . the production of them is undoubtedly fostered by the entirely erroneous theory that a novel, as a first essential, must be a sociological textbook: whereas, of course, the first essential of a work of art is that it should be a work of art.

A work of art, the reviewer implied, needed characterisation and an interesting story “and in both these respects *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* is weak.”<sup>30</sup> Thus, from both ends of the political spectrum, critics of *TT* tackled the issue of the place of politics in literature: for the communists, a novel that did not accurately represent the party and the working class was poor in literary terms, while most conservative reviewers felt that political issues should be secondary to “art”, which should transcend politics. A further factor in this debate was the question of genre, as many reviewers expressed the opinion that “sociology” did not belong in a literary work. As John Docker has noted, in the 1940s, the literary journal *Southerly* criticised other journals — particularly *Meanjin* — for their non-literary perspectives and for a “certain philosophical-psychological comment” which “borders on sociology”. Literature, it was felt, should occupy a distinct and separate sphere from other discourses and debates.<sup>31</sup>

Colin Roderick, who reviewed *TT* for *Southerly* in 1948, did not directly object to the presence of politics or sociology within the book, but found the speculative aspect unrealistic. Like several reviewers of the period he questioned the portrayal of the fall of Sydney and of capitalism, feeling that: “The whole phantasmagoria of

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Unknown author, ‘Fish and Chips’, *Bulletin*, 15 October, 1947: 2.

<sup>31</sup> John Docker, *Australian Cultural Elites: Intellectual Traditions in Sydney and Melbourne*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1974: 121.

the destruction of Sydney is unreal, crazy, impossible."<sup>32</sup> He found that *TT* lacked internal consistency: as a Henry Lawson scholar he focussed on the fact that Knarf quoted from Lawson even though it is implied in *TT* that all laws and books from the twentieth century have been forgotten.<sup>33</sup> Rather than viewing the novel as speculative or allegorical, he regarded the situations described in *TT* as implausible, and thus flawed. Similarly, P.H. Partridge expressed the view that "the collapse of capitalism, if it occurs at all, could not be quite so simple as all that,"<sup>34</sup> and John Miller wrote that "*Tomorrow and Tomorrow . . .* is a hard book to write about because one is never quite sure whether the authors expect their anticipation of social and political events to be regarded as accurate prognostication or not."<sup>35</sup> For Miller— as for Partridge and Roderick— the issue of whether *TT* could be considered to be prophetic was connected to the credibility of its historical depictions. Miller contended that the "false impressions begin to appear in the author's treatment of the immediate prewar period and their picture of Australia during the war" and that this falsity extended into the picture of the future.<sup>36</sup> As noted in the previous section of this chapter, these reviewers tended to compare the descriptions in *TT* to their own perceptions of historical and social realities, and to judge the book accordingly. Unlike later reviewers, they had an abiding interest in whether *TT* had accurately expressed the politics and mood of Australia at war, probably because this was a time and a place that all of the readers had directly experienced. It was also common for 1940s and '50s reviews to regard *TT* as a work of prophecy or 'prognostication'— and usually a bad one. As will be further discussed, this approach influenced the novel's publication as well as its reception.

---

<sup>32</sup> Colin Roderick, 'This Battered Caravanserai', *Southerly* 9.4, 1948: 223.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> P.H. Partridge, 'The Shape of Things to Come', *Meanjin* 6.4. Summer, 1947: 251. Partridge's very critical review of the novel is published alongside Davison's sympathetic one.

<sup>35</sup> John Donald Bruce Miller, 'A Footnote on Tomorrow', *Meanjin* 7.2, 1948: 125.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

Edgar Harris, the publishers' representative at Georgian House, saw the question of whether Barnard Eldershaw had "indulged" in accurate speculation as crucial, as he felt that the "life" of the book would be damaged if its predictions were proved to be inaccurate.<sup>37</sup>

Another striking aspect of reviews of *TT* in this period is the number that focus on the race of the twenty-fourth inhabitants. Roderick for instance wrote that "It may be that our civilization will fall before the race-migration of an Oriental people, superior in intellect and social organisation to ourselves, which God forbid."<sup>38</sup> A *Bulletin* reviewer wrote that in the futuristic section of the novel "the Australians have been replaced by a vaguely oriental race" and Gilbert Mant noted that *TT* described how "A strange Japanese plague begins to sweep the earth", despite the fact that *TT* describes the plague as originating in China (p.368 *TT*).<sup>39</sup> Given the recent end of World War Two, it is perhaps not surprising that 1940s reviewers should assume that the invaders of Australia in *TT* were Japanese. However, the instances in the text referring to this possibility are few. As discussed in Chapter One, there are only fleeting references to Northern-influenced architecture and to men living on the coast with "orient in their faces" (p.8). In the 1983 edition of the novel it is specified that the right-wing coalition that lands on the Australian coastline at the end of World War Two is comprised of British, American and Japanese forces (p.371), but in the 1947 edition we are simply told that "A strong mixed force of "International Police" was landed at Broken Bay" (p.377).

---

<sup>37</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944, Marjorie Barnard's papers (hereafter "Barnard's papers"), ML MSS 451/5.

<sup>38</sup> Colin Roderick: 223.

<sup>39</sup> Gilbert Mant, 'What Shall Tomorrow Be?', *The Australasian Book News and Literary Journal* 2.5, November, 1947: 227. Gilbert Mant was the Chief Censor of South Australia in 1944, when *TT* was censored. While no connection has been established between this position and Mant's obvious interest in the book, his review does provide another example of the common overlap between censor and literary critic, as discussed here in Chapter Five.

Conceivably then, for reviewers who still had the events of Pearl Harbour and the fall of Singapore fresh in their minds, the lack of specification in the Georgian House edition encouraged assumptions. However, the emphasis that these reviewers gave to the race of the invaders, despite the lack of this emphasis in *TT* itself, demonstrates the extent to which pre-existing expectations influenced readings of the novel.

A scepticism about the futuristic element of the book coincided with a favouring of the "present day story." A majority of reviews in the '40s and '50s concentrated on the aspects of the novel concerning Harry Munster and other characters living in twentieth-century Sydney, expressing the belief that the diverse structure of the novel diverted attention away from the strength of the domestic themes. The writer of 'Symbolic Fallacy', while disliking the twentieth-century narrative, does not mention the futuristic section of the novel at all except to briefly quote Knarf. Other reviewers expressed personal admiration for the technical skill demonstrated in the novel, but anticipated that the general reader would feel differently. Gilbert Mant wrote for instance that "the ordinary novel-reader, absorbed in the progress of the human characters of Knarf's novel, will be irritated by the discursive [sic] intrusions of the subsidiary story."<sup>40</sup> Another common view was that the vision of the future was "shadowy" or "two-dimensional", in comparison with the vivid descriptions of the twentieth century. In 'Facets of Freedom', for instance, the writer contended that "the people to whom we are introduced in this period are, as might be expected, shadowy, and used as pegs for hanging up ideas."<sup>41</sup> These views contrasted with later reviews that foregrounded the science fiction aspects of *TT*. However, as discussed further in Chapter Three, Edgar Harris at Georgian House was also of the opinion that the narrative depicting the twentieth-century was the

<sup>40</sup> Gilbert Mant: 228.

<sup>41</sup> H.J.H. 'Facets of Freedom', *Australian Observer*, 18 October, 1947: 208.

most important and best executed section of the novel. It would seem then that he accurately read the tastes of many Australian critics of the 1940s and '50s who confirmed their preference for narratives of social realism, at least in the case of *TT*.

This preference was not without exceptions. Frank Dalby Davison's 1947 review devoted space to describing the activities in the Tenth Commune, and compared Ren's revolutionary activities to a comparable contemporary situation:

It is almost as if a recent and intelligent recruit to the Eureka Youth League were to give cordial expression to his enthusiasms at a cocktail party attended by directors of heavy industry, newspaper proprietors, 'Liberal' party bigwigs, company promoters, and a few bishops.<sup>42</sup>

In making this comparison, Davison responded to *TT* as science fiction: that is, he viewed the events in Knarf's world as an analogy of events in his own, making his familiar world seem strange. To use the words of Suvin, a science fiction narrative actualises "a different — though historical and not transcendental — world corresponding to different human relationships and cultural mores."<sup>43</sup> Davison acknowledged that the inhabitants of the society set four hundred years from now in *TT* "see us and our times as remotely as we see Tudor England — or the Tang Dynasty."<sup>44</sup> With this acknowledgment, he gained distance from the then almost contemporary society described in the novel, reading these sections quite differently from those who critiqued *TT* in terms of how accurately it described this particular period of history.

---

<sup>42</sup> Frank Dalby Davison, 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow', *Meanjin* 6.1, Summer 1947: 250.

<sup>43</sup> Darko Suvin, *Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction*, London: Macmillan, 1988: 37.

<sup>44</sup> Frank Dalby Davison: 249.

Davison did have more familiarity with *TT* and with its authors than most other reviewers. He had known both Barnard and Eldershaw for many years through the Fellowship of Australian Writers, the editing of *Writers In Defence of Freedom*, and political activities such as the Popular Front Against Fascism and the Civil Rights Defence League.<sup>45</sup> It is also probable that Davison was Barnard's lover until 1942, after which he remarried and moved to Melbourne.<sup>46</sup> Davison had indicated to Nettie Palmer that he had difficulty with the novel when he had read it in manuscript: "I didn't feel emotionally involved in the story, not to any extent, but then the book is not directed at the emotions." Like other reviewers, he also felt that the scenes describing the burning of Sydney strained credibility:

They make it a wholly symbolical [sic] and sacrificial bonfire, and yet have a Communist in charge of the destruction. I think if the Commos were in charge the symbolism would have to be made a subjective aspect of a planned scorched earth policy.<sup>47</sup>

These points are not directly criticised in Davison's review, and thus it is worth speculating that there were factors that influenced his positive and somewhat anomalous reception of the novel. However, there were other reviewers in the 1940s with less intimate associations who also praised the scope of *TT* and analysed the connections between the different time periods in the novel. Ian Mair noted the continuum between the themes in *TT*'s twentieth-century narrative and its twenty-fourth, commenting that: "All would go to show that "Liberty" will always recede: 400 years hence, Barnard Eldershaw think, mankind will be maintaining a

---

<sup>45</sup> See Drusilla Modjeska, *Exiles At Home: Australian Women Writers 1925-1945*, [1981], Second Edition, North Ryde: Collins Angus & Robertson, 1991: 210; Carole Ferrier, *Jean Devanny*: 158-9;236; Stuart McIntyre, *The Reds: The Communist Party of Australia From Origins to Illegality*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1998: 404.

<sup>46</sup> This supposition is based on two letters from Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny. See Chapter Four, p.173.

<sup>47</sup> Frank Dalby Davison to Nettie Palmer. 3 January 1946. Palmer papers 1174/1/6886-7009. Folder 88.



repressive ruling class."<sup>48</sup> W.G. Sullivan included an analysis of the novel within a larger study of humanism in literature. He or she considered that the way in which *TT*'s scope broke with novelistic conventions was a strength, and compared the book to Russian "epics" such as those by Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy.<sup>49</sup> Those who praised the range and diversity of the novel commonly compared it to Russian works, but no reviewer compared it to any other work of Australian literature. Many claimed, as O'Leary did, that "Although "Tomorrow and Tomorrow" is a new novel by two Australians, it is not an Australian novel."<sup>50</sup> The implication was that the largeness of *TT*'s scope exceeded the more specific boundaries of other Australian novels, even though the novel was set in Australia and dealt with Australian history and culture. Few if any saw the novel in nationalistic terms; as discussed, most felt that the book did not accurately reflect "ordinary Australia". John Miller noted for instance that "we have to imagine Australians, not as we know them today, but as tried beyond any measure of which we have knowledge."<sup>51</sup> Ian Mair related the book to Tolstoy but also to "Romain Rolland, Dos Passos or Upton Sinclair"<sup>52</sup> and Aileen Palmer also saw similarities with Russian novels:

In its breadth and intensity, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* . . . can rather be likened to some vast Russian novel than to most of contemporary writing . . . a certain similarity in theme with some of Dostoyevsky's novels is inevitably suggested. Dostoyevsky took us into an overcharged, explosive world where individuals were driven to violent acts to end an intolerable situation; he also told us that retribution (physical or moral) must overtake the individual who committed these violent acts; but, wherever he wanted to lead us in the end, it was the arguments of Rasholnikov or Ivan Karamazov with which they justified their actions, and the latent vitality in the tremendous, tortured world in which they lived, rather than the later punishment and remorse of these people, that made the sharpest impact on

---

<sup>48</sup> Ian Mair, 'MBE's *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*', *Fellowship*, April 1948: page number unknown.

<sup>49</sup> W.G. Sullivan, 'Humanism — and Some Recent Australian Writing', *Melbourne University Magazine*, 1948: 37.

<sup>50</sup> Shaun O'Leary: 13.

<sup>51</sup> John Donald Bruce Miller: 126.

<sup>52</sup> Ian Mair: page number unknown.

our minds. The impact and argument of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* can be described in something [of] the same terms.<sup>53</sup>

Palmer's unpublished review is one of only two reviews written in the 1940s that mentions the censorship of *TT*. While in 1947 it was no longer illegal to refer to the censorship of printed material,<sup>54</sup> the only published review to make reference to *TT*'s censoring was W.G. Sullivan's 'Humanism — and Some Recent Australian Writing'. Sullivan acknowledged that the book had been patched together post-censorship and that this had damaged the development of the novel's climax.<sup>55</sup> This suggests that he/she had some personal knowledge of the circumstances; someone coming to the book without background knowledge could not have been aware of the extensive re-writing of this section of the novel. Perhaps then, Sullivan was also aware of Harris's criticism of the "prophetic" elements of the book and intended the words below as a response:

Those who criticise *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* . . . as a work of socially realistic political prophecy are inevitably misled: for who would set out to predict the exact nature of human relations as they may be four hundred years from now?<sup>56</sup>

Sullivan added that art should not be viewed as reproduction, but as "an illusory image that will sharpen man's awareness of the world he lives in"<sup>57</sup>, thus rebutting critics who disliked *TT* because of its inaccuracies or its speculations. The review resembles later critical pieces on *TT* that argued that it could be recast as a commentary on a wide range of issues and themes.

---

<sup>53</sup> Aileen Palmer, unpublished review of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, Barnard's papers, ML MSS 2809.

<sup>54</sup> For instance, Brian Penton's *Censored!*, an account of the suppression of Australian newspapers in April 1944, appeared in 1947.

<sup>55</sup> W.G. Sullivan: 38.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

Broadly speaking, Australian reviewers of the 1940s and '50s who expressed sympathy with *TT*'s themes tended to be aligned with the "interpretive community" or intellectual camp that Patrick Buckridge has defined as "liberal." While this is a rough and inexhaustive distinction, it has the advantage of clarifying particular positions in Australia in the 1940s to '60s regarding artistic value, political imperatives, modernism and realism. Buckridge identifies this group as including individuals such as Vance and Nettie Palmer, Frank Dalby Davison, Clem Christesen, Arthur Phillips and Patrick White. Marjorie Barnard and Flora Eldershaw would also be most closely aligned with this liberal tradition: as discussed, the fact that some of the most positive early reviews of *TT* came from personal friends of the writers is probably significant. Those within the liberal tradition were a heterogeneous group who were unified by a regard for the importance of "preserving, developing and promoting 'Australian literature' almost as an end in itself."<sup>58</sup> The group also embraced the idea of "a creative merging of writers and critics", employing a critical practice that tended to be appreciative and loyal to the national literary interest rather than to any absolute literary standard.<sup>59</sup> While early reviewers did not draw attention to *TT*'s treatment of nationhood, those who wrote sympathetically usually stressed the importance of the book, despite its flaws. Davison for instance acknowledges his difficulty with the argument that "man's behaviour is more important than his social organisation" but still asserts that *TT* is "probably of enduring value."<sup>60</sup> Nettie Palmer similarly insists on the book's significance:

if the fires and outbreaks of violence that marked the end of Sydney are hard to believe in, they do not affect the power of the book or the high importance

---

<sup>58</sup> Patrick Buckridge: 191.

<sup>59</sup> Patrick Buckridge: 194.

<sup>60</sup> Frank Dalby Davison: 250.

of its theme. *To-morrow and To-morrow* is written with great sincerity and is full of stimulating ideas.<sup>61</sup>

Those who emphasised the enduring value and significance of *TT* tended to feel that this ultimately overrode other political and artistic objections to the novel, a tendency which could be seen as indicative of the liberal tradition as a whole. The journal *Meanjin*, a dominant voice within this tradition, frequently emphasised the political and social responsibilities of the intellectual and artist, while stressing the priority that a creative artist must give to 'his' art. It was not that politics was unimportant; rather, it was seen as crucial to foster a creative 'voice' "to which the nation might be expected to listen."<sup>62</sup> Cultivating art was therefore a political act in itself. A book such as *TT* was thus more likely to be endorsed by liberal intellectuals, not because it expressed approved ideological positions, but because it was seen as canvassing important ideas and keeping political debates alive. As Mair puts it:

The book rejects every current political line. In times of crisis, wholesale renunciation is often a means of showing the white flag. Barnard Eldershaw can have had no such intention. Every sort of capitalist and socialist will charge it with subversive aim, mystification, political illiteracy. But the authors chiefly set out to add to Australian literature a novel with something of the bold range of the Tolstoys . . . In the critic's sense as well as in the publisher's sense, the resulting book may seem a monster, "ingens, informis". But it is still a redoubtable giant.<sup>63</sup>

Despite the fact that modernist techniques attracted criticism from some in the liberal group, particularly from within *Meanjin*, many were receptive to the literary experimentation in *TT*. As discussed, those with conservative affiliations were concerned about *TT*'s break with novelistic conventions and its inclusion of

---

<sup>61</sup> Nettie Palmer, Council of Adult Education, Discussion Group Book Notes, 1952, Palmer Papers, NLA MS 1174/25/86.

<sup>62</sup> Patrick Buckridge: 192.

<sup>63</sup> Ian Mair, page number unknown.

“sociology”, while those aligned with the Communist Party disliked its lack of “realism”, in the Marxist sense of an awareness of history, class consciousness and revolution. However, reviews from Sullivan, Davison and Aileen and Nettie Palmer praised the fine writing, the innovation and the interlacing of different narratives in *TT*. Nonetheless, these reviews still favoured a coherent and close reading of the novel that offered specific commentary on current social and political concerns. As following sections will explore, the 1970s saw transitions in literary, critical and reading practices which significantly affected the republication of *Tomorrow* and its reception. Increasingly, *Tomorrow* was seen as a fragmented and fluid text which was open to a diverse range of interpretations and appropriations.

## Three: 'The Wreckage of Established Institutions'

*"I am a scientist, a lover of exact truth, he is a man of imagination who would cut the thongs of life and bring in chaos again . . . Knarf is a poet, his son is an agitator. So it is that the helpless blind roots work upon the solid foundations."*

*Tomorrow: 374*

From the late 1950s to 1980, *Tomorrow* received little public attention. The main critical treatment came from bibliographers and literary historians, who were interested in placing the novel in relation to particular genres and historical periods. H.M. Green devoted several pages to *Tomorrow* in his *A History of Australian Literature*. He compared it to Eleanor Dark's historical novels, and noted that Barnard Eldershaw had treated their present historically. Like many earlier reviewers, Green focussed on the section of the book dealing with the Depression and its immediate aftermath, finding that "the people of Knarf's world, even Knarf himself, are not much more than abstract figures in a fantastic film."<sup>1</sup> Frederick Macartney and Edmund Miller concurred with this assessment in their 1956 bibliography, writing that "the picture of the future is necessarily somewhat shadowy as compared with the familiar phases of present-day life portrayed in the book."<sup>2</sup>

It was not until 1982, just before the republication of the novel, that the futuristic aspects of *Tomorrow* were foregrounded, and the book was labelled 'science fiction'. This first occurred when Van Ikin included the first eight pages in his anthology, *Australian Science Fiction*. Ikin noted that there are "two separate glimpses of Australia's future" in the novel, a distinction which had not been previously made. In concentrating on some of the conventions of science fiction, like the portrayals of innovations in technology and lifestyle, he attended to other previously neglected aspects of the novel, particularly the significance of the "votometer" on the Tenth Commune.<sup>3</sup> He also observed that the reprinted excerpt of the novel "presents

---

<sup>1</sup> H.M. Green, *A History of Australian Literature, Volume II 1923-1950*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1961: 1100-1104.

<sup>2</sup> Frederick Thomas Bennett Macartney, Edmund Morris Miller, *Australian Literature: A Bibliography to 1930, Extended to 1950, Revised Edition*, Ed. F.T. Macartney, Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1956: 163.

<sup>3</sup> Van Ikin, ed, and intro., *Australian Science Fiction*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1982: xxviii-xxx.

Australian sf's first sensitive and sympathetic account of the Aboriginal way of life".<sup>4</sup> Such observations helped to recontextualise the novel within the spectrum of theoretical topics which became prominent in the 1970s and 80s, notably postcolonial and utopian theory. Since this time, *Tomorrow* has been identified as being part of the science fiction and the utopian literary genre in several works, most recently the Melbourne University Press *Encyclopaedia of Australian Science Fiction and Fantasy*.<sup>5</sup> Despite being categorised in this manner, however, there are few comprehensive studies of *Tomorrow* as a utopian or science fiction text. Two exceptions to this are David Carter's and Nan Alinski's work, which will be looked at later in this section.

The most significant response to *Tomorrow* prior to its republishing was a commissioned essay by Robert Burns for *Meanjin* in 1970.<sup>6</sup> Marjorie Barnard's piece, 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written', accompanied it and crucially influenced the way in which the book's censoring and its authorship were later regarded.<sup>7</sup> Details about the publishing of these articles are given here because they expose the political and literary circumstances surrounding Clem Christesen's attempts to publicise the book. Clem Christesen supported *Tomorrow* and campaigned for its republication for over twenty years. He was responsible for reprinting a section of 'Aubade' in *Australian Heritage* in 1949<sup>8</sup> and revived interest in the novel in 1970 through the two articles that he organised for *Meanjin*. In the intervening years he corresponded extensively with Barnard about the book, sometimes asking for her response as the author of *Tomorrow*. On 21 May

<sup>4</sup> Van Ikin: 146.

<sup>5</sup> Graham Stone, Sean McMullen, *The MUP Encyclopaedia of Australian Science Fiction and Fantasy*, Ed. Paul Collins, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1998: 61.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Burns, 'Flux and Fixity: M. Barnard Eldershaw's 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow'', *Meanjin*, 3, 1970.

<sup>7</sup> See Chapter Four, p.166.

<sup>8</sup> See 'An Ancient Continent' (from *Aubade*), *Australian Heritage*, Ed. Clem Christesen, Melbourne: Longmans, Green, 1949: 211-226.



1958 for instance, while compiling an editorial which was to include discussion about the threat of the hydrogen bomb, he wrote:

Could you help in any way — by supplying me with material which could be incorporated in the editorial? A paragraph here and there, pointers, relevant extracts from other writers, anything of that kind? How about introducing comment on Tomorrow and Tomorrow . . .? The novel keeps recurring to me . . . But only of course if you have the time, or your imagination catches fire! That is what this society so badly needs - a leap of the imagination, a visionary drive.<sup>9</sup>

Much has now been written about the personality of Christesen and how he influenced the complex character and outlook of the journal that he edited.<sup>10</sup>

Buckridge, as discussed, regarded *Meanjin* as representative of the Australian liberal intellectual camp; John Docker defined the journal as “an interaction between a liberal-humanist social optimism, and concepts of art, culture, and society derived from European post-Romantic thought.”<sup>11</sup> Both Docker and Buckridge emphasised the beliefs frequently expressed in *Meanjin* concerning the social function of art and its importance in society. *Meanjin* was decried by some in its early years for being radically political — albeit nationalist — and it was continually criticised for its intermittent dependence on the Commonwealth Literary Fund, suspected by some of being controlled by communists.<sup>12</sup> However, by the late '60s, the journal was seen as conservative by newer poets, in part through the mere fact of its endurance, but also because of Christesen's contradictory stance on experimental poetry and prose. He declared himself a supporter of experimental writing, but at times counteracted this with a demand

---

<sup>9</sup> Clem Christesen to Marjorie Barnard, 21 May 1958, *Meanjin* Archives, Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne (hereafter *Meanjin* Archives).

<sup>10</sup> See for instance Judith Armstrong, *The Christesen Romance*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1981; Lynne Strahan, *Just City and the Mirrors: Meanjin Quarterly and the Intellectual Front 1940-1965*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1984.

<sup>11</sup> John Docker, *Australian Cultural Elites: Intellectual traditions in Sydney and Melbourne*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1974: 85.

<sup>12</sup> See Lynne Strahan, 'Short Steps and Public Opinion', *Just City and the Mirrors*: 116-152.

that it be of an undefined 'quality' or 'enduring value'. In a letter to poet Kris Hemensley in 1970 he wrote:

As for a battered old bugger like me who's been trying to produce a literary magazine for just on thirty years, I'm now lumped with the Establishment drongos by the wall-eyed younger blokes . . . But I've always sought, and been receptive to, experiment, new formulations, innovations, in whatever art form . . . All I insist on is *quality*— in verse, fiction, criticism or whatever; the best available at any given time.<sup>13</sup>

Christesen's abiding interest in and support of *Tomorrow* was unusual in the late '60s, but it is likely that Christesen's own philosophies found an echo in the preoccupations of *Tomorrow*, in particular the questions about the nature of Australian identity and nationhood; how to achieve individual freedoms without violence; the value of art and the possibility of utopia. Like Christesen, *Tomorrow* expressed left-wing sympathies without espousing a Marxian dialectic and portrayed Knarf as searching for "patterns" to make meaning out of the rubble of twentieth-century history. Christesen had always been interested in creating patterns out of chaos and wrote in one of his books of poetry: "The rebel who creates/ A grand design/ In place of moral disorder/ Is an artist. The rebel against chaos/is an artist."<sup>14</sup> This small verse summarised Christesen's beliefs well. Christesen wanted to be a revolutionary, but his values frequently moved him to search for wholeness, and for structures that would bring order and truth to his life and to his art.

Christesen's letters in the *Meanjin* Archives convey the impression that his decision to commission the 1970 piece was initially motivated by sympathy for

---

<sup>13</sup> Clem Christesen to Kris Hemensley, 23 April 1970, reprinted in *The Temperament of Generations: Fifty Years of Writing in Meanjin*, eds. Jenny Lee, Philip Mead, Gerald Murnane, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1990: 204.

<sup>14</sup> Clem Christesen, 'The Redeemers', *The Hand of Memory*, Sydney, 1970: 184. Quoted in Lynne Strahan: 38.

Barnard, although he had always thought that the book was important. He wrote to the historian Robert Burns several times, telling him that he was seeking “someone to assess the writings of Flora Eldershaw and Marjorie Barnard, perhaps giving particular attention to the socio-political-philosophical content of *To-morrow and To-morrow...*”.<sup>15</sup> This query in itself revealed something of Christesen’s interpretation of the novel and his agenda for the paper for *Meanjin*. He had long seen *Tomorrow* as the exposition of a world in political crisis and his letters to Barnard indicate that he often recalled the novel when feeling pessimistic about the times in which he lived, and the political events of the day: “as we both know (particularly the author of Tomorrow and Tomorrow) a profound crisis has overtaken the arts in our epoch.”<sup>16</sup>

Following Christesen’s letter to Barnard informing her that a piece on *Tomorrow* was to be commissioned, Barnard wrote to Christesen that she had had dinner with Burns and his wife, in order to discuss *Tomorrow*. She thought it had gone well. She added that she had just finished writing another novel, ‘The Gulf Stream’. “Heaven knows when it will see the light of print”, she added. “No violence and only normal sex. It is a minor novel. When *T.T.T.* fell flat on its face I realised that I was not a major novelist and am really happier with a smaller pattern.”<sup>17</sup>

Christesen replied that he “for one had never forgotten *Tomorrow and Tomorrow...*” and that many parts of the novel were still fresh in his mind. He asked Barnard if she had ever thought of a new edition “to include the parts that were cut by the censor? It was an extraordinary work and it only ‘fell flat on its face’ because it was hacked about, and published at a difficult time.”<sup>18</sup> It is likely that Christesen approached Melbourne University Press about the book himself; in an interview in

<sup>15</sup> Clem Christesen to Robert Burns, 1 May 1969, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>16</sup> Clem Christesen to Marjorie Barnard, 21 June 1973, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>17</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 10 August 1969, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>18</sup> Clem Christesen to Marjorie Barnard, 14 August 1969, *Meanjin* Archives.

October 1999 he stated that he thought that he had,<sup>19</sup> but MUP now have no records of this. He also offered Barnard the opportunity to write a piece to accompany Burns' article: "an account of how you and Flora came to write *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*." Barnard accepted, and the result was 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came to Be Written', the piece which for the first time discussed the censorship of *Tomorrow* and denied that Eldershaw had made a substantial contribution. As Chapter Four explores in detail, these revelations became common knowledge, and many later critics and readers regarded *Tomorrow* as Barnard's work alone, even though it is unlikely that this was the case. Barnard's account of the censoring also contained inaccuracies. A letter to Barnard from Christesen records that after the publication of this article, Brian Harris from Georgian House had telephoned the *Meanjin* office "to say that [Barnard's] account of the publication of Tomorrow and Tomorrow was 'all wrong'."<sup>20</sup> No elaboration survives; in 1999 Brian Harris could no longer remember making the call.<sup>21</sup> Perhaps he objected to Barnard's claim that "I knew nothing of the censoring until the eve of publication"<sup>22</sup> when the book was in fact censored in 1944, revised over the next two years, and then finally published in 1947.

Burns's and Barnard's essays were both controversial even before they got into print. Burns took issue with the last paragraph of Barnard's piece, in which she discusses her regret at being labelled an 'intellectual'. Burns felt that this paragraph amounted to

---

<sup>19</sup> Clem Christesen to Rachel Cunneen, 7 October 1999.

<sup>20</sup> Clem Christesen to Marjorie Barnard, 1 December 1970, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>21</sup> Personal communication, August 1999.

<sup>22</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came to be Written', *Meanjin*, 3, 1970: 330.

a head on disagreement with the latter part of my article in which I write of M.Barnard Eldershaw as belonging intrinsically to the age of the intellectual. I think it is wrong anyway — Marjorie patently is an intellectual.<sup>23</sup>

The published version of Burns's article did not include reference to M. Barnard Eldershaw belonging to "the age of the intellectual." Instead, it states that in 1947 "a tidy and optimistic future held force among politically concerned people" and that *Tomorrow* "proposed a view antithetical to this climate of reasonable expectation."<sup>24</sup> The implication then is that *Tomorrow* and its authors were working against the current of the times — and against the way that other informed people were thinking. Rather than offering a conclusion to World War Two, Burns wrote, *Tomorrow* demonstrated that "comfort is not to be found in mere social arrangements."<sup>25</sup> Barnard's own comments showed similarities with this viewpoint:

I was not a Communist or a Trotskyist or a fellow traveller or a reactionary or an intellectual or a prophet . . . I had no intention of peddling panaceas, nor had I any faith, secret or overt in any of them.<sup>26</sup>

In making such a statement, Barnard made it clear that she wished to avoid labels, and that like Burns she did not view *Tomorrow* as expressing a coherent and singular ideological statement. She also stated that as a writer she wished to avoid the label of "intellectual" because the term suggested a person who was detached from an emotional and creative outlook. While Burns and Barnard appear to have held congruent opinions on the need to resist ideological labels and typecasting, it is possible that Burns, in calling Barnard an intellectual, still wished in some sense to declare the book 'great' or a masterpiece. A number of later readers and editors, in

---

<sup>23</sup> Robert Burns to Clem Christesen, 4 March 1970, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>24</sup> Robert Burns: 326.

<sup>25</sup> Robert Burns: 327.

<sup>26</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came to be Written': 330.

their desire to reinstate *Tomorrow* into the Australian literary canon, stressed that the novel was under-recognised, and that it deserved to be seen as a great achievement, not just by the individual writers, but in the context of national literary history. Burns himself emphasised the largeness of the book: its “extraordinary scope”, “complete sort of exposure” and “extensive ground plan [that] . . . opens up quite an awesome range of possibilities.”<sup>27</sup> Certainly he wished to declare that the book was important and enduringly relevant. However, Barnard even objected to this aspect of his argument. In a later argument with Christesen she wrote to Arthur Phillips:

I have grown wary and not without reason. Clem has possibly forgotten the essay on To-morrow and To-morrow by Robert Burns which he published. Praise is dispensable [sic], understanding and attention are not and a book that could be obliterated as “quaint” is hardly worth considering in a literary quarterly. This is not an attack on Burns who may be an excellent critic of his contemporaries but was, I think, unleashed on something outside his field.<sup>28</sup>

It is difficult to ascertain what Barnard had found so unpalatable about Burns’ reading, or how she could interpret the tag of “quaint” as having “obliterated” her book. The context of Burns’ article makes it clear that he wants to argue that the book is far from irrelevant, as the paragraph in question reads:

Striking chords of sympathy and understanding today, Tomorrow and Tomorrow cannot be regarded as the product of a past epoch, for all its quaintness in matters of detail. It is one of those books which serve to remind us that we have been living in the one continuing era (of repose and resolution of human problems by totally violent methods), since the year 1914.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Robert Burns: 320; 321.

<sup>28</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Arthur Phillips, 16 June 1973, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>29</sup> Robert Burns: 321.

Correspondence between Burns and Christesen indicate that they also had very different ideas about the novel and about what sort of article would be appropriate. Both Christesen and Barnard expressed the opinion that the crux of the problem was “the Generation Gap”. Barnard wrote that: “he [Burns] has no idea what I was saying beneath the surface and I can’t understand what he says. It’s one of those things & no matter.”<sup>30</sup> Nonetheless, Christesen felt that it did matter. He wrote to both Burns and Barnard that the issue of freedom seemed to him to be central to the novel and that this was something that Burns had failed to pick up. Christesen advised Burns that:

You did not take note of the significance of the ‘vote’ on whether Knarf’s society wished to gain more Freedom. You’ll recall that the vote was lost because of majority indifference. That section has long remained in my memory, and seems important for today.<sup>31</sup>

After another letter from Christesen which further criticised his paper, Burns defended his writing by expressing a view shared by many previous reviewers of *Tomorrow*: that it was such a dense and diverse book that it was difficult to pin down precisely what it was ‘about’. “It is, of course a difficult book to lay out for readers who don’t know it and aren’t familiar with the sort of thing it attempts to do. To indicate its best qualities entails writing sharply, concisely, cutting a way into its tropical undergrowth.”<sup>32</sup> The difference of opinion between Burns, Christesen and Barnard extended well beyond what can be attributed to a “Generation Gap”. Broadly speaking, while Christesen saw the novel in political terms, Burns saw it schematically. Christesen had always found it to be a book about searching for meaning in apocalyptic times, while Burns was more interested in looking at what he called its “ground plan” as a basis for opening up a range of

---

<sup>30</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 12 September 1970, *Meanjin Archives*.

<sup>31</sup> Clem Christesen to Robert Burns, 15 January 1970, *Meanjin Archives*.

<sup>32</sup> Robert Burns to Clem Christesen, 6 June 1970, *Meanjin Archives*.

possibilities. The title of his paper, 'Flux and Fixity' referred to the human commonalities that he saw the authors searching for "in spite of the dislodging force of History." Burns suggested that perhaps, for individual intellectuals, a climate of flux might eventually be advantageous, a "sort of 'life searching' among the wreckage of established institutions (including the established form of the novel)."<sup>33</sup> With this conclusion, and in identifying some of the debates circulating in intellectual institutions as pertinent to the study of this particular text, Burns foreshadowed a more post-structuralist reading of the novel, although comparable readings did not appear until the early 1990s. These were conclusions that disappointed Christesen and Barnard, and Barnard found them alienating. Of an earlier version of the paper she wrote: "I read Robert Burns' article 'The Ascendancy of History' with great interest and complete detachment. It *is* detached. The dialectic does not touch my line of thought at any point, that is the thoughts I think I think."<sup>34</sup>

As the later *Meanjin* correspondence reproduced here demonstrates, Barnard was upset at the lack of understanding between herself and Burns over *Tomorrow*. The record of Barnard's feelings on this matter is valuable because it helps to catalogue the extent to which interpretations of *Tomorrow* moved away from what Barnard herself felt the novel was about. As will be seen, her differences with those interested in republishing her novel contributed to the ambivalence she felt towards the Virago edition. Later reception of the novel was characterised by an interest in issues extraneous to the text, such as its censorship, the life of Marjorie Barnard and the pertinence of the novel to contemporary concerns, like the nuclear arms race. However there was also a shift away from attempts to view the novel in terms of the authors' perspectives. Publishers and readers in the 1970s and '80s were

<sup>33</sup> Robert Burns: 327.

<sup>34</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 23 February 1970, *Meanjin Archives*.



less concerned about what Barnard and Eldershaw might have meant, and more concerned with reinterpreting *TT* and *TTT* so that it was relevant to current issues and intellectual preoccupations. To paraphrase Ord, a reader of the novel in this period might not have played Knarf's "game", but s/he was not adverse to finding plots of his or her own. The critical shift brought about by those interested in interpreting the text according to specific theoretical methodologies meant that many literary analysts and general readers in this latter period focussed more on the production of meaning rather than on authorial intention. In terms of the models for reading utopias proposed at the beginning of this chapter, some identified the novel as speculative and looked for what it illuminated about their own time. However, others continued to seek inspiring or utopian models of feminist and Marxist futures within the book and inevitably found that the narratives did not comply with their expectations.

Drusilla Modjeska's 1981 study of Australian women writers in the years between 1925 and 1945 included a significant section on *Tomorrow*. Like Burns she recast the novel in the light of current preoccupations, but her focus was on recovering the lives and work of forgotten women artists from this period of cultural history. Her readings thus offered both political and feminist perspectives on the novel. In retracing the careers of Barnard and Eldershaw, she noted the departure that *Tomorrow* represented both politically and in terms of the treatment of women's issues for the authors, especially for Barnard. Modjeska found the portrayal of women and women's situations in *Tomorrow* lacking, and noted:

Lin, for example, is still in exactly the same situation as women of the twentieth century, preoccupied by her changing relationship with her husband and her son . . . *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* . . . does not challenge in any way the patriarchal ideology underlying women's situation."<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Drusilla Modjeska, *Exiles At Home: Australian Women Writers 1925-1945*, [1981], Second Edition, North Ryde: CollinsAngus & Robertson, 1991: 242.

Modjeska concluded that the position and experience of women is simply not a focus in *Tomorrow*. In feminist terms the book disappointed because “while possible political solutions to the crisis in capitalism are explored, there is no suggestion of collective or political action by women against their oppression as women.”<sup>36</sup> As the following chapter explores, it is likely that Modjeska’s work on Australian women writers significantly influenced the eventual decision to republish *Tomorrow*, as it rekindled public and academic interest in the work of M. Barnard Eldershaw. Modjeska herself was integral to the Virago republishing of *Tomorrow*, corresponding with Barnard and arranging for copies of part of the Mitchell Library typescript to be sent to London. However the confusion for some critics — which was not necessarily shared by Modjeska — was that the publication of *Tomorrow* by a feminist press set up the expectation that *Tomorrow* should conform to specific feminist criteria. Jill Roe, for instance, wrote that “A measure of the distance between then and now is to be found in the seeming paradox of a novel by two women published by a feminist press which contains scarcely a whiff of feminism, and in fact upholds values abhorrent to many modern feminists.”<sup>37</sup> In a later paper on feminist publishing in Australia, Di Brown reiterated Modjeska’s criticisms of *Tomorrow*, but argued that the political content of the novel nonetheless spoke to feminists. Commerce, capitalism and even “advanced technocracy” worked against feminist practice much as it restricted human choice and creativity in *Tomorrow*.<sup>38</sup> However, Ian Saunders argued, in a study that foregrounded the issue of expectations of positive gender representations in

---

<sup>36</sup> Drusilla Modjeska: 243.

<sup>37</sup> Jill Roe, ‘The Historical Imagination and Its Enemies: M.Barnard Eldershaw’s *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, *Meanjin*, 43, 2, 1984: 247.

<sup>38</sup> Di Brown, ‘Feminist Publishing in Australia: Commercial and Cultural Practices’, *Overland* 153. Summer 1998: 8-13.

*Tomorrow* that the novel seemed “disturbingly blind to the fact that gender itself is a matter of politics.”<sup>39</sup>

The difficulty the text represents, then, is that given expectations it seems to behave rather poorly, at once patriarchal and misogynist. Fathers nurture, while mothers remain blind to the needs of their children; fathers offer a site of security, mothers a bitter resentment; fathers represent continuity, mothers the trivial demands of the present.<sup>40</sup>

Saunders' argument is centred on his claim that *Tomorrow* is of broader theoretical interest than might at first be apparent: he appropriates the text to explore “codes” of progression, repetition and gender identity. What is relevant here is that the demands that *Tomorrow* perform as a satisfactory feminist text appeared only from the 1980s onward, after the appearance of *Exiles At Home* and the republication of the book by Virago. Such expectations were not commented on in any earlier documentation of reception. Much of the attempt to reframe *Tomorrow* as a feminist novel can be explained by its publication by a feminist press, but it was also the result of the general resurgence of interest in feminist issues in academia, literature and the media. Some readers therefore approached *Tomorrow* anticipating that its narratives would be critical of patriarchy and would relate to the struggles of women to overcome oppression. As the following chapter notes, in later interviews Marjorie Barnard's own life was also sometimes presented from a comparable angle. Her difficulties as a woman author were highlighted, as was the refusal of her father to allow her to go to Oxford to continue her education.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Ian Saunders, ‘The Most Difficult Love’: Expectation and Gender in Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, *Constructing Gender: Feminism in Literary Studies*, Ed. Hilary Fraser and R.S. White, Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press, 1994: 200.

<sup>40</sup> Ian Saunders: 208.

<sup>41</sup> See for instance Sally McInerney, ‘Recognition For A Writer Who Wanted To Change Things Despite The Censor’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 November 1983: 43.

Modjeska was also the first critic of *Tomorrow* to mention the existence of the censored typescript at the Mitchell Library in Sydney, although Barnard had done so herself in 1970.<sup>42</sup> Modjeska noted that the manuscript was “severely cut”, and that “all speculation on international affairs, any comment on the conduct of soldiers, particularly in relation to civilians, and all mention of government use of propaganda and censorship were removed.”<sup>43</sup> As Chapter Five examines, this is overstating the case: the censor cut less than 200 lines of typescript, and the less specific details concerning international affairs and propaganda were left untouched. Modjeska does give the most comprehensive analysis to date of the material that was cut from the typescript and the difference that the censorship made to the narrative of *Tomorrow*. Every published treatment of *TT* and *TTT* following *Exiles At Home* has mentioned the fact that *Tomorrow* was censored. The notion of *Tomorrow* as an unjustly suppressed work that has since been retrieved and restored has thus been central to its reputation since 1981.

An opinion first expressed by Modjeska that was picked up by almost every subsequent reviewer was that “*Tomorrow and Tomorrow* is one of the most underrated novels of the period.”<sup>44</sup> Barbara Jefferis’s sentiments were typical of reviewers in the 1980s when she wrote:

It is deeply political, deeply humane, deeply provocative. It is, therefore, not surprising that the war-time censor was provoked . . . It is great. It has been neglected.<sup>45</sup>

Longer articles such as Jill Roe’s were equally restorative in intent, calling the Virago Modern Classics imprint a “significant cultural event” and applauding the

<sup>42</sup> See ‘How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came to be Written’: 329.

<sup>43</sup> Drusilla Modjeska: 245.

<sup>44</sup> Drusilla Modjeska: 244.

<sup>45</sup> Barbara Jefferis, ‘The Censorship of Yesterday Hid A Great Tomorrow’, *Weekend Australian*, 10-11 September 1983: 14.

renewed attention to Barnard Eldershaw's reputation. Roe suggested that the combination of social theory and fiction in *Tomorrow* had been responsible for its lukewarm reception in the 1940s, but asserted that this was "now a major point in its favour."<sup>46</sup> Like most 1980s reviewers, she insisted on the novel's pertinence for contemporary authors and compared the atmosphere in which it was written to the socially urgent issues of the present:

A novel pre-dating the nuclear age may even seem, in some respects, optimistic. To another anxious generation insecure in current alliances and hostile to the wilful destruction of the environment, the underlying message that the people are betrayed by resort to war has fresh urgency.<sup>47</sup>

Like Modjeska, Roe also looked at *Tomorrow* in terms of history and historiography. Her analysis included a comparison between Barnard Eldershaw's account of Sydney in the 1940s with other historical material, highlighting the difference between her reference point and that of earlier reviewers. She also examined the ways in which Sydney and its inhabitants had altered between the novel's first release and its republication. Roe saw Barnard Eldershaw as straddling left and right wing politics in *Tomorrow*, playing one ideology against another and dissecting "the most dynamic version, that is, Marxism". This, for Roe was a strength in *Tomorrow*; it took "historical experience seriously . . . illuminating phrasing of tensions in Australian cultural history."<sup>48</sup> Significantly, no review or article in this period negatively criticised the political content or slant of *Tomorrow*; most praised its pluralism as being part of a wide-reaching effort to find solutions to the turmoil of war. As Yvonne Rousseau put it:

In this world "out of control", fundamental questions about humanity's actual trajectory were clamoring [sic] for attention; and the impassioned

---

<sup>46</sup> Jill Roe: 244.

<sup>47</sup> Jill Roe: 251.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

expedients of martyrdom, revolution or logical argument were tested by radicals refusing to despair of change.<sup>49</sup>

It is noteworthy that most material published in this period expressed the view that *Tomorrow* was an overtly political book, despite Barnard's frequent protestations to the contrary. In part, this can be attributed to the way in which it was marketed as a politically provocative book that had been censored because of its radical content. Most reviewers, like Sally McInerney, felt that the book was "immersed in the philosophy of politics", whether or not it held a firm political stance:

*Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* is galvanised with a high charge of rational anger at the processes of capitalism and materialism: it is "patriotic" in that Australia is seen as the abused pawn of other nations.<sup>50</sup>

The perceived prophetic elements of *Tomorrow* were also universally praised. While in the 1940s *Tomorrow* was compared to H.G. Wells and Huxley, in the 1980s *Tomorrow* was seen to have similarities to Ursula Le Guin's work and Doris Lessing's *Canopus in Argos: Archives* series. Nan Albinski also included *Tomorrow* in her study of women's utopian fiction.<sup>51</sup> These comparisons were just as frequent as those relating the novel to other Australian works of the '40s; in contrast to earlier reviews, large Russian novels did not receive a mention. In these ways *Tomorrow* was situated and recontextualised within an alternative tradition: that of women's utopian writing, a genre which enjoyed recognition and a reflowering as part of the second-wave feminist movement in Britain, America and Australia. Beate Josephi reversed the assessment of many earlier critics when she wrote:

---

<sup>49</sup> Rousseau, Yvonne, 'Classical View of Wartime', *The Age Saturday Extra*, 27 August 1983: 10.

<sup>50</sup> Sally McInerney: 43.

<sup>51</sup> Nan Bowman Albinski, 'The Well-Ordered Paradise: Utopian Fiction By British, American and Australian Women,' Ph.D Thesis, Monash University, N.S.W. 1985. See also Nan Bowman Albinski, 'A Survey of Australian Utopian and Dystopian Fiction', *Australian Literary Studies* 13.1, May 1987: 15-28.

Parts of the novel which are set in the 24th century are beautifully written and are probably amongst Barnard Eldershaw's best writing . . . But moments of such serenity and lyricism are rare. Knarf, whose novel we hear throughout most of the book, unfortunately is not quite as good a novelist as his makers, Marjorie Barnard and Flora Eldershaw. Once he starts to read his novel we are plunged into the deep end of a socialist realist novel with all its inherent stereotyping. The jump is rather frightening and off-putting.<sup>52</sup>

Other articles that focussed on the futuristic elements of *Tomorrow* did so for specific purposes. David Carter's article, as discussed in Chapter One, examined the utopian elements in *Tomorrow* as part of an argument about the upholding of the centrality of the novel and novel writing in Australian fiction of the '30s and '40s. Carter related *Tomorrow* to a "specific 'ideology of the novel', a specific formation of literary intellectuals, and a discourse on culture."<sup>53</sup> In articles published in the late '80s, Humphrey McQueen also appropriated the novel for use in wider-ranging studies. He looked at *Tomorrow* in terms of "the role of literature in achieving social change" and argued that its emphasis on memory and imagination demonstrated possibilities for a different future.<sup>54</sup> Another article by McQueen was both more overtly political and broader in subject matter. In examining 'The Social Development of European Australia', McQueen appropriated *Tomorrow* as a "a peg on which to hang a discussion of ideas."<sup>55</sup> This discussion concerned "features of [post 1778] Australia's social development" and McQueen divided his broad topic into seven headings: Jubilees; Harder for Girls; Censorship; Violence; Canberra; Tertiary Education and Overseas Control. Some of these headings, such as 'Canberra' dealt only tangentially with the novel; McQueen was unapologetic about

---

<sup>52</sup> Beate Josephi, 'Utopia, Dystopia and Then Australia', *Centre for Research in the New Literatures in English Reviews Journal* 2, December, 1984: 61.

<sup>53</sup> David Carter, "'Current History Looks Apocalyptic": Barnard Eldershaw, Utopia and the Literary Intellectual, 1930s-1940s', *Australian Literary Studies*, 14. 2, 1989: 174.

<sup>54</sup> Humphrey McQueen, 'Memory and Imagination', *Social Alternatives* 8.3, 1989: 20-22.

<sup>55</sup> Humphrey McQueen, '*Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*', *Island Magazine* 32, Spring 1987: 3.

using the novel as a spring-board, and about drawing in other details about Barnard's life, to further his larger "proposals for reshaping Australia".<sup>56</sup> However, some of these comparisons are strained: for instance, McQueen erroneously states that Barnard was working in Canberra when she completed *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*.<sup>57</sup> As discussed in Chapter Four, like other reviews and criticism in this period, McQueen's work was characterised by its focus on Barnard, and on its acceptance that Barnard was the sole author of *Tomorrow*. It was not until Maryanne Dever published 'The Case for Flora Eldershaw' at the end of the decade that this view began to be seriously questioned.<sup>58</sup> Again, the marketing of the new edition contributed to the emphasis on Barnard's authorship. Unlike Eldershaw, she was available for interviews and initially there were no obvious reasons to question her account of the novel's creation. Undoubtedly, it was also easier to promote a single, live author than a collaboration that had expired nearly forty years earlier.

Ian Saunders was one of only two critics to publish material specifically on *Tomorrow* in the 1990s.<sup>59</sup> In both his papers, his objective was to use *Tomorrow* to illustrate current concerns in critical theory. 'The Texts of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*: Author, Agent, History' provided the first and only published partial comparison of the Mitchell Library manuscript and the Virago edition of the novel, and also asked questions pertinent to "the poststructuralist critique of the legislative role of the concept of author, the pragmatist critique of essentialism, the various unfoldings of the ethically 'natural'".<sup>60</sup> Comparably,

<sup>56</sup> Humphrey McQueen: 13.

<sup>57</sup> Humphrey McQueen: 9.

<sup>58</sup> Maryanne Dever, 'The Case for Flora Eldershaw', *Hecate* 15, No.2,1989: 38-48.

<sup>59</sup> Also see Rachel Cunneen, 'The Possibilities of Desire/Desiring The Possible', *Impossible Selves: Cultural Readings of Identity*, eds Jacqueline Lo et al., Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 1999: 104-113.

<sup>60</sup> Ian Saunders, 'The Texts of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*: Author, Agent, History', *Southern Review: Literary and Interdisciplinary Essays* 26.2. July 1993: 239.



Saunders' essay on expectation in *Tomorrow* focussed on essentialist and constructivist evasions in the "text" concerning love and gender. In both papers, Saunders concludes that *Tomorrow* and its histories point to "broken circuits": in questing for authority and an authentic text we find instead "the mobility and relativity of all texts and indeed the relativity of all signs",<sup>61</sup> while the promise of utopian gender equality remains empty.

The most recent substantial work on *Tomorrow* has suggested then, as Robert Burns did twenty years earlier, that the experience of reading *TT* and *TTT* offers little certainty or security. Rather, the diversity shown in later reviews reveals that interpretations altered almost completely according to corresponding changes and fluctuations in intellectual trends, publishing and literary markets. These reviews also demonstrate that reviewers and critics ceased to expect *Tomorrow* to be 'realistic' once many of the historical events described in the novel were long past. Instead, many of these reviews welcomed the speculative and 'prophetic' perspectives that *Tomorrow* offered. As time went by, the meanings intended by Marjorie Barnard were also seen as less significant. As Elizabeth Freund has proposed, in the context of reader-response studies, once a work is displaced from the central priority of the author, the autonomy of the work can be put into doubt "and in certain cases even cause the work to 'vanish' altogether."<sup>62</sup> In examining the reception of *Tomorrow* over a fifty year period, it is clear that while the work may not have 'vanished', finding a single, definitive interpretation is impossible.

---

<sup>61</sup> Ian Saunders, 'The Texts of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*': 252.

<sup>62</sup> Elizabeth Freund, *The Return of the Reader: Reader-Response Criticism*, New York: Methuen, 1987: 2.

## **Chapter Three: Publishing, Ideology and the Marketplace**

*“Authors write texts. They do not make books. Their work is edited, designed, laid out, illustrated, packaged, priced, formatted and advertised by others responsible for making commercial decisions and targeting specific sections of the reading public.”*

Martyn Lyons, ‘Introduction’, *A History of the Book in Australia 1891-1945: A National Culture in a Colonised Market*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2001: xv

# One: 'Are You Prepared To Risk Your Reputation?'

*"What we would like to ask you is this: Are you prepared to risk your reputation as front rank Australian creative writers for the sake of an ideology?"*

Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944, Marjorie Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/5.

The primary objective in the next two sections is to present the material that was recovered after the death of Vera Murdoch, when it emerged that Barnard and Murdoch's "coffin" held travel diaries, letters, photos and newspaper clippings, in addition to typescripts of *The Gulf Stream* and *Tomorrow*<sup>1</sup> Most of the surviving letters from this material are business related. As discussed in Chapter Four, it is likely that Barnard's remaining personal letters were burned after her death. However, the letters concerning Barnard's later attempts at republishing *Tomorrow* illuminate aspects of the novel's complicated history because they dramatise the many rejections it received, as well as the struggles by its supporters to have it recognised. Most importantly, the letters reinforce the existence of an intricate relationship between the readers of the text and the publishing of *Tomorrow*. As with the reviewers and critics discussed in the previous chapter, both the publishers who accepted *Tomorrow* and the publishers who rejected it read it in ways related to broader cultural expectations about the structure and subject matter of novels. Correspondence concerning the republishing of *Tomorrow* tells a story that traces the popularity of social realism; the emergence of Australian science fiction and the effect of Marxist, feminist and post-structuralist readings in Australian fiction.

The publishing history of *Tomorrow* also provides an exemplary instance of a point made by Jerome McGann: that is, that all literature is collaborative by nature.<sup>2</sup> As will be seen in more detail, *Tomorrow* gives us both an example of a text created by two authors, and examples of texts that have been modified by a

---

<sup>1</sup> In several of the later interviews, Barnard and Murdoch referred to the documents that they kept in the "coffin". For instance, in an interview with Candida Baker in 1987, Barnard mentioned her unpublished novel, 'The Gulf Stream'. Murdoch replied, "Yes, and it's as short as TTT is long. We keep it in the coffin, don't we? The coffin is the place where all our bits and pieces — your books, our travel stories, letters, all that — are kept." *Yacker 2: Australian Writers Talk About Their Work*, Candida Baker, Sydney: Pan Books, 1987: 34.

<sup>2</sup> See Jerome McGann, 'What Is Critical Editing?' *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship*, 5, 1991: 15-29.

large number of editors, publishers and friends. This publishing history has also involved the efforts of several prominent figures in the Australian literary scene, notably Patrick White, Clem Christesen and Drusilla Modjeska. While the next chapter is devoted to the authorship and collaboration between Barnard and Eldershaw, this chapter highlights the crucial role that other individuals, institutions and cultural and economic trends have played in the production of *Tomorrow*.

*Tomorrow* was the first and only M.Barnard Eldershaw novel to be set up and published in Australia, by Georgian House in Melbourne. All other Barnard Eldershaw novels were published by Harrap in London, who had first accepted the manuscript for *A House is Built* after Barnard and Eldershaw were co-winners of the *Bulletin* prize in 1928.<sup>3</sup> Edgar Harris, the Georgian House representative who wrote all letters to Barnard and Eldershaw about *Tomorrow*, was new to the publishing industry in 1944. He had joined George Jaboor, who had taken over the Australian agencies for Cambridge University Press, in 1938. However, Georgian House was not founded until 1943, and Harris did not become the managing director of the company until 1946, when George Jaboor died.<sup>4</sup> A pamphlet titled, *Georgian House: The First Two Years*, designed as a tribute to George Jaboor, states that the company did not begin business until 1 November 1943.<sup>5</sup> *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, submitted to Georgian House at the beginning of 1944, must have been one of the first novels that Harris dealt with in his capacity as the representative of a publishing company.

---

<sup>3</sup> Barnard and Eldershaw shared the prize with Katherine Susannah Prichard for *Coonardoo*. See Louise E. Rorabacher, *Marjorie Barnard and M. Barnard Eldershaw*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973: 32.

<sup>4</sup> *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Volume 14: 1940-80, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1996: 393.

<sup>5</sup> *Georgian House: The First Two Years, 1944-45*, Melbourne: Specialty Press, 1945: 1.

Harris' letter to Barnard and Eldershaw on 22 March 1944, informing them that he had submitted some of their typescript to the censor, makes it clear that he expected fictional writing to have a precise correlation to "real life." There was only one novel published by Georgian House in 1944: *Dead Puppets Dance*, by M. W. Peacock, "a story of the years 1870 to 1938, with the Victorian countryside and Melbourne for its setting." Other publications included Australian poetry, by writers such as Rex Ingamells, Paul Grano and William Hart-Smith; Australiana like *Bushranging Days*, edited by "Wurrama"; biographies; and 'how to' books, like *How to Grow More Vegetables*.<sup>6</sup> Even in the following years, when publication expanded to include novels such as *Washdirt: A Novel of Old Bendigo*, by James Devaney, and *The Winds Are Still*, by John Hetherington (a "prize winning war novel"),<sup>7</sup> the majority of Georgian House literary publications subscribed to Frank Dalby Davison's 1942 pronouncement that "Literature gives back to life an image of itself."<sup>8</sup> *Tomorrow* did not fit this mould, providing an unsettling and confusing image of life that affirmed little. The images it gives back are fragmented and reflexive, and it is improbable that Edgar Harris had previously encountered a manuscript that resembled it. Thus, Harris' questions to the authors pertained to doubts about how 'realistic' their novelistic presentation was. In a similar vein to many 1940s Australian critics, he had concerns that their prophecies would prove to be false, and that the book would suffer, "if events go contrary to your speculations"<sup>9</sup>:

We are most anxious to save you embarrassment, though you have no doubt gone into the matter with your eyes open, and know as well as anyone that prognostication is a dangerous business. What we would like

<sup>6</sup> *Georgian House: The First Two Years, 1944-45*: 2-21.

<sup>7</sup> Georgian House advertisement, 'Georgian House 1947 Successes', *Meanjin* 7.1, Autumn 1948: 2.

<sup>8</sup> Frank Dalby Davison, 'What is Literature?' in *Australian Writers Speak: literature and life in Australia*, a series of talks arranged by the Fellowship of Australian Writers for the Australian Broadcasting Commission, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1942.

<sup>9</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944, Marjorie Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/5.

to ask you is this: - Are you prepared to risk your reputation as front rank Australian creative writers for the sake of an ideology?

It is not clear what ideological position Harris is referring to, although it might be inferred that he felt there was a connection between the descriptions of the destruction of Sydney and a communist revolution. In any case, it is worth noting that Harris contended that ideology was a marketing problem when it pertained to speculative matters, but not when it concerned an imaginative portrayal of events that had already happened, regardless of the critique of capitalism that appears on many of these pages. On the contrary, Harris wrote that he favoured the section of *Tomorrow* that dealt with the Munster family and Sydney between 1924 and 1944 and felt that they should stand alone: "Your picture of those years between the wars is so magnificently done that we feel it is of permanent value, and should not be made to suffer by your speculations being confounded in a few months or a few years."<sup>10</sup> Harris required Barnard Eldershaw's prophecies to be accurate because he felt it was necessary to portray real and credible situations whether they were accounts of the past or the future; thus, prophecy was only acceptable within the confines and conventions of realism. In the authors' reply, Eldershaw explained to Harris that the speculative aspects of *TT* reflected possible outcomes rather than precise prediction:

We did not seek to prophesy or prognosticate the future, only to show a possible line of effect from the causes set out in the earlier part. That history will inevitably fail to conform to that does not seem to us the important thing, but if the book is to be anything more than a description of the times we live in, it must show how the thoughts and tendencies of to-day if uncorrected may resolve themselves to-morrow.<sup>11</sup>

In 1970 Barnard was more apologetic, perhaps in response to those who had criticised the book for its failure to foresee the future: "Nor do I claim any

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Draft of letter in Eldershaw's hand to Edgar Harris, undated, but Harris's next letter indicates he received a letter on 25 March 1944, ML MSS 451/5.

prophetic powers. It is obvious by now that I do not possess them."<sup>12</sup> As has been seen, later reviewers often *did* regard the novel as prophetic, if it is read as an allegory, rather than a work of historical documentary or social realism. As the authors' explanations of their work were received by Harris several weeks after the typescript had gone to the censor, it was a futile gesture. All of the censor's stamps on the typescript are dated 17 March 1944, and Harris wrote to inform the authors that he had submitted the pages on 22 March 1944. Thus, Barnard and Eldershaw had no chance of justifying the futuristic aspects of their novel before they were censored.

Perhaps what is more remarkable is that Harris's submission to the publicity censor was voluntary. While the publicity censorship directions under the National Security Act allowed for any media agency to be given an "order to submit" by the Chief Censor, this was primarily intended to regulate broadcasting stations and newspapers rather than publishers of literature.<sup>13</sup> It would also appear that *Tomorrow* was the only novel in Australia to be censored by the Publicity Censor during World War Two<sup>14</sup> Moreover, Harris emphasised that his reservations would remain regardless of what the censor might have to say on the matter:

Independent of what the censor may say regarding the pages mentioned above, we would like to have your views regarding the desirability of speculation of the kind which you have indulged in those pages.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'How 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow' Came To Be Written', *Meanjin Quarterly* 29.3. Spring 1970: 330.

<sup>13</sup> See John Hilvert, *Blue Pencil Warriors: Censorship and Propaganda in World War II*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1984: 31.

<sup>14</sup> No other examples were found, after consulting the National Archives [AA B5661], and several key texts on wartime censorship, including John Hilvert's *Blue Pencil Warriors* and Paul Hasluck's *The Government and the People: 1939-1941*, Canberra, 1952. My thanks also to Eddy Vickery, currently completing a thesis on the Australian National Security Act in World War II at the Australian National University, who also confirmed he was not aware of any other examples of Australian novels being censored in this manner.

<sup>15</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944.



Given that the authors' views were of little relevance when these passages had been cut, it would seem likely that Harris used the option of submitting to the Publicity Censor in lieu of an editorial process which allowed for no negotiation. As Chapter Five elaborates, Harris was in effect a co-censor of the passages that were cut in *Tomorrow*; it is also possible that he or someone at Georgian House engaged in pre-emptive censorship by cutting material that the censor did not actually see.<sup>16</sup>

Considerable publicity has been given to the fact that someone at Georgian House decided to "lop off the third Tomorrow", so that this edition was published with the shortened title of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*. Barnard's account of this decision in a letter to Eleanor Dark in 1947 and in the later 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written' asserted that the authors did not know about the title change until the last moment:

The publishers' last act was to lop off one of the To-morrows from the title. We only discovered this (galley proofs didn't indicate) when, on the eve of publication, he sent the jacket round to Teenie. She protested—but gave in when Harris pointed out that to change it would delay the book another year. A rose with any other name would have too many aphids . . . but I'm set in my ideas and this annoys me out of all proportion.<sup>17</sup>

In her 1970 essay Barnard added that three Tomorrows would not have fitted conveniently on the spine, but that "Writing and publication had both been so long drawn out that I felt the book needed and had earned the third 'Tomorrow'."<sup>18</sup> Without knowing the precise restrictions on the printing of dustcovers at Georgian House, it is difficult to imagine why a smaller font could not be used for the title, or why an adjustment would take a year. However, the truncated name certainly does change its significance, and perhaps, as Barnard

---

<sup>16</sup> See Chapter Five, pp.231-2, 252.

<sup>17</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 21 September 1947, Eleanor Dark's papers, NLA MSS 4998.

<sup>18</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'How 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow' Came To Be Written': 330

suggests, blights expectations about what the name is representing. Both editions of the novel give the passage from *Macbeth* as an epigraph:

Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow,  
 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,  
 To the last syllable of recorded time;  
 And all our yesterdays have lighted fools  
 The way to dusty death . . . (Act 5, Scene 5, ll.18-22)

By cutting a "Tomorrow", the connection between the novel and this famous passage from Macbeth's last soliloquy is muted; the rhythm effected by the repetition, which evokes a tired monotony, is lost. In the play, Macbeth utters these words after hearing of the death of Lady Macbeth. It is reasonable to assume that many readers of the novel would have been aware of the context of the epigraph, and would have been well acquainted with the soliloquy. The epigraph gives the text an association with Macbeth's weariness and nihilism, of a loss not just of rewards but of reasons for being alive. From such a beginning, readers would not anticipate a hopeful or uplifting narrative; even the faint optimism in the conclusion of the novel is thus coloured with ambiguity. Macbeth's words also indicate a collapse of time, and suggest that we "fools" do not learn from history, that our imaginings of the future become tedium in the present. These are grim implications with which to begin a book that concerns itself with history, and with connections between the past and future.

The lines in *Macbeth* that directly follow this quotation are also well known, and could potentially influence a reader of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* :

. . . Out, out brief candle!  
 Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player  
 That struts and frets his hour upon the stage  
 And then is heard no more. It is a tale  
 Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,  
 Signifying nothing. (Act 5, Scene 5, ll.22-7)

If the novel is viewed through the lens of Macbeth's sentiments, then many of the stories within it take on an ironic and bitter twist. What, for instance, is the significance of the account of 'Everyman', if it is believed that his tale is "told by an idiot, full of sound and fury"? The narrativisation and the conscious constructedness of lives are also called to attention. However, without the third 'Tomorrow' in the title of the novel, the Macbeth allusion could have been missed entirely by those who only read a review, heard about the book, or saw it in a shop window. The link is only made obvious once the book is open and the epigraph is read.

The covers of both the Georgian House and the Virago editions of the book relate to the title, in that they conjure impressions of distance, fantasies, and far-away places. In the case of the Georgian House edition, imagination was probably restricted by a shortage of funds and paper and the cover is in four colours only. The title on the cover is given with an ellipse after the second 'Tomorrow', a detail which is not reproduced on the title page inside. It could suggest the omission of the third 'Tomorrow', but it also emphasises uncertainty, and distance, as do the pictures of clouds in a blue sky. The impression that the cover gives is more of trailing off into a unknown future, not of being confronted with the politics of the present. Georgian House's focus on historical, realist Australian fiction is evident in the advertisements for Brian Elliot's *Singing to the Cattle* and James Devaney's *Washdirt: A Novel of Old Bendigo* on the dustcover of *Tomorrow*. Readers could expect *Tomorrow* to be in the same tradition: a novel about Australia and about white Australians' history. The blurb on the inside sleeve is brief, but it does mention the time shifts in *Tomorrow's* narrative, an unusual feature in Australian fiction of the 1940s that almost certainly set the novel apart from other Georgian House publications. It foregrounds the "realistic picture" of the years 1920-1950, "particularly as they affect the lives of a group of working people." The

narrative about the Tenth Commune is not described except for a mention that the story “swings between a period in time 400 years hence and our own day”, and the theme of “man’s eternal quest for individual freedom” is also referenced.

Edgar Harris was not the only person to consider that the “inner core” of *Tomorrow* was the most compelling and saleable section. As the last chapter discussed, it was often favoured by earlier reviewers and critics, but as late as 1970 Louise Rorabacher implied a preference in writing that “had the authors written only their twentieth-century story, they could be ranked with John Steinbeck in America and Kylie Tennant and Leonard Mann in Australia as realistic documenters of the common man’s struggle through the Great Depression.”<sup>19</sup> Perhaps with the reception of *TT* in mind, Harris continued to encourage Barnard and Eldershaw to publish the “present-day” section of the story separately after the Georgian House publication had been released. On 19 August 1948, Harris wrote to Eldershaw about a letter that she had received from Appleton’s, a publishing firm. He told Eldershaw that he had been interested to find that their reactions to the manuscript of *Tomorrow* were the same as his had been when he had first encountered it. He asked again:

I do not suppose you & Miss Barnard would be disposed to extract the present-day story and offer it as a novel in itself. If you do, it might be worth while taking it up with Appleton’s, which we would be very glad to do.<sup>20</sup>

Barnard and Eldershaw — and later Barnard by herself — always refused to remove the “shell” from their novel. It took tenacity to insist that the story be taken as a whole or not at all, particularly when the price of that insistence was virtual obscurity for the novel for over thirty years. Barnard later said that although she had been very much criticised for the framework, she felt the

---

<sup>19</sup> Louise E. Rorabacher: 71.

<sup>20</sup> Edgar Harris to Flora Eldershaw, 19 August 1948, Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/5.

futuristic segment was needed “to give the years perspective, to cut them down to size” and “to give continuation after the disaster I felt must happen.”<sup>21</sup>

Patrick White, who was to be influential in the later textual and publishing history of the novel, also agreed with many reviewers of the 1940s and '50s who felt that the speculative aspects of the book were uninspiring, but were compelled by sections of the inner narrative. He wrote to Barnard on several occasions in the 1950s and 1960s about the novel. The letters of White that are dealt with here have had little previous exposure and several are unpublished.<sup>22</sup> Although White disliked the “boring prophetic shell”,<sup>23</sup> he was consistently enthusiastic about the book. As he wrote to Barnard in 1961, when encouraging her to persist with trying to find another publisher for *Tomorrow*:

Although I found the prophetic casing pretty tough, the central bits about Sydney in the Nineteen-Twenties are so wonderful I never go into that hell-hole without remembering the book. It seems to me to be the Book of Sydney — not that I don't feel you still have other things to say about the place. There are so many changing values, always fresh angles.<sup>24</sup>

White began his efforts for *Tomorrow* after Barnard wrote a full survey of his work for *Meanjin* in 1956. The resulting essay, ‘The Four Novels of Patrick White’, was considered one of Clem Christesen’s greatest ‘scoops’ because, until Barnard’s essay was published, White had received scant attention in Australia and few had even heard of him.<sup>25</sup> According to White’s biographer, David Marr, White was thrilled with what Barnard had written: “A great many people have become excited over *The Tree of Man*, but it is the first time anyone has shown

---

<sup>21</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, *Marjorie Barnard* (film), 17 April 1975, produced and directed by Keith Salvat, Keisal Films.

<sup>22</sup> As referenced below, the others appear in David Marr’s *Patrick White: A Life*, Sydney: Random House, 1991.

<sup>23</sup> Patrick White described the futuristic narrative of *Tomorrow* this way on several occasions. See for instance *Bulletin*, 13 October, 1981: 92.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> See *The Temperament of Generations: Fifty Years of Writing in Meanjin*, Eds Jenny Lee, Philip Mead, Gerald Murnane, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1990: 110.

that I have been working towards it over the last twenty years."<sup>26</sup> Barnard had sent a draft of the essay to White and, as she told Jean Devanny, White telephoned her when he read the review and "quite a friendship has sprung up. I like him. He is, of course, a great deal younger than I am (about 15 years) but he can talk the same language".<sup>27</sup>

Patrick White was optimistic about the possibility of getting the book republished. It was one of the first novels that he recommended to his own US publishers, Viking. As Marr wrote: "If he discovered Australian novels that excited him, he urged them on his publishers, not to promote a cause but to help the writers break into the big market."<sup>28</sup> In a letter dated 5 September 1956, Patrick White wrote to Ben Huebsch at Viking Press in New York: "I am about to send you a novel in which I think you may be interested. It is *To-morrow and To-morrow* and *To-morrow and To-morrow* by "M. Barnard Eldershaw". As a publisher, Ben Huebsch was reportedly "not deterred by length" and "put no pressure on writers to be commercial,"<sup>29</sup> so perhaps there was hope that Huebsch would be less concerned than previous publishers about the size of the novel and its unfashionable prophecies. White told Huebsch that he was amazed that the book was not better known. "It is one of the few mature Australian novels, and at the same time it is of universal interest. The shell is, admittedly, a little tough, but do get inside it, and I think you will be surprised. It is full of passion and truth."<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> David Marr, *Patrick White: A Life*, Sydney: Random House, 1991: 309.

<sup>27</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 12 December 1957, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn With You*, Ed. Carole Ferrier, Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press, 1992 (hereafter *As Good As A Yarn*): 398.

<sup>28</sup> David Marr, *Patrick White*: 348.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid*: 198.

<sup>30</sup> Patrick White to Ben Huebsch, 5 September 1956, Ben Huebsch's papers, Library of Congress. MSS50013/30.

Details concerning dates in this letter are somewhat confusing.<sup>31</sup> White told Huebsch in his letter that “Flora Eldershaw died a couple of weeks ago.” However, Eldershaw did not die until 20 September 1956, although she had suffered a series of strokes before her death. It is possible that White took several weeks to write the letter after dating it, and thus it is also possible that Barnard had begun planning the republishing of *Tomorrow* before Eldershaw’s death, although given Eldershaw’s extremely poor health it is highly unlikely that Eldershaw participated in this plan. It is equally likely that Barnard decided to try to republish *Tomorrow* immediately after Eldershaw’s death. On 28 September 1956, Barnard was sent a copy of Eldershaw’s will, which named her and Eldershaw’s sister Mary (Molly) as executors. All interests in and future royalties on Barnard Eldershaw books, “written in partnership”, were bequeathed to Barnard.<sup>32</sup> Molly Eldershaw wrote to her brother to tell him that Barnard planned to withdraw from being appointed executor, “appreciating that it was a gesture of love on Teenie’s part.”<sup>33</sup>

On 9 January 1957, Barnard wrote to Edgar Harris at Georgian House, requesting that the publishers relinquish their rights to *TT*. This he promptly organised, replying on 21 January : “As you say, the book has been out of print for many years, a large proportion having been jobbed out by us some years ago.” Harris wrote that he deplored the fact that such a fine book should remain out of print, but that it was simply too expensive to reprint it. He concluded: “I hope you can find a publisher with the financial resources and enterprise necessary to reissue it.”<sup>34</sup> It has now become apparent that during this period Barnard was getting a revised edition of *Tomorrow* typed. White’s letter to

<sup>31</sup> There is a stamp on the letter with the date 9 November 1956, presumably recording the date that Huebsch received it.

<sup>32</sup> A copy of the will is in Barnard’s uncollected papers.

<sup>33</sup> Mary Eldershaw to Pat Eldershaw, undated. Obtained from John Eldershaw’s personal collection. “Teenie” was a nickname for Eldershaw used by family and friends.

<sup>34</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 9 January 1957, Marjorie Barnard’s papers, ML MSS 4869 Add on 1825.

Huebsch on 5 January 1957 records that Barnard had arranged for *Tomorrow's* re-typing:

...this is really a line to explain the delay in the arrival of Marjorie Barnard's To-morrow and To-morrow. She lent me a copy, and I thought she would have no difficulty in producing another when I announced I was sending it. However, she preferred to have the original MS re-typed. At the time, when it was published, it appears, it was badly hacked about by the Censor, with the result that the published book is only an abridged version. I know she is very keen to send To-morrow and To-morrow, and it will be on its way as soon as possible.<sup>35</sup>

The three volumes of typescript that were found in Barnard's papers after the death of Vera Murdoch are almost certainly the "re-typed MS" that is referred to above and thus represent the final authorial intentions of Barnard for *Tomorrow*. The volumes are professionally typed and bound, and they are labelled by Marjorie Barnard. There are annotations in ball-point pen on the typescript which could not have been made until at least some time in the 1950s, since all manuscript records indicate that Barnard used a fountain pen before this period. While there is a small possibility that Barnard created this typescript later, after the publication of the Virago edition of *Tomorrow* in 1983, this is unlikely. As will be seen, the newer typescript has been created using the ML ms as a guide and the ML ms was deposited in the Mitchell Library in 1960.<sup>36</sup> White's letter suggests that Barnard did indeed get *Tomorrow* re-typed in 1957 and it is improbable that she would then re-type it again at a later date.

This typescript, P ms,<sup>37</sup> and the critical difficulties involved in publishing it are examined in Chapter Five and the conclusion. As discussed, it is highly unlikely that Eldershaw contributed in any way to its production, and she was

<sup>35</sup> Patrick White to Ben Huebsch, 5 January 1957, Ben Huebsch's papers, Library of Congress, MSS50013/30.

<sup>36</sup> See Chapter Five, p.216.

<sup>37</sup> The privately owned typescript of *Tomorrow* is hereafter referred to as P ms.



probably not even aware of its existence. *P ms* does not contain the additional 2384 words that appear in *TT*. As Chapter Four discusses,<sup>38</sup> it is likely that Eldershaw was responsible for these additional words. Thus it is also possible that Barnard intentionally removed some of Eldershaw's work on the novel, recreating *Tomorrow* in the manner that she wished it to be republished, and reclaiming authorship of *Tomorrow*. These details offer a possible explanation as to why Barnard did not assert ownership of *Tomorrow* until after the death of Eldershaw.<sup>39</sup> By mid 1957, Barnard had the publication rights, the royalties, and in all probability the possession of a version of the novel that she had overseen the creation of in its entirety. As will be further discussed, questions of collaborative effort in *Tomorrow* are thus even more complex than has been previously suggested in other work on *Tomorrow*. This final version of *Tomorrow* can be considered to be a more solitary effort than earlier versions of the novel, but collaborative traces inevitably remain.

Ben Huebsch rejected the new version of *Tomorrow* for republication, although Barnard later said that she never had such a flattering and gentle rejection letter as "the one that Mr Huebsch wrote."<sup>40</sup> On 29 May 1958, Barnard wrote to Clem Christesen that: "The poor thing is very dead indeed. Patrick White tried to interest the Viking Press and nothing came of that but a few kind words."<sup>41</sup> Correspondence between Barnard and potential publishers in the 1970s and '80s does not mention the 1957 revised typescript, and there is no indication that Virago publishers were aware of its existence. The most probable reason that this version of *Tomorrow* does not feature in publishers' correspondence is that it was not seen as financially viable to completely reset the novel. However, as correspondence discussed later in this chapter indicates,

---

<sup>38</sup> See Chapter Four, pp.175-6.

<sup>39</sup> See Chapter Four, p.199.

<sup>40</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, *Marjorie Barnard* (film), 17 April 1975.

<sup>41</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 29 May 1958, *Meanjin* Archives, Baillieu Library, Melbourne (hereafter "*Meanjin* Archives").

Barnard always hoped that a completely new edition of *Tomorrow* would be possible.

White continued to support the book and its republication for many years. A letter from White to Barnard in May 1961 asked if Barnard had ever tried sending "*To-morrow and To-morrow and To-morrow* to Macmillan." He offered to give his copy of the book to a Macmillan representative:

We were at Kylie's last night and she is the Macmillan representative here. We were wondering about sending it. What do you think? If you would consider it, I can give my copy to Kylie. It might be better if it came from her.<sup>42</sup>

There is no record of a reply, either from Barnard or Macmillan.

Twenty years after this letter, as negotiations with Virago to reprint the novel began, Geoffrey Dutton sent out a questionnaire to a number of "eminent Australians, asking them what Australian book or books they would most like to see back in print." The responses were published in *The Bulletin*, and *TT* was nominated twice. Myfanwy Gollan, one of the nominators, wrote that "The message that came across to me then was that the struggle for individual dignity and freedom was unending, and that no political system would ever meet the hopes held out for it . . . The book has a scene of Sydney in revolution that gripped my juvenile imagination."<sup>43</sup>

White was the other nominee and his comments were more terse. He wrote that he had been "racking his memory" but he couldn't think of any Australian book that "hasn't had justice done to it . . . *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* was a memorable book but a pity they weren't persuaded to lop off

---

<sup>42</sup> Patrick White to Marjorie Barnard, 14 May 1961, in Barnard's uncollected papers. It has not been possible to trace the identity of the "Kylie" to whom White refers.

<sup>43</sup> Geoffrey Dutton, 'Out of Print: Prominent Australians name the Australian books they would like to see republished', *Bulletin*, 13 October, 1981: 92.

the boring prophetic shell."<sup>44</sup> However, this tentative nomination was an enduring one: the cover of the Virago edition of *TTT* changed the slant of White's comments in stating that the novel "was recently named by Patrick White as the Australian novel he would most like to see republished." By this time, White was no longer in contact with Barnard,<sup>45</sup> but his commitment to her last novel had lasted twenty-seven years. Carmen Callil, the founder of Virago, recalled that it was Patrick White who had made her aware of the existence of *TT* and of Marjorie Barnard: "It may well have been him who told me about the censored version of the book, in fact I'm pretty sure it was, because I can't think of anyone I know in Australia except for him, who knew much about [Marjorie Barnard]."<sup>46</sup>

There is no correspondence regarding *Tomorrow* in any of Marjorie Barnard's personal papers for another sixteen years. This coincides with the lack of public interest in *Tomorrow* in this period. Frederick Macartney and Edmund Miller acknowledged the book in the 1956 extended *Australian Literature: A Bibliography*,<sup>47</sup> and H.M. Green devoted four pages to the book in his massive *A History of Australian Literature* in 1961<sup>48</sup>. An extract of the book was printed in *Australian Heritage*<sup>49</sup> in 1949 and reprinted in 1954 and 1956. Clem Christesen was the editor of *Australian Heritage*, and was responsible for including this extract; like White, he had a commitment to *Tomorrow* that lasted several decades. This was the extent of the significant critical attention given to

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> See Barnard's interview with Guilia Giuffre, November 1984: "Patrick rang me up and we were friends for a time, but he's just grown out of my life. We didn't give him up. He outgrew me, very definitely." Guilia Giuffre, *A Writing Life: Interviews With Australian Women Writers*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1990: 136.

<sup>46</sup> Personal correspondence, 19 April 2000.

<sup>47</sup> Frederick Thomas Bennett Macartney, Edmund Morris Miller, *Australian Literature: A Bibliography to 1930, Extended to 1950, Revised Edition*, ed. F.T. Macartney, Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1956.

<sup>48</sup> H.M Green, *A History of Australian Literature*, Vol 11, 1923-1950, Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1961: 1096-1104.

<sup>49</sup> Clem Christesen ed., *Australian Heritage*, Melbourne: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949 [1954, 1956]: 211-226.

*Tomorrow* for twenty years. Barnard continued to publish history, and works on Francis Greenway and Miles Franklin. She had also, as she told Jean Devanny in 1957, decided to live “the life of a hedonist, as far as I can afford to”<sup>50</sup> and she took four trips abroad with Murdoch between 1950 and 1970.<sup>51</sup>

The *Meanjin* essays in 1970 mark the point at which *Tomorrow* regained public attention after an almost complete break for two decades. As discussed, although Christesen and Barnard felt removed from the arguments in Robert Burns’s paper, Burns did argue that a younger generation would find that the book expressed issues that were of current concern. His interpretations also emphasised, as Patrick White had implied, that *Tomorrow* could be promoted from a number of different angles, a point which became significant when Virago marketed the book as being relevant to readers’ interests in the 1980s. In the introduction to the Virago edition, Anne Chisholm wrote that Barnard had “recently seen her work praised by a new generation of women who have learned to look again at the lives and works of her colleagues and friends and to learn from them.”<sup>52</sup> Chisholm was probably referring to the publication of Drusilla Modjeska’s *Exiles At Home* in 1981 which revitalised interest in Barnard and her literary contemporaries and helped to create a publishing and intellectual scene that was more receptive to *Tomorrow* than it had been in several decades. Ironically, it was only as Barnard’s generation was fading from the public sphere that *Tomorrow* began to receive attention again.

---

<sup>50</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 12 December 1957, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 397.

<sup>51</sup> As stated in Section 2 of this chapter, Marjorie Barnard’s uncollected papers contains travel itineraries and/or diaries for the years 1951, 1961, 1964, 1967, 1971 and 1979.

<sup>52</sup> Anne Chisholm, introduction to M. Barnard Eldershaw, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, London: Virago Press, 1983: xiv.

In April 1973, Barnard wrote a letter to Clem Christesen, questioning the delay in publishing an article that she had written and withdrawing her permission to publish a review of her own writing:

You spoke of publishing a review of my writing in Meanjin. I should esteem it a favour if I'm dropped from the project as I am heartily tired of being patronised by latter day academics. I have come to resent having my work evaluated in the light of their feuds, philosophies and theories. I belong to another world and as an antique should rest in peace.<sup>53</sup>

While Barnard may have been referring to Burns and his article on *Tomorrow*, several other academics had also been in contact with her at the time that she wrote this letter. One was Bruce Molloy, who completed his Masters thesis in 1974, but interviewed Barnard about the political aspects of *Tomorrow* in July 1973, and may have questioned Barnard about her politics before this formal interview. By 1973, when questioned about her political position, Barnard frequently insisted, as she had in her *Meanjin* article, that she was a "nineteenth century liberal" and that she had never belonged to a political party. Academics have since drawn attention to her membership of the Peace Pledge Union and the Australian Labor Party; her political activities through the Fellowship of Australian Writers; the political content of her unpublished pamphlet 'The Case For the Future'<sup>54</sup> and the political content of *Tomorrow* itself. In the interview with Bruce Molloy, Barnard admitted that she had been a member of the Labor Party, but she resisted the notion that *Tomorrow* was a political novel, despite many questions about the book's politics from Molloy. Eventually she conceded that although she would not have called it a political novel, "you [Molloy] and I have different definitions."<sup>55</sup> From the date of this interview onwards Barnard usually denied any political affiliations and seemed increasingly frustrated by political interpretations of *Tomorrow*. In the

<sup>53</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 28 April 1973, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>54</sup> See for instance Robert Darby, 'While Freedom Lives: Political Preoccupations in the Writing of Marjorie Barnard and Frank Dalby Davison, 1935-1947', Ph.D. thesis, Australian Defence Force Academy, NSW, 1980.

<sup>55</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Bruce Molloy, 26 July 1973: 353.

*Meanjin* article written three years earlier she had asserted: "No, I was not a Communist or a Trotskyist or a fellow traveller or a reactionary or an intellectual or a prophet. I was still, inescapably, a nineteenth century liberal."<sup>56</sup> The reasons for Barnard's protestations are elusive, although perhaps they hinge, as she suggested, on problems of definition and her later resistance to any position that seemed partisan. What is pertinent is that a new generation was beginning to re-read the book in the light of issues that preoccupied them, recognising that the book was fluid in its meanings.

In the short film about Barnard that was shot at her home in Longueville in 1975, Barnard remarked of *Tomorrow* that "it has a few friends, that book". She reported that it had recently had "a near miss" with the University of Queensland Press, "who had an idea they could republish it in its complete form". However, according to Barnard, they had kept the book for five months and had then told her that they couldn't publish it "for financial reasons". They had then offered to republish *The Persimmon Tree*, and Barnard had written some more stories for it, but then UQP had "rejected that too."<sup>57</sup> In the late 1970s and early '80s, Barnard was to have comparable experiences with both Hutchinson and Virago Press. The following account is based entirely on correspondence from privately held papers and from Drusilla Modjeska's papers in the National Library. It is included to indicate the extent to which Barnard was frustrated in her earlier attempts to republish *Tomorrow*, and to give the chronology of letters and events leading up to the Virago republication.

---

<sup>56</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written': 330.

<sup>57</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, *Marjorie Barnard* (film), 17 April 1975.

## Two: 'My Heartbreak Novel'

*“. . . more importantly I wonder if it is in the book's ultimate interest to republish the abridged, not to say, mutilated, Georgian House edition. It might indeed put paid to its issue ever in complete form. It just might come round again, perhaps after my death.”*

Marjorie Barnard to Tim Curnow, 10 January 1979, Marjorie Barnard's uncollected papers.

On 25 January 1978, Tim Curnow, Barnard's literary agent at Curtis Brown, wrote a letter to Barnard with the heading "Tomorrow and Tomorrow"

Believe it or not, I now enclose three contracts for the reissue with Hutchinson's. They have yet to decide on how they will do the reissue but it does appear that they will want to restore the censored passages if they possibly can.

Curnow went on to warn Barnard that it was an expensive business resetting a book totally, but that an appendix, presumably containing the censored passages, might be possible at the end of the book and "may well highlight the difficult birth of the book better than by issuing it as the uncensored work. Censored passages are always difficult to find unless one has a reference to them."<sup>1</sup> Curnow also advised Barnard that a \$300 advance would be due on the signature of agreement and that he would forward an invoice.

However, on 20 July of the same year the Managing Director of Hutchinson, Elizabeth Douglas, wrote to Curnow advising him that it had been decided that it was not possible to proceed with reprinting *Tomorrow*: "As I told you in my last letter on this title, we investigated the alternatives of producing this book as a Marlin but neither was a viable proposition." In concluding, Douglas wrote that this decision meant that the three other Barnard Eldershaw titles would not be considered and requested that the advance be repaid.<sup>2</sup> Curnow enclosed this correspondence in his letter to Barnard on 4 September 1978, writing, "I am afraid your nose was right after all." He returned her copies of *Green Memory*, *The Glass House* and *Plaque With Laurel*, and told Barnard that he would return her copy of *Tomorrow and*

---

<sup>1</sup> Tim Curnow to Marjorie Barnard, 25 January 1978, in Barnard's uncollected papers.

<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth Douglas to Tim Curnow, 20 July 1978, *ibid.*



*Tomorrow* when it arrived. He ended with congratulations for Barnard's 81st birthday.<sup>3</sup>

There are two handwritten and undated responses to this in Barnard's uncollected papers. Both make it clear that Barnard took the rejection of *Tomorrow* badly, writing that "Hutchisons [sic] failure to honour their contract to republish *TTT* is a painful blow on my most vulnerable spot." She queried why Hutchinson had signed the contract if they had not studied the feasibility and profit of doing so. However she sent back the advance with interest. Her second letter concludes "[t]his is my fight. The novels arrived safely thankyou. They look depressed old & unwanted."<sup>4</sup>

Elizabeth Douglas responded directly to Barnard in a letter on 9 November 1978, saying that she had just received Barnard's letter of 15 September, which was probably a version of the first of Barnard's letters that is quoted above. She reiterated her comments to Tim Curnow, saying that while she was sorry not to have written directly to Barnard about *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, it was common practice for the publishers to go through the agent. Douglas explained that it had not been possible to proceed with the proposed paperback edition of the book because "the text would have had to have been completely reset to have fitted into the series format, and this was not a viable economic proposition." Thus, once again, the size of *Tomorrow* and the expense of printing it was given as a prohibitive factor. Douglas added that the decision had not been taken lightly and "We were extremely reluctant to lose *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* as we very much wanted it to be part of

---

<sup>3</sup> Tim Curnow to Marjorie Barnard, 4 September 1978, *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Tim Curnow, undated (September 1978?), *ibid.*

our list.”<sup>5</sup> The receipt for \$300 was enclosed, although no mention was made of the interest.

On 1 December 1978, Barnard drafted a reply to the Managing Editor of Hutchinson:

My complaint, I reiterate, in case you have missed the point, is that your firm sent me a contract for the republication of *TT* without having first established the feasibility [sic] & profit of doing so. On discovering your mistake you broke the contract. I claim this is highly unprofessional conduct.

Barnard added that she had never encountered a comparable situation in her many years as a writer and claimed that her “friends in the literary world” were shocked by the story. She concluded by explaining her need for the receipt and by commenting that “the way things are managed I now feel relieved that Hutchinsons is not republishing *T.T.*”<sup>6</sup>

On 10 January 1979, Barnard wrote to Curnow, saying that she had two matters that she wished to take up. One was to do with *A House Is Built* and the other was “Hutchinson’s change of mind”. It is possible to surmise from Barnard’s letter that Elizabeth Douglas had written on 11 December, probably to suggest that a hardback edition of *Tomorrow* might be possible. However, Barnard wrote:

I am thinking about not letting them publish it at all. For one thing I have little confidence in them but more importantly I wonder if it is in the book’s ultimate interest to republish the abridged, not to say, mutilated, Georgian House edition. It might indeed put paid to its issue ever in complete form. It just might come round again, perhaps after my death. I can’t see anyone coming at the expense of re-setting at present. I should be interested in your opinion.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Elizabeth Douglas to Marjorie Barnard, 9 November 1978, *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Douglas, 1 December 1978, *ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Tim Curnow, 10 January 1979, *ibid.*

This letter is an important one in light of *Tomorrow's* later editorial history, because it indicates that Barnard was concerned about the implications of republishing the Georgian House edition. The letter also confirms that Barnard was 'holding out' — even until her death, if necessary — for a complete edition of *Tomorrow*. She was aware that if she acceded to the publication of another abridged version of the book she might prevent a complete edition being published in the future. This is precisely what happened with the republication of the novel by Virago, although it has not been acknowledged that the majority of the Virago edition is a photo-offset of the Georgian House edition. No one to date has ever "come at the expense of re-setting".

On 21 January 1979, Barnard had firmly decided against Hutchinson as a publisher for *Tomorrow*. In her letter to Curnow she wrote :

After mature consideration I have decided not to allow Hutchinsons [sic] to republish *TTT* in any form. I have no confidence in them. They have repudiated a contract once and there is no guarantee that they would not do it again. It cost them nothing except perhaps reputation.<sup>8</sup>

She also made it clear that she would not be interested in any further offer from Hutchinson to do with her other novels. A letter to Nancy Gray on 6 December 1978 is another surviving account of Barnard's dealings with Hutchinson:<sup>9</sup>

Two bad things have happened. Our little cat Vera was savaged by a dog . . .  
The other thing is only infuriating. Hutchinsons [sic] after long

---

<sup>8</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Tim Curnow, 21 January 1979, *ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> In 2002 'Austlit', the Australian Literature Gateway database, recorded that an Hutchinson edition of *TT* existed, published in 1978 in Richmond, Victoria. While an ISBN number for this edition does exist, and was the basis for Austlit registering the book, it has not been possible at the present time to confirm any library holdings and the National Library of Australia has never held this edition. It would therefore appear probable that Hutchinson applied for an ISBN number in 1978 and did not cancel it when the contract for *TT* was revoked. Austlit have since removed the entry from their database. Apart from the lack of library holdings, the letters reproduced here are the strongest evidence suggesting that this edition has never existed.

contemplation, contracted to republish To-morrow & To-morrow, we signed & they paid the advance royalty. Six months passed then they decided to break the contract & demand their money back. You would think that an old established publisher would study the feasibility [sic] & profitability of publishing a book before the contract, wouldn't you? I wasn't pleased & wrote what I considered a memorable letter.<sup>10</sup>

Barnard was overseas in the latter half of 1979, but Curnow corresponded with Hutchinson again. On 31 July 1979, Elizabeth Douglas wrote to Curnow again suggesting that the bound edition of the book could be republished, presumably distinguishing between the possibility of reprinting the existing edition, rather than publishing a typescript. Curnow forwarded this letter to Barnard in London on 15 August 1979,<sup>11</sup> but there is no record of the reply.

The next item of correspondence in Barnard's uncollected papers is from Tim Curnow on 6 June 1980. He wrote to Barnard to inform her of the Virago project and its Australian co-founder, Carmel Callil. Virago, Curnow assured Barnard, "has built a fine reputation with fiction publishing and in particular the reissuing of women writers who have been ignored or neglected." Curnow told Barnard that her work had been discussed and that he had given Callil a copy of *The Persimmon Tree* with some stories that had been written more recently by Barnard, as well as a full list of her published work and breakdowns on the novels.<sup>12</sup> Barnard's reply, drafted on 14 June 1980, seems to have been composed in two stages. She wrote to Curnow that:

The rescue operation being conducted by M/s Carmen Callil of Wardour St. does not appeal to me. I am not in the dustbox yet or am I? I have gone through her catalogue and don't like the company . . . You have by now

---

<sup>10</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Nancy Gray, 6 December 1978, Nancy Gray's papers 1939-1989, ML MSS 5803.

<sup>11</sup> All in Barnard's uncollected papers.

<sup>12</sup> Tim Curnow to Marjorie Barnard, June 6 1980, *ibid.*

guessed that I am not submitting the three novels. I appreciate that you are trying to help but I am too old to grasp at that straw.<sup>13</sup>

It can be surmised from the letter above — and from a later one to Drusilla Modjeska where Barnard explained that it was Virago's "ladies only" policy that was unwelcome to her<sup>14</sup> — that Barnard objected both to the idea that her work needed to be retrieved from obscurity and that the work of women needed special attention. A Virago catalogue for August 1985 to February 1986 is in Barnard's uncollected papers and the Virago reprint of *The Persimmon Tree* is advertised in it. The first page of the 1985 Virago catalogue, launching a new series called "Virago Pioneers", claims that there has been, "no single area of our cultural, political, economic and intellectual inheritance in which women have not played a part" and then notes that history still invariably refers to men and male achievements. The stated aim of "Virago Pioneers" is to "redress the balance, to provide new interpretations of the lives and achievements of a wide range of women."<sup>15</sup> As a woman who had achieved most of her success in the 1930s and '40s, Barnard was unlikely to have sympathy with the Virago project, which has always emphasised the neglect or marginalising of women's achievements and the need to correct this imbalance. In later interviews, when questioned by feminists whose values had been shaped by the movements of the 1960s and '70s, Barnard was inclined to assert that she didn't see herself as a "woman writer" because there was no such thing. "There are writers, good and bad. Only the work counts."<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Tim Curnow, 14 June 1980, *ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Drusilla Modjeska, 30 March 1982, Drusilla Modjeska's papers, NLA MS 8320/6.

<sup>15</sup> *Virago Press: New Books and Complete List August 1985 to February 1986*, London: Virago Press, 1985: 2.

<sup>16</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Candida Baker, May 1986, in *Yacker 2: Australian Writers Talk About Their Work*, Candida Baker, Pan Books: Sydney, 1987: 39.

Marjorie Barnard did not share the sensibilities of the campaigners for women's rights in the 1960s and '70s, who believed that the establishing of feminist printing houses was a crucial step in illuminating "women's history and women's lives and experience in such a way that the value of this culture can be understood by everybody."<sup>17</sup> As a writer who felt that she had, on the whole, been given "a very fair turn as a writer",<sup>18</sup> Barnard was personally resistant to the idea that gender could be a factor in the exclusion and silencing of literary voices. It was not that she denied the importance of acknowledging the contributions of women to Australian culture and public life; with Eldershaw she had written many essays and lectures on the achievements of women writers such as Henry Handel Richardson, Katharine Susannah Prichard, Christina Stead and Eleanor Dark. She also co-wrote an article with Eldershaw on Elizabeth MacArthur for *The Peaceful Army* in 1938, which was edited by Eldershaw, and in her later life completed a biography of Miles Franklin. With few exceptions, however, Barnard did not devote attention to woman-specific qualities in the work of her subjects and she was seldom interested in exploring the suggestion that writers might have suffered oppression because they were women. While many of her fictional pieces focussed on feminine experience, when talking of her work, she did not express a particular consciousness of this emphasis. She also resisted the idea that her sex influenced the shape or style of her historical writing: ". . . if you're doing historical research you don't think if you're a man or a woman."<sup>19</sup> When prompted in later interviews, Barnard expressed awareness that the fact of her sex had produced specific

---

<sup>17</sup> Eileen Cadman, Gail Chester and Agnes Pivot, *Rolling Our Own: Women as Printers, Publishers and Distributors*, Minority Press Group: London, 1981: 30.

<sup>18</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 28 August 1973, *Meanjin* Archives, Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne.

<sup>19</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Guilia Guiffre, November 1984, Guilia Guiffre, *A Writing Life: Interviews With Australian Women Writers*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1990: 138.

restrictions on her intellectual and literary pursuits,<sup>20</sup> but she seemed unwilling to consider that her lot might have been more difficult than that of her male literary peers. Arguably, her opinion of her own fair treatment blinded her to the plight of women with less fortunate careers. In the interview with Candida Baker she conceded that the women of her generation were, in some ways, emancipated by the wars. Women “had to be called upon when there were no men, and then they found that women could do jobs just as well!”<sup>21</sup>

These sentiments were at odds with those of many feminists of the 1970s and '80s who contended that if the publishing industry is controlled by men, who have the privilege of choosing and circulating the issues that they consider important to the public, women's writing and women's views are inevitably marginalised.<sup>22</sup> In publishing or republishing the work of women from earlier periods, feminist presses like Virago found that their objectives sometimes clashed uncomfortably with the authors and the material that they were retrieving. Sue Roff, for instance, in reviewing the list of Australian Viragos in 1987, expressed surprise that several of the novels, “while . . . all interesting artefacts in the history of Australian feminism”, contained remarkably traditional views of marriage and gender roles. The books in question — Miles Franklin's *Some Everyday Folk and Dawn*, Dorothy Hewett's *Bobbin Up* and Jean Devanny's *Cindie* — were all, according to Roff, marketed as part of the documentation of evolving feminism, but Roff was

---

<sup>20</sup> See for instance Guilia Guiffre's interview with Barnard in *A Writing Life*, pages 138-9. Barnard is also heavily prompted by Murdoch in this interview; however, the two of them do concede that it would have been easier for Barnard to accept a scholarship to Oxford if she had been a man, as the scholarship included free passage for men only. Her father would not pay the fare, so she stayed in Australia.

<sup>21</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Candida Baker, May 1986, in *Yacker 2: Australian Writers Talk About Their Work*: 39.

<sup>22</sup> See for instance Lynne Spender, *Intruder on the Rights of Men, Women's Unpublished Heritage*, London; Boston: Pandora Press, 1983.

critical of the conventional resolutions for characters in several of the novels.<sup>23</sup> In the attempt to reframe these works as emancipatory texts, the subject matter did not always fit the agenda.

Another example of this phenomenon occurs in Dale Spender's introduction to the reprinting of *The Peaceful Army*. Eldershaw's foreword was a brief 140 words and says only that the book "is a tribute from the women of today to the women of yesterday" before explaining how the "women pioneers" were selected for the book's attention.<sup>24</sup> Spender's foreword to the Penguin edition is eight times the length of Eldershaw's and informs the reader that during preparations for the Sesquicentenary in 1938, it became apparent to the Women's Executive Committee and Advisory Council that "little credit was being given to the contribution that women had made to the development of the country and the culture."

There was a need to recognize publicly the crucial role that they had played in the birth of the nation; one solution proposed was to publish a documentation of women's influence and achievements.<sup>25</sup>

The crucial difference in these two introductions is the emphasis. In collating a book on literary and artistic women, Eldershaw did give new credit to women's "work and influence." However, the view that women's achievements had been under-acknowledged was not one that Eldershaw found necessary to express explicitly; she made no mention of the Sesquicentenary or the Women's Executive Committee and Advisory Council. The contributions to the book were deemed to speak for themselves, without attention being drawn to the need to give "women pioneers" greater recognition. On the whole, the articles in the book concentrated

---

<sup>23</sup> Sue Roff, 'Virago Press Offers Stunning List of Australian Viragos', *Antipodes* 1:1 1987: 58-9.

<sup>24</sup> Flora Eldershaw, *The Peaceful Army*, Second Edition, ed. by Dale Spender, Ringwood: Penguin, 1988: xi.

<sup>25</sup> *ibid*: vii.



more on the issues involved in being an Australian pioneer than on the issues involved in being a woman.

As discussed previously, *Tomorrow* as a Virago edition encountered critical difficulties because it did not read as a feminist text. While it was Virago's ability to reframe the subject matter of *Tomorrow* that helped to make it relevant to a new generation of readers, Barnard felt alienated by Virago's attempt to pitch her book to a feminist audience.<sup>26</sup> It is probable that she allowed the republication to go ahead on the basis of a misunderstanding. Some of Barnard's letter to Tim Curnow on 14 June 1980 is openly antipathetic towards the Virago project, but on the reverse of this page is a rough draft that indicates a change of heart: "But let's see her [Carmen Callil's] reaction to *The Persimmon Tree*. It might amuse me & it also might [brown?] her off me..." The rest of the letter is hard to read; the writing suggests it was perhaps written hurriedly or in some fury. Barnard appeared to be expressing anger both at "my own publisher", perhaps Hutchinson, and at the "A Bias C". She concluded, "[s]inging for my supper is no longer my pigeon."<sup>27</sup> The letter as a whole conveys weariness with publishing, the media and the academic industry. The scrawled note suggests that perhaps, after all, Barnard was tired enough to "grasp at straws." Ironically, just as one publisher became interested in *Tomorrow*, another also became enthusiastic. On 13 August 1980, Tim Curnow wrote to Barnard to say that he had been talking to Brian Johns at Penguin Books:

---

<sup>26</sup> Virago, like many feminist publishers, have since revised their selling strategies. See for instance Diane Brown, 'Feminist Publishing: Reinventing a Reading Culture', *Australian Women's Book Review*. 9.2-3. Spring 1997: 15. "In their current catalogue, Virago (UK) announces a new series, Virago 'V' for young women, aiming to publish the best, young female writers around. Virago markets the new series as 'ranging from the trendy to the traditional, the heavyweight to the deeply frivolous it will avoid political correctness at all costs.' This is the publishers' message to young women in the nineties."

<sup>27</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Tim Curnow, 14 June 1980, Marjorie Barnard's uncollected papers.

He confirms that he does have an interest in *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*. He is looking into the possibility of developing a programme of reissuing novels which have been neglected in recent years and yours would probably form part of this list.<sup>28</sup>

Curnow advised Barnard that Johns would be in touch when he had made a decision one way or the other.

There is no record of Johns' reply, and the next correspondence on *Tomorrow* that is available is in Drusilla Modjeska's papers. It is a letter from Barnard to the Mitchell Librarian, dated 8 February 1982. It gives Modjeska permission to photocopy pages of the censored typescript of *Tomorrow*, because, Barnard wrote, "I understand from her that this is required."<sup>29</sup> A receipt for 144 photocopies, dated 4 March 1982, is with this letter. It can be reasonably assumed that the 144 photocopies were of the 144 pages of the censored *Tomorrow* typescript that had the censor's stamp on the top. This letter of permission from Barnard and the photocopying receipt are important, because they strongly imply that the publishers at Virago did not view the censored typescript at the Mitchell Library before setting up the Virago edition of *Tomorrow*. On the contrary, it is likely that Virago were working from photocopies. If the censored manuscript is examined, it is easy to observe that emendations on the censored pages are made with several different pens and pencils. For reasons that are discussed in Chapter Five, it is likely that many cuts and emendations were made post-censorship. However, a photocopy of the emendations would obscure the variations in colours and marking styles, which could explain why Virago attribute all cuts and emendations to the censor. The letter quoted below was written by Barnard to Modjeska on the same day as her note of permission:

<sup>28</sup> Tim Curnow to Marjorie Barnard, 13 August 1980, *ibid*.

<sup>29</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Mitchell Librarian, Mitchell Library, Macquarie St., Sydney, 8 February 1982, Drusilla Modjeska's papers, NLA MS 8320/6.

At long last I enclose a letter to the Mitchell Librarian giving my permission for you to take copies of *To-morrow* and *To-morrow* . . . I have been in touch with my agent, Tim Curnow (Curtis Brown) and he had probably written to or telephoned you. He has another nibble...I'd be happy with Penguin . . .<sup>30</sup>

Modjeska replied to Barnard on 1 March 1982. Her letter advised Barnard to consider allowing Penguin to republish *Tomorrow* instead of Virago. She wrote that "They [Penguin] feel they should wait until Virago has made a decision, although they are obviously very keen". She indicated that, if the Penguin edition were to go ahead, she would do the introduction, but "I don't say this out of self interest, an intro is neither here nor there, above all the book needs the attention it deserves." Modjeska listed the advantages, as she saw them, of allowing Penguin to re-publish *Tomorrow*, arguing that Penguin would have better distribution in Australia, that they would be cheaper and that they would be pitched to a general fiction market, rather than a "specialist feminist/women's market." Modjeska acknowledged that Virago texts had distinctive covers and that they "do have good sales in that specialist market. They'd reach a British market that Penguin Aust [sic] probably wouldn't; but Penguin would reach most of the Australian Virago readers, I should think, and extend much further." She also told Barnard that she was arranging for Penguin to be sent a copy of the censored version or sections in case they did get the "go ahead".<sup>31</sup>

The photocopies were made three days later, on 4 March 1982, but it is not possible to ascertain whether they were sent to Virago or Penguin. On 12 March, Bryony Cosgrove at Penguin Books had already written to Tim Curnow expressing regret that Barnard and Curtis Brown had decided to take up the Virago option.

---

<sup>30</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Drusilla Modjeska, 8 February 1982, Modjeska's papers, NLA MS 8320/21.

<sup>31</sup> Drusilla Modjeska to Marjorie Barnard, 1 March 1982, Barnard's uncollected papers.

Cosgrove argued that "Penguin are in a much better position to publish and distribute Marjorie's books to the best advantage in their natural market" and that Drusilla Modjeska, "a specialist on the subject of women writers of this period", had agreed to write an introduction to a Penguin edition. Cosgrove also stated that it had been intended that the publication of *Tomorrow* would be followed with a February/March 1983 publication of *A House Is Built*.

It is curious that a firm proposal by Penguin for two of Marjorie's novels has not been able to override an option on one novel that has been held over from 1980 without a firm decision having been reached until now.

Finally I gather that Virago's distribution in Australia is inefficient, and because of this they may offer Penguin the paperback rights. Unfortunately, the cost of the books resulting from such an arrangement usually proves to be prohibitive, and therefore unattractive to us.<sup>32</sup>

Cosgrove concluded by saying that Penguin hoped these issues would be considered seriously when the Virago contract arrived.

However, it would seem that the Virago contract was accepted and that the process for publication began at this time. Barnard replied to Modjeska on 30 March, writing that her agent "advises Virago because this firm has access to a large market and offers better terms." Barnard added that Virago's "ladies only" policy was unwelcome to her and she was therefore glad that it had been taken over by Chatto and Windus. She reported that she was working on a compromise with Tim Curnow and that it had involved "a good deal of discussion." "Penguin supply the Australian market and Chatto the English and American. He seems to think that would work but I have doubts. Writers soon learn to doubt, don't they?"<sup>33</sup> Soon after this date it must have become clear to Barnard that a compromise had not been

---

<sup>32</sup> Bryony Cosgrove to Tim Curnow, 12 March 1982, *ibid*.

<sup>33</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Drusilla Modjeska, 30 March 1982, Drusilla Modjeska's papers, NLA MS 8320/6.

reached. On 30 April Modjeska wrote to Barnard that she was pleased to hear that Virago had bought *Tomorrow*; “[s]he seems so enthusiastic that it is surely the best solution. You must be very pleased after all these years.”<sup>34</sup> In the following month, the senior editor at Penguin wrote to Modjeska: “We were all sorry that the *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* project fell through for Penguin.”<sup>35</sup>

There is also a record from 20 August 1982: a letter by Barnard to Bill Reed of Macmillan in which Barnard writes, “My heartbreak novel *TTT* is I hope being re-printed someday by Virago a sidepiece of Chatto & Windus [sic].”<sup>36</sup> The fact that Virago decided at this point to publish in agreement with the group Chatto, Bodley, Head and Cape was obviously important to Barnard, who mistakenly believed that Virago would cease to be a feminist press when they increased their mainstream outlets and distribution channels. The commercial pressures were real, with Virago suffering their first ever financial loss in 1982.<sup>37</sup> However, the feminist agenda remained explicit, if tempered by an objective to make women’s literature widely available and accessible.

Surviving details about the setting up of the Virago edition and Barnard’s reaction to the edition are fragmented and contradictory. In January 1983, Carmen Callil wrote to Modjeska to tell her that everything was coming along “very well indeed with ‘Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow’”, adding:

(did I tell you that we discovered that the novel should be called that? The publisher left off the final “Tomorrow”, the ultimate indignity for poor

---

<sup>34</sup> Drusilla Modjeska to Marjorie Barnard, 30 April 1982, Barnard’s uncollected papers.

<sup>35</sup> Jackie Yowell to Drusilla Modjeska, Modjeska’s papers, NLA MS 8320/11.

<sup>36</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Bill Reed, 20 August 1982, Barnard’s uncollected papers.

<sup>37</sup> See Antonia Wilkinson, ‘Virago Press and the Alteration of Publishing Culture’, *The Culture of Publishing*, [www.brookes.ac.uk/schools/apm/publishing/culture](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/schools/apm/publishing/culture).

Marjorie Barnard). Marjorie is evidently in a state of high excitement about the forthcoming publication...<sup>38</sup>

When the Virago edition was printed, the third 'Tomorrow' was restored, thus strengthening the Shakespearian reference, discussed here in the previous section. On the 'Notes On Cuts' page at the beginning of the edition, it is stated that: "The Georgian House edition was published as *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, the third "Tomorrow" having been dropped by the publishers without the authors' permission."<sup>39</sup> This account does not completely correspond with Barnard's, who asserted that permission was granted, albeit reluctantly.<sup>40</sup>

Another letter to Modjeska from Callil seven months later, on 19 August 1983, has a different tone. Callil wrote that she was puzzled that "[t]hings do not look promising on the Marjorie Barnard front":

I'm puzzled about it because John Cody our Australian agent tells me that she seems perfectly happy with us, yet her agent told me she doesn't want to be published by us any more because of Anne Chisholm's introduction. I shall puzzle it through . . .<sup>41</sup>

Even allowing for the slowness of mail between England and Australia, it is strange that Callil was apparently unaware that the book had already been launched in Australia by the time she wrote this letter; Vera Murdoch's diary records the event on Tuesday, 16 August 1983: "THE DAY T.T.T. launched by Dame L. Kramer."<sup>42</sup>

Further documents and letters confirm that Barnard was not happy with the Virago

---

<sup>38</sup> Carmen Callil to Drusilla Modjeska, 14 January 1983, Modjeska's papers, NLA MS 8320/6.

<sup>39</sup> See the ninth page (unnumbered) in *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, London: Virago Press: 1983.

<sup>40</sup> See for instance Barnard's letter to Eleanor Dark, 21 September 1947, NLA MSS 4998. Some of it is reproduced in this chapter on p.122.

<sup>41</sup> Carmen Callil to Drusilla Modjeska, 19 August 1983, *ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> Vera Murdoch's diary, Barnard's uncollected papers.

edition — particularly the Introduction — but they do not clarify the reasons for her unhappiness.

The presentation of the Virago edition was very different from the earlier Georgian House edition. The cover reproduces a detail from the painting 'Mirmande' by Dorrit Black, a South Australian painter who was a contemporary of Barnard and Eldershaw.<sup>43</sup> The hill-top tower that Black painted is in the south of France, but the naturalistic browns and greens suggest Australia, perhaps even the Riverina and the Tenth Commune. It is a painting that, at the time of its creation, both looked to the future, with its modernist influences, and suggested a long-ago time, of walled cities and castles.<sup>44</sup> In these senses it evokes Knarf's world perfectly, with its mix of futuristic technology and the simple rural lifestyle of the past. This cover pulls the focus to the outer novel of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* and to the peace of the twenty-fourth century: the world of Harry Munster, the Depression and World Wars cannot be seen.

A header on the front cover of the Virago edition announces that the book is one of Virago's Modern Classics, and the last two pages of the edition list other titles in the series, including a selection from Christina Stead, Henry Handel Richardson and Miles Franklin. Most, although not all, of the titles are written by women and more

<sup>43</sup> Black was born three years after Barnard and Eldershaw in 1891. In *Stravinski's Lunch*, Drusilla Modjeska notes that an unusually large number of talented and later well-known Australian women artists were born from 1880-1900 (Sydney: Picador, 1999: 182). It is possible that Virago deliberately chose a cover for *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* from an artist of Barnard Eldershaw's period, and Modjeska could have advised them. 'Mirmande' was painted in 1928, the year that Barnard and Eldershaw wrote their first novel, *A House is Built*.

<sup>44</sup> Ian North writes that Black painted 'Mirmande' at Andre Lhote's Summer School at Mirmande, near Montelimar. Lhote was considered the 'academician of Cubism', and, according to North, 'Mirmande' reflects his influence, as it is "organized on a system of diagonal lines in a manner somewhat comparable to one of his published diagrams." Ian North, *The Art of Dorrit Black*, South Melbourne: Macmillan, The Art Gallery of South Australia, 1979: 32-35. The simple, geometric lines aptly illustrate the austerity of Knarf's world.

recent authors, such as Margaret Atwood and Tillie Olsen, are also included. The last page of the book lists the Virago Advisory Group, including the Spare Rib Collective and well-known feminists such as Germaine Greer and Angela Carter. If a reader did not already associate the edition with a feminist publishing initiative from Virago's distinctive green cover, then these additional details would make some of the philosophies of the publishing house explicit.

The blurb on the back of the book is detailed. It begins with a quotation from the 'Nocturne' section, which examines the connection between the past and the present. Unlike the Georgian House edition, attention is given to the futuristic elements of the novel, and to its exploration of "technocratic socialism." The edition is heralded as the "full uncensored text" — and this is also bannered on the front cover. Inexplicably, it is claimed that the book gives "a prophetic vision of what was to follow—the nuclear shadow which is our common inheritance." The Virago version of *Tomorrow* makes no mention of nuclear war or its aftermath. However, the Georgian House edition includes a reference in one of the pages that are not included in the Virago edition: "Russia declared war, the long-maturing atomic bomb ripened and fell" (p.364). While perhaps the writer of this blurb had read the Georgian House edition and had made an error about the content of the Virago edition, it is unlikely that this is the sole reason behind the mistaken impression. It is more probable that this writer wished to portray the book as topical, as did Anne Chisholm who in the Introduction drew a comparison between *Tomorrow's* right wing invasion and the dismissal of Gough Whitlam. In 1983 the Cold War had not yet ended, protesters were blockading Pine Gap and Patrick White delivered his famous speech 'Australians in a Nuclear War'. Moreover, some of the details given about the Tenth Commune could be construed as having associations with nuclear technology and its ramifications. The Commune is described as emphasising



scientific analysis, bureaucracy, power and secrecy; many of the communes have been established inland for reasons unspecified, and sick people like Illil are “herded out of sight in nice, scientific, fool-proof prisons, weeded out and kept separate so that they’ll die off and the world will get cleaner and cleaner”(TTT p.427). Given that it is unlikely that Barnard and Eldershaw would have been aware of the effects of radioactive fallout in 1942, it is also unlikely that they would have intended to portray the Tenth Commune as being under a nuclear shadow; the allusions probably pertain to eugenics, a popular notion prior to World War Two amongst left-wing writers of Barnard Eldershaw’s acquaintance. The Virago blurb encourages readers to interpret the sections of the book about the twenty-fourth century with an entirely different set of expectations to those who read the Georgian House edition, even though the text for these sections in both editions is the same.

Other details on the back cover also suggest the sort of novel that readers can anticipate and appear intended to attract a definite type of reader: it is stated that Marjorie Barnard and Flora Eldershaw were “personally involved in the radical left in the 1920s and 30s.” In Barnard’s case in particular, this is stretching the truth, as many would assume that the “radical left” in this period would involve the Communist Party. Naming Barnard and Eldershaw’s political activities in this way also risks perpetuating the mistaken conception promoted in the 1950s: that the Fellowship of Australian Writers and the Commonwealth Literary Fund, which both Barnard and Eldershaw were involved with, were directly linked to the Communist Party. While it would be difficult, despite Barnard’s later protestations, to read the novel as non-political, those who picked up the book expecting a “party-line” would be disappointed. The pages in the Virago edition containing the Introduction, Notes On Cuts and List Of Cuts Restored also affect the reading of the novel, as they

promote the edition as the full, uncensored text, an inaccuracy that will be explored in Chapter Five.

In the year following Virago's re-publishing of *Tomorrow*, as Virago were arranging to republish Barnard's *The Persimmon Tree*, Barnard wrote several letters expressing confusion over who had been appointed to write the introduction for the book. Barnard had understood that Modjeska would write the introduction, but in fact Elizabeth Riddell was initially appointed. On learning of this, Barnard wrote to Riddell explaining some of her reservations:

I have nothing to do with Virago's ideas of the author's work, getting an introductory write up. The first I knew of this was when I received the first copy of my book TT&T republished by them in which there was a preface written by someone I had never heard of. It had never been submitted to me before publication and is not strictly accurate.<sup>45</sup>

With no further records, it is impossible to know precisely what aspects of Chisholm's introduction were found by Barnard to be "not strictly accurate." She may have objected to the account of the censoring, which stated that the censors "confined their cuts to the fictional ending", when in fact this was the only portion of the book that the censors saw. The introduction is written from a feminist and a political perspective; it opens with a discussion of the "extraordinary flowering of writing talent" by women novelists between the two world wars and then links the rediscovery of these women to the women's movement of the 1960s and '70s. It also states that the "whole book is . . . provocative in the extreme. It reveals Barnard Eldershaw's deep hostility to capitalism, materialism, and competition."<sup>46</sup> As already noted, it is possible that Barnard had objections to perspectives on the novel that emphasised feminism or radical politics, since she did not feel that they

<sup>45</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, undated, Barnard's uncollected papers.

<sup>46</sup> Anne Chisholm, introduction to M. Barnard Eldershaw, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, London: Virago Press, 1983:vii-xiv.

matched her own. There are a few other small mistakes such as “They [Barnard and Eldershaw] published nothing until they were over thirty.” Barnard had in fact published a book of children’s stories, *The Ivory Gate*, when she was twenty-three.<sup>47</sup>

Another undated newsletter, from the Society of Women Writers (Australia), reiterates that Barnard felt she had not been adequately consulted about the Virago edition of *Tomorrow*. A section of it reads:

The last M. Barnard Eldershaw title, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, came out in 1947 and here is a warning to all writers to be constantly on the alert. The book has been republished recently without Marjorie’s permission and she did not receive royalties.<sup>48</sup>

The correspondence detailed here shows that Barnard was in fact well aware of the republication of the novel. However, her claim that she did not receive royalties does appear to be correct. A letter in Barnard’s uncollected papers from a Sydney solicitor dated 22 February 1984 states, without explanation, that *Tomorrow* had fallen into the public domain and thus the copyright had expired and Barnard was not entitled to royalties.<sup>49</sup>

It can be seen then that although Barnard did live to see another publication of *Tomorrow*, the circumstances were, from her point of view, far from satisfactory. Although she must have given approval for the edition to go ahead, she believed that she had not been given the opportunity to comment on the introduction, and she did

<sup>47</sup> Marjorie Barnard, *The Ivory Gate*, illust. Leyshon White, Melbourne: H.H. Champion, Australasian Author’s Agency, 1920.

<sup>48</sup> In Barnard’s uncollected papers.

<sup>49</sup> In 2000 no Virago archives from the 1980s were extant, due to the company being taken over by Little Brown, and it was thus not possible to locate Barnard’s contract, if one had existed, for the republication of *Tomorrow*. While it is strange that the copyright for *Tomorrow* would expire while Barnard was still alive, perhaps this can be explained by the fact that Georgian House had relinquished publishing rights in 1957.

not receive royalties. Moreover, as she had feared, the existence of the Virago edition meant that most people felt that the “full uncensored edition” had been produced and that the injustices of the past had been rectified. It is equally apparent that Barnard’s readings of *Tomorrow* changed over time, and that she was subject to the vicissitudes of memory, both in her recollections of the book and of its editorial history. Ultimately, Barnard’s accusations of not being informed and consulted about the republication of *Tomorrow* were an uncanny echo of the claims Barnard made about Georgian House, who had ostensibly failed to inform her of the censorship until the eve of publication.<sup>50</sup> It is worth recalling the lines in *Tomorrow* about the unreliability of memory: “We change, and memory changes with us. The history of memory. No one ever wrote that, did they? Let it lie in the mind and the simplest fact undergoes change” (p.93). By the time that Virago republished *Tomorrow*, stimulating a new flurry of interest in its surviving author, Barnard was very old. Many of the late interviews describe Barnard as frail, and inclined to ramble or lose concentration during conversation. In the interview for *Yacker 2*, Candida Baker wrote “A physically frail eighty-nine, she suffers from a sub-thyroid condition and is often forgetful”:

Murdoch, who is as talkative as Barnard is reticent, often answered on Barnard’s behalf, prompting her when a question elicited the response, ‘I don’t know’, or ‘I don’t remember’.<sup>51</sup>

Barnard’s failing physical and mental capabilities need to be taken in account when reading the correspondence above, as it is likely that some of the confusions

---

<sup>50</sup> Barnard claimed in 1970 that she and Eldershaw “knew nothing of the censoring until the eve of publication [when] we were faced with an alternative, to accept the book in its altered form or forego publication altogether.” ‘How *Tomorrow* and *Tomorrow* Came To Be Written’, *Meanjin Quarterly* 29.3. Spring 1970: 30. Maryanne Dever notes that this was unlikely, given the existence of Harris’s letters to the authors informing them of the censorship, in 1944. ‘The Case For Flora Eldershaw’, *Hecate* 15. 2. 1989: 47. The extent of post-censorship revision to *Tomorrow*, as discussed in the remainder of this study, also reinforces the improbability of this claim.

<sup>51</sup> Candida Baker, *Yacker 2*: 31.

described were the result of memory failures and misunderstandings on her part. Conversely, some of Barnard's letters demonstrate that she was, at times, lucid up until the final years of her life. However, a detailed impression of the agreement leading up to the Virago publication is occasionally obscured or obliterated by the meandering nature of Barnard's memory, which, like all memories, tended to have an inconsistent relationship with other documented versions of the truth.

This chapter can be seen as an account of the many reconstruction projects to do with *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*. Some elements of this "story" of *Tomorrow's* publication history involve fundamental reappraisals, as this material shows that *Tomorrow* has never been published as Marjorie Barnard wished it to be done. Crucially, this chapter also demonstrates the interrelationship between readings of the novel and the history of the text itself. In various publication enterprises, *Tomorrow* has been packaged as a novel about life during World War Two; as a politically provocative novel; and as a novel that has been retrieved from various forms of silencing and censorship. In promoting these ideas about the novel's content, the texts themselves have been affected, particularly if the bindings, covers and other bibliographic apparatus are considered to be part of the text. As will be discussed further, Edgar Harris succeeded in muting some of the speculative aspects of the book and foregrounding the "present day narrative", while Virago were successful in situating the novel within a tradition of feminist and radical political literature. However, the existence of the almost completely unread 1957 typescript and the accompanying letters both complicates questions about the authorship, production and reading dealt with thus far, and provides opportunities for fresh perspectives on these issues. While the fallibility of memory, gaps in knowledge and differences of interpretation have led to discursive studies of Eldershaw's and Barnard's lives and work, the 1957 typescript gives

some concrete evidence about Barnard's final authorial intentions. Nonetheless, as will be seen further in the following chapter, the issue of the authorship and ownership of *Tomorrow* remains a contentious one.

## Chapter Four: Authorship, Authority, Ownership

*"In many ways, the editorial enterprise starts with . . . the desire to speak with the dead, to hear in their full authenticity the voices of those dead authors whose textual intentions we are bound to recover and whose textual corpuses we resurrect with our carefully considered methods."*

Stephanie Trigg, 'Speaking With The Dead', *Editing In Australia*, ed. Paul Eggert, Canberra: English Department University College ADFA, 1990: 137-8.

# One: 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow Was Different': Reconsidering Aspects of the Collaboration

*"The real author was neither one of us: a fist is more than the sum of its fingers . . . Laura was my left hand, and I was hers. We wrote the book together. It's a left-handed book. That's why one of us is always out of sight, whichever way you look at it."*

Margaret Atwood, *The Blind Assassin*, London: Bloomsbury, 2000: 512-13.



To date, Maryanne Dever, in her doctoral thesis,<sup>1</sup> and in two related papers<sup>2</sup>, is the only scholar to argue that Flora Eldershaw made a creative as well as a critical contribution to *Tomorrow*. While Eldershaw's participation in the writing of the novel was unquestioned during her lifetime, in the 1970s and '80s it was commonly believed that Barnard had written most, or all, of *Tomorrow*. What is less well known is that Barnard and her companion, Vera Murdoch, were exclusively responsible for perpetuating this belief, despite the existence of documents that contradict their assertions. While Dever's thesis comprehensively examines the collaboration between Barnard and Eldershaw, new information in Barnard's uncollected papers reveal possible reasons for Barnard's dismissal of Eldershaw's co-authorship of *Tomorrow*. Some of the newly uncovered documents also strengthen Dever's contentions that *Tomorrow* was a collaborative effort, and that misconceptions about the collaboration have effectively resulted in Eldershaw being written out of literary history.

As will be discussed at greater length, the uncovering of a hitherto unknown version of *Tomorrow*, found after the death of Murdoch, further problematises inquiries into the authorship of *Tomorrow*. As discussed in the previous chapter this version was almost certainly typed after the death of Eldershaw in 1956, making it a final authoritative version of the novel. Since Eldershaw died before this last version was created, it is also far more the work of Marjorie Barnard than previous versions of the novel. Exclusive consideration of this document would miss many significant aspects in its complex collaborative production. Crucially, it would sideline Eldershaw's involvement, which, as this chapter shows and Chapter Five consolidates, would distort Eldershaw's central position in *Tomorrow's* creation. This chapter therefore seeks to emphasise the number

---

<sup>1</sup> Maryanne Dever, 'Subject to Authority: A Study of M. Barnard Eldershaw', Unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1993.

<sup>2</sup> Maryanne Dever, 'The Case for Flora Eldershaw', *Hecate*, 15, No.2, 1989: 38-48; "No Mine and Thine but Ours': Finding 'M. Barnard Eldershaw'", *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, 14:1, 1995: 65-75.

and variety of documents which suggest both that Eldershaw did contribute equally to *Tomorrow*, and the extent to which Barnard, in her later life, repeated her claim to the exclusive authorship of *Tomorrow*.

All reviews and articles published during Eldershaw's lifetime assumed that *Tomorrow* was a joint effort, like *A House Is Built*, *Green Memory*, *The Glasshouse* and *Plaque With Laurel*. Most reviewers seemed to consider that the collaboration on *Tomorrow* was indicated by the pseudonym, as it had been with the previous novels. P.H. Partridge in his 1947 review even shortens the pseudonym to 'Eldershaw'.<sup>3</sup> It was also not uncommon for reviewers to refer to the two writers as a single authorial entity. H.M. Green, for instance, in his study of the authors in *A History of Australian Literature*, wrote: "though Barnard Eldershaw has not Furphy's talent or personality, her talent is considerable and she is a literary artist as he is not."<sup>4</sup> Frank Dalby Davison also referred to M. Barnard Eldershaw as "this author" in his review of the novel.<sup>5</sup> In her dissertation, Maryanne Dever criticises this general tendency "to equate 'literature' and 'literary authority' with the individual". As Dever notes, in the case of M. Barnard Eldershaw, the constructedness of literary subjects is emphasised both by the pseudonymity and by the collaboration:

...The often problematic nature of M. Barnard Eldershaw's literary reputation derives at least in part from the acknowledged presence of a collaboration — the one which is not one.<sup>6</sup>

This sense of the 'two in one' in M. Barnard Eldershaw's collaboration was something that Barnard encouraged consistently, but in differing ways, at various points in her professional life. In the early stages of M. Barnard Eldershaw's joint career, as both Dever and Rorabacher have noted, the two

<sup>3</sup> P.H. Partridge, 'The Shape of Things to Come', *Meanjin*, 6:4, 1947: 251.

<sup>4</sup> H.M. Green, *A History of Australian Literature Vol 11 1923-1950*, Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1961: 1104.

<sup>5</sup> Frank Dalby Davison, 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow', *Meanjin*, 6: 4, 1947: 249.

<sup>6</sup> Dever, 'Subject to Authority': 1, 3.

authors were reluctant to discuss how the collaboration worked, or how their respective contributions might be identified. Both authors burnt their letters to one another over a period of time; the uncollected papers of Barnard's that were found after Murdoch's death also included an empty folder on which was written: "to be destroyed after my death." Presumably Murdoch did so, and if some correspondence between the two did survive until this point, it is now unlikely that any is extant. While the destroyed correspondence may have been intimate in nature, its destruction also obscured any details about the mechanisms of collaboration that personal testimony might have helped to illuminate.

When Barnard placed her papers and some of the M. Barnard Eldershaw manuscripts and typescripts in the Mitchell Library in 1960, she left handwritten disclaimers for researchers seeking to disentangle the collaborative efforts of M. Barnard Eldershaw. At the beginning of the manuscript of *A House Is Built*, for instance, she wrote: "This manuscript is alternately in the handwriting of each author but if anyone thought that this was a key to the collaboration they would be vastly mistaken."<sup>7</sup> A note at the beginning of *Green Memory* reads similarly: "Please note [sic] the handwriting is no indication to the composition of the various parts."<sup>8</sup>

Barnard's implicit suggestion here, that it was impossible to disentangle the ideas and contributions of two individuals, was repeated in her 1975 article, 'The gentle art of collaboration'. "There was no mine and thine but ours", she wrote. "This not only excluded proprietary rights on either side but gave the book its own unity":

---

<sup>7</sup> Marjorie Barnard's papers (hereafter "Barnard's papers"), MSS 451/1.

<sup>8</sup> Barnard's papers, MSS 451/1.

Curiously it seems to follow that when two people have worked and thought together on a book their prose styles even become similar. They unconsciously take up from one another.<sup>9</sup>

However, while Barnard could have appeared to be emphasising a similar sentiment in correspondence with Clem Christesen in 1970, there are indications there of a markedly different attitude to authorship and ownership. In relation to Robert Burns' article, which Christesen was publishing alongside Barnard's piece on *Tomorrow*, Christesen asked: "By the way, Bob has used the term 'authors'. Should it be 'author' or 'authors' for M. Barnard Eldershaw (with a footnote referring to the collaboration)?"<sup>10</sup> Barnard replied that the author of the article agreed with her that it should be 'author' and not 'authors': "A book is only weakened by drawing too much attention to collaboration and its seams."<sup>11</sup>

Curiously, Christesen did not heed her request, and the article appeared with an indication of plural authorship and a footnote stating: "'M. Barnard Eldershaw' was the pseudonym of Marjorie Barnard and the late Flora Eldershaw."<sup>12</sup> Significantly, the majority of the article relates to the single author of the narrative inside the narrative of *Tomorrow*, Knarf.<sup>13</sup> As indicated in Chapter Two, Barnard's 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came to be Written', 'disclosed' for the first time that the book had been censored, and that Barnard had written the majority of the book by herself. Under these circumstances, Barnard's suggestion that authorship should be indicated in the singular does not imply that she considered that the 'two' in M. Barnard Eldershaw were indivisible. Rather,

<sup>9</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'The Gentle Art of Collaboration', *Ink No.2: 50th Anniversary Edition*, Ed. Hilarie Lindsay, Sydney: Society of Women Writers, 1977: 126.

<sup>10</sup> Clem Christesen to Marjorie Barnard, 16 January 1970, *Meanjin* Archives, Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne (hereafter "*Meanjin* Archives").

<sup>11</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 23 February, 1970, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>12</sup> This is not to suggest that Christesen thought *Tomorrow* was a collaborative effort. In an interview Christesen stated that Barnard had told him that she had written the book. (Clem Christesen to Rachel Cunneen, 7 October 1999).

<sup>13</sup> The article was Robert Burns' "Flux and Fixity": M. Barnard Eldershaw's 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow', *Meanjin* 3, 1970: 320-7.

it is a request that the attention to collaborative effort in the novel be minimised, encouraging the assumption that the work was not collaborative. As will be seen, it was only after the death of Eldershaw that ownership, as well as authorship, came into question. With the unity broken absolutely, it was easier for Barnard's own contribution to be privileged.

If early reviewers of *Tomorrow* were sometimes intrigued or confused by its complicated authorship, they never suggested that Eldershaw had not contributed equally to the book. *The Sunday Times* in London, for instance, wrote that the book was by "the two Australian ladies who write as M. Barnard Eldershaw."<sup>14</sup> Other reviews, like those of Colin Roderick, J.D.B. Miller and Shawn O'Leary,<sup>15</sup> all referred to the "authors". Letters from the period also indicate that literary friends believed that Eldershaw was the co-author of *Tomorrow* and that she had put a lot of work into it. A letter from Vance Palmer to Frank Dalby Davison in September 1947, for instance, assumes that Eldershaw was central to *Tomorrow's* creation. For unknown reasons, Palmer calls the novel, "Flora's Magazine book", but the date of the letter and its contents indicate that he is referring to *Tomorrow*:

Flora's Magazine book has come and I'm beginning to go through it again.<sup>16</sup> I'm impressed — more so, even, than when I read it in manuscript. What a lot of thought and imagination they've poured into it. Naturally I shy off abstractions and fantasy, so that I didn't come to it quite sympathetically, yet I've been carried away by it. There's more of both Flora and Marjorie in it than in anything they've yet done.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Anonymous, *Sunday Times*, London, 27 February 1949, ( page no. obscured).

<sup>15</sup> Respectively, Colin Roderick, 'This Battered Caravanserai', *Southerly*, 9:4, 1948: 222-4; John Donald Bruce Miller, 'A Footnote On *Tomorrow*', *Meanjin*, 7:2, 1948: 125-7; Shawn O'Leary, 'Fall Of The City Of Sydney', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 September, 1947:13.

<sup>16</sup> Vance Palmer had read the manuscript of *Tomorrow* in 1943. An undated diary entry, for 10 May 1945, in Nettie Palmer's diaries reads: "Vance read the manuscript eighteen months ago, while I was in Canberra"

<sup>17</sup> Vance Palmer to Frank Dalby Davison, 2 September 1947, reprinted in *Letters of Vance and Nettie Palmer 1915-1963*, Ed. Vivian Smith, Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1977: 190.

Palmer reiterated these sentiments nearly ten years later, in his tribute to Eldershaw after her death. Praising, amongst other qualities, her energy, clear-sightedness and “sense of abundance”, Palmer concluded his tribute by writing, “And more than a trace of all these qualities is to be found in the books of which she was co-author with Marjorie Barnard, especially their last novel, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow...*”<sup>18</sup>

Katharine Susannah Prichard was also under the impression that Eldershaw was *Tomorrow's* co-author. She wrote to Miles Franklin in December 1947 that Eldershaw, “attaches a lot of importance to the book. Says she put everything she’s got into it. And I think she has. There’s some fine writing in the first descriptions of Sydney.”<sup>19</sup>

The first publishers of *TT* considered the work collaborative. As Dever remarks, all correspondence from Georgian House assumes that the work is a joint effort. It is Eldershaw’s — and not Barnard’s — handwriting on the surviving response to Harris’ now infamous question: “Are you prepared to risk your reputation as front rank Australian creative writers for the sake of ideology?”<sup>20</sup> Like Harris, Eldershaw wrote in the plural in her reply:

As you surmise, we did write the last part with our eyes open to the risk that details of the immediate future would invalidate the sequence of events in the last part of the inner novel. It was a risk we had to take if we were to write the novel.<sup>21</sup>

Other readers of the censored version of *Tomorrow* must have assumed Flora Eldershaw’s authorship. The Victorian State Library copy of the English Phoenix House edition, published in 1948, contains Flora Eldershaw’s signature, but not

<sup>18</sup> Vance Palmer, in ‘Tributes to Flora Eldershaw’, *Meanjin* 4, 1956: 390-1.

<sup>19</sup> Katharine Susannah Prichard to Miles Franklin, 11 December 1947, Miles Franklin’s papers, ML MSS 364/21/307.

<sup>20</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 12 April 1944, Barnard’s papers, ML MSS 451/5.

<sup>21</sup> Flora Eldershaw to Edgar Harris, draft, undated, Barnard’s papers.

Marjorie Barnard's. While the reason for this omission may have been a practical one — perhaps Barnard was simply not available at the time — the effect is to symbolically attribute the “ownership” of the text to Eldershaw.<sup>22</sup>

Thus, as can be seen, the suggestion that Barnard had written most of *Tomorrow* originated in an article written by Barnard over 20 years after the novel had first been published. In 1970 she wrote ‘How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came to be Written’ for *Meanjin Quarterly*. The piece included a paragraph which was to have far-reaching ramifications:

This novel was to be written in collaboration with Flora Eldershaw. We often discussed it but from the first I think she was sceptical about the viability of the idea. She did not feel the same compulsion as I did to write it. The collaboration broke down almost from the beginning, not from any quarrel, disagreement, or failure of friendship but by reason of war and geography. Flora left Sydney, at first for Canberra and later for Melbourne. She was extremely busy. So was I. We were both drawn into the war effort. We saw one another only at rare intervals, letter writing was almost impossible. I went on alone and the book was to suffer from the lack, most particularly, of her critical judgement.<sup>23</sup>

Louise E. Rorabacher referred to this paragraph in her 1973 book, *Marjorie Barnard and M. Barnard Eldershaw*, the only published full-length study of the writers. She was uncertain of the paragraph's veracity, as will be seen later, but nonetheless included the following statement, which gave Barnard the benefit of the doubt:

A quarter of a century later Marjorie, never prone to discuss shares in the partnership, admitted to me frankly that while they planned and discussed the book together, she herself did all the writing. This is credible, since with her greater leisure she had apparently done far more than half of the actual composition of the two novels that preceded it and, as we shall see later, much of the writing as well as the research of the three intervening histories as well.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> In Special Collections, State Library, Victoria. The signature is in ball-point pen, which suggests that the book was signed some time after its publication.

<sup>23</sup> Marjorie Barnard, ‘How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written’, *Meanjin* 3, 1970: 329.

<sup>24</sup> Louise E. Rorabacher, *Marjorie Barnard and M. Barnard Eldershaw*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973: 66.

It also should be noted that Barnard's other claim, that she was more responsible for the "actual composition" of many Barnard Eldershaw works, was made repeatedly in the 1970s and 1980s. A short film was made about Barnard in 1975, two years after Rorabacher's book was published. In it Barnard claimed that Flora was "not interested" in *Tomorrow*, because it was "too big" and "not cogent". Eldershaw had "opted out of the collaboration" but it had been "foolish to think up another name" as she had only "warmed up" her own name as a historian, although in actual fact Barnard had had a book of short stories published under her own name in 1943.<sup>25</sup> This is reminiscent of Barnard's suggestion to Christesen that the indication of double authorship in the pseudonym was not accurate. With these three separate claims — the *Meanjin* article, the Rorabacher interview and the film — the idea that Barnard had written *Tomorrow* by herself began to gain credence.

Fifteen years after the *Meanjin* paragraph had been written, it was so commonly accepted that Barnard was the primary creator of *Tomorrow* that the novel's entry in *The Oxford Companion to Australian Literature*, which was published in the following year, stated that Barnard was "the predominant author" and cited the *Meanjin* article as its source.<sup>26</sup> The impression had been solidified by many interviews with Barnard at the time that *Tomorrow* was republished by Virago. This extract from an interview from the *National Times* in 1983 is a good example of Barnard's claims:

But *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* was different. I wrote most of it myself. It took a very long time. Flora was not very interested. She was in Canberra most of the time I was writing it.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Marjorie Barnard interviewed by Elizabeth Riddell, *Marjorie Barnard*, 17 April 1975, produced and directed by Keith Salvat, Keisal Films.

<sup>26</sup> *The Oxford Companion to Australian Literature* [1985], Second Edition, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994: 750.

<sup>27</sup> Kristen Williamson, 'The Remarkable Marjorie Barnard', *The National Times*, 19-25 August 1983: 32.



This version of events was presented so frequently in the early 1980s that repetition gave it the appearance of fact, as demonstrated by the following list of quotations: “Miss Barnard said Flora Eldershaw, who died in 1956, acted mainly in a critical capacity”; “But by the time *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* came to be written . . . Eldershaw had moved to a wartime job in Canberra and the collaboration ceased to be an active one. This book is essentially Marjorie Barnard’s work”; “M. Barnard Eldershaw’ comprised the joint authorship of Marjorie Barnard and Flora Eldershaw, but ‘Tomorrow’ is now accepted as being almost wholly written by Marjorie Barnard”.<sup>28</sup>

Thus, the impression that Barnard wrote the majority of *Tomorrow* began with her own assertion in 1970. Her continued assertion of authorship in articles and interviews meant that few doubted its truth by the mid 1980s. Academic work by Humphrey McQueen and Rob Darby assumed that Barnard was the sole author.<sup>29</sup> Most recently, in 1993, *The Encyclopedia of Science Fiction* noted that the novel had been written by Barnard alone.<sup>30</sup> Some academic writers, however, maintained ambivalence: Drusilla Modjeska wrote that *Tomorrow* was written with Flora Eldershaw, but noted that “Marjorie Barnard claims to have written most of the novel.”<sup>31</sup> David Carter began his 1989 paper by stating that

<sup>28</sup> Cosetta Bosi, ‘Writer Beats Censor After 40 Year Wait’ in Flora Eldershaw’s papers, ML MSS 5601 (hereafter Eldershaw’s papers); Barbara Jefferis, ‘The Censorship of Yesterday Hid A Great Tomorrow’, *Weekend Australian*, 10-11 September 1983: 14; Colin Steele, ‘Prophetic Classic Restored’, *Canberra Times*, 22 October 1983 (page no. obscured).

<sup>29</sup> See Humphrey McQueen, ‘Memory and Imagination’, *Social Alternatives*, 8, No.3, 1989 : 20-22 and Rob Darby, ‘While Freedom Lives: Political preoccupations in the writing of Marjorie Barnard and Frank Dalby Davison, 1935-1947’, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Australian Defence Force Academy, NSW, 1980: 441. While Darby notes Rorabacher’s reservations, he states that, “it seems reasonable to conclude that Barnard’s share of the partnership was far greater with *TTT* than with other ventures, and also that the novel was more an expression of her own viewpoint than that of Eldershaw.” In his study of *Tomorrow* he refers exclusively to Barnard as the author of the book.

<sup>30</sup> John Clute et al., *The Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*, London, New York: Saint Martin’s Press, 1993.

<sup>31</sup> Drusilla Modjeska, *Exiles At Home: Australian Women Writers 1925-1945*, [1981], Second Edition, North Ryde: CollinsAngus & Robertson, 1991: 242, 244.

the novel was M. Barnard Eldershaw's, but his reliance on Barnard's *Meanjin* article as a source meant that his focus was on Barnard's input into *Tomorrow*, and on the impact that the novel had on Barnard's writing career.<sup>32</sup> Jill Roe gave Barnard the credit for the novel's diagnosis of the inter-war years but wondered, "if it is the case that responsibility for the novel is hers, though it seems that memory has played small but protective tricks here."<sup>33</sup>

In 1973, Louise Rorabacher had also expressed ambivalence. Despite reprinting the paragraph in question from the *Meanjin* article and giving it some weight, she also wrote that the account was at odds with "the contemporary record". She cited a letter by Barnard from December 1941, in which Barnard wrote that the novel "should be finished by the end of the year", since she had just spent ten days at Eldershaw's flat in Canberra. Rorabacher questioned why, even if Eldershaw was at work, this "didn't provide some opportunity for the two to continue to shape together the now nearly finished book."<sup>34</sup>

It is difficult to ascertain whether the book really was "nearly finished" by the end of 1941, given that events in Barnard and Eldershaw's personal lives and in broader historical terms impinged upon the book's completion after this date. Many of the historical events which are recounted in the novel — the fall of Singapore; the bombing of Darwin and Broome; the arrival of MacArthur and the Americans and, in the first edition of the book, the fall of the atomic bomb on Japan — occurred after 1941. However, as *Tomorrow* was redrafted many times, it is possible, though unlikely, that an early version of the novel was nearly complete in 1941. Given that a significant portion of *Tomorrow* must

---

<sup>32</sup> See David Carter, "Current History Looks Apocalyptic": Barnard Eldershaw, Utopia and the Literary Intellectual, 1930s-1940s', *Australian Literary Studies*, 14: 2, 1989: 174-87.

<sup>33</sup> Jill Roe, 'The Historical Imagination and Its Enemies: M. Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*', *Meanjin*, 43:2, 1984 : 245.

<sup>34</sup> Rorabacher: 66.

have been written after this point, any work completed at this stage would have been significantly different from the text that was submitted for publication.

Rorabacher also made several observations that are crucial to any investigation of the collaborative nature of *Tomorrow*. The reason that Barnard gave most frequently for the collaboration on *Tomorrow* breaking down was one of “geography”; in fact, as Rorabacher noted, Eldershaw returned to Sydney after only six months in Canberra.<sup>35</sup> Barnard's *Meanjin* account obfuscates this point; it is phrased in a way which implies that Eldershaw went straight from Canberra to the Melbourne appointment. However, from mid 1942 to the beginning of 1944 Eldershaw was in the Sydney office of the Division of Industrial Welfare,<sup>36</sup> so the writers both spent most of their time in Sydney until the novel was completed. Evidence indicating that Eldershaw was living primarily in Sydney between 1942 and 1944 comes from an account in Eldershaw's own hand, now among her papers in the Mitchell Library. It appears to be a draft for her curriculum vitae, as she refers to herself in the third person. It reads, in part,

...appointed June 1940 as Research Officer in Division of Post-War Reconstruction. Transferred to Division of Industrial Welfare in *January 1942 and at first her work was in the Sydney office of the Division . . .* Other work at this stage included . . . supervision of other staff in the N.S.W. office of the Division and control of the Departmental Library. *At the beginning of 1944, transferred to Central Office of the Dept. in Melbourne and was promoted to Controller of the Personnel Practice Branch of the Division.* [emphases mine]<sup>37</sup>

The whereabouts of Eldershaw in these years has been confused by the fact that she did initially transfer to Industrial Welfare in Melbourne at the beginning of 1942, but then returned to Sydney. As Barnard wrote to Eleanor Dark:

---

<sup>35</sup> Rorabacher: 67.

<sup>36</sup> Undated, biographical note in Eldershaw's hand, Eldershaw's papers, 5601/1.

<sup>37</sup> In Eldershaw's papers 5601/1.

No, Teenie is not in Canberra now, she has gone to the Industrial Welfare branch of the Department of Labour & National Service in Melbourne, will be there for a couple of months and then hopes to be transferred to Sydney.<sup>38</sup>

As Eldershaw was reappointed as President of the Fellowship of Australian Writers in Sydney in May, and her address in July was in Wollstonecraft, a suburb of Sydney,<sup>39</sup> it can be inferred that Eldershaw was indeed transferred back to Sydney. Rorabacher quotes several letters written by Barnard in this period, including an account of Eldershaw reading the novel aloud to Barnard and Davison, and the remark, "It's lovely to have her [Eldershaw] back . . . There's a lot of work in front of her here, I fear — the novel, the novel."<sup>40</sup> In October 1943 Barnard wrote to Dark that "our very large novel *To-morrow and To-morrow and To-morrow* is at last finished."<sup>41</sup> As correspondence with *Tomorrow's* Georgian House publisher, Edgar Harris, is dated from March 1944,<sup>42</sup> it is almost certain that the first typescript of *Tomorrow* was submitted before Eldershaw even left for Melbourne permanently.<sup>43</sup>

Dever has argued convincingly that other letters and documents indicated that Eldershaw spent much of 1942-44 in Sydney, but it appears that she was not aware of this document, and of Eldershaw's appointment with Industrial Welfare in Sydney. Instead, she cites minutes from the Sydney branch of the Fellowship of Australian Writers, which reveal that Eldershaw was "co-opted to the committee once more in May 1942 'on her return to Sydney'."<sup>44</sup> When

---

<sup>38</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 22 March 1942, Eleanor Dark's papers (hereafter "Dark's papers") NL MSS 4998.

<sup>39</sup> See *As Good As A Yarn With You*, Ed. Carole Ferrier, Oakleigh:Cambridge University Press, 1992 (hereafter *As Good As A Yarn*): 89.

<sup>40</sup> Rorabacher: 67.

<sup>41</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 21 October 1943, Dark's papers, NL MSS 4998, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 106.

<sup>42</sup> See Harris' letters in Barnard's papers MSS 451.

<sup>43</sup> On 17 April 1944, a month after the novel had been censored, Barnard wrote to Eleanor Dark that: "Teenie's address is Suite D, 6 Milson Rd, Cremorne or, in town, Dept Labour & National Service, Welfare Branch, 10th Floor, 39 Martin Place." Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 115.

<sup>44</sup> Dever, 'Subject to Authority': 45.

Rorabacher's and Dever's evidence is combined with Eldershaw's own account, it seems improbable that geography hindered Barnard and Eldershaw's collaboration.

Many other factors did hinder the completion of *Tomorrow*, and many of them were Barnard's. As is now well recorded, after a break of seven years she returned to work in early 1942, first at the Public Library and then at the National Standards and Radiophysics laboratories of the CSIR.<sup>45</sup> Both jobs were a struggle for her and she wrote to Eleanor Dark in April 1942 that "[t]he novel, alas, stands stock still."<sup>46</sup> Barnard's domestic duties were also considerable. As Devanny wrote bluntly in 1943:

We never see Marjorie. Her old mother will persist in taking years to die and makes insistent demands on Marjorie, stupid and childish you know, and besides the girl works at the Fisher Library during the day.<sup>47</sup>

Barnard was also twice involved in the writing and delivering of lectures during the creation of *Tomorrow*. The first occasion, in September 1941, involved only four lectures on Australian literature, at the University of Tasmania.<sup>48</sup> The second time, however, in 1942, involved 60 lectures on Australian Cultural Background for the Library School.<sup>49</sup> Dever reprints a letter that Eldershaw wrote during this period as evidence that, on occasion, Eldershaw worked more on *Tomorrow* than Barnard:

Saturday & Sunday were nice & I got on with the novel. . . A letter from Marjorie sends her love. She is working very hard, has about 6 of her 60

---

<sup>45</sup> See for instance Rorabacher: 67, 68.

<sup>46</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 19 April 1942, Dark's papers, NL MSS 4998.

<sup>47</sup> Jean Devanny to Karl Shapiro, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 106. Devanny could have been confused about Barnard's place of work, as by this time Barnard was working for CSIR.

<sup>48</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 18 August 1941: "I'm going to Hobart early next month, about the 9th or 10th, to give 4 lectures on Australian literature in the Univ Tasmania [sic]. Seems to me there must be some mistake, but there it is." Dark's papers NL MSS 4998, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 68.

<sup>49</sup> See Rorabacher: 68.

lectures prepared & feels satisfied with them. She has had to stop work on the novel temporarily to get ahead with the other job.<sup>50</sup>

In 1943 Barnard's collection of short stories, *The Persimmon Tree*, was published. No letters describing its construction survive, but the writing, organising and proofreading of the collection must have cut into the time that Barnard could devote to *Tomorrow*. The other event in 1943 that derailed Barnard's activities for some weeks was a life-threatening bout of pneumonia. She spent several weeks in hospital in July. As Eldershaw wrote to Dark, "[t]he difficulties of her new job, her responsibilities at home, and desperate effort to squeeze in a little time for our poor novel, all combined to lower her resistance to this attack."<sup>51</sup> It appears that the ending of Barnard's relationship with Frank Dalby Davison also precipitated her illness. In a letter to Jean Devanny, she describes how she believed that she "took refuge in pneumonia"<sup>52</sup> when it was clear that the eight-year affair was coming to an end. In sum, Barnard's paid work, her duties at home, her other book, her illness and the end of her relationship with Davison all conspired to make it difficult to complete writing *Tomorrow*.

Eldershaw was also very busy in 1942 and '43, and her working hours would also have made literary efforts difficult. As noted above, she was elected again (the first time had been in 1935) as the President of the Fellowship of Australian Writers in May 1942. Other academics have written about the

---

<sup>50</sup> M. Barnard Eldershaw, *Plaque With Laurel: Essays Reviews and Correspondence*, M. Barnard Eldershaw, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1995: 276. Originally in Palmer Papers, NLA MSS 1174/1/6112.

<sup>51</sup> Flora Eldershaw to Eleanor Dark, 15 July 1942, Dark's papers, NL MSS 4998, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 90.

<sup>52</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 1 January 1947, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 154. This long letter, and a related one on 18 January 1947, are the most substantial pieces of evidence that Barnard had had an eight year affair with Davison. Of its confessional style, Dever suggests, if "Barnard's letters to Jean Devanny regarding her relationship with Frank Dalby Davison are any indication, we can assume that a particular form of intimate, self-revelatory letter has almost certainly been lost." Dever, 'Subject to Authority': 8.

extent of her commitment to and influence with the FAW and other committees, including the Commonwealth Literary Fund advisory committee.<sup>53</sup> Her draft note in the Mitchell Library, possibly intended for a curriculum vitae, also gives some insight into how busy her role as a civil servant was:

Early work was in charge of selection, training and supervision of industrial welfare and personnel officers, at first for Government munitions factories, and later for private industry as well. Other work at this stage included preparation of a conspectus of State's factory legislation, work in the preparation of a report on labour turnover, supervision of other staff in the NSW office of the Division and control of the Departmental Library. At the beginning of 1944, transferred to Central Office of the Dept. in Melbourne and was promoted to Controller of the Personnel Practice Branch of the Division. Duties then covered supervision and development of personnel practice in industry and the initiation and direction of a comprehensive programme of research.<sup>54</sup>

In addition to the work as Controller of Personnel Practice, as Eldershaw recorded, she also acted as Officer-in-Charge of the Publication Section and edited and sub-edited the Division's publications, on topics such as personnel practice, employment procedures and absenteeism, as well as publications from other branches on such issues as lighting, food service and "the use of Colour in Industry." Eldershaw's health, like Barnard's, was often fragile; after 1947 it was to decline steadily, until she was eventually forced to give up work.

However, as early as November 1943, Devanny wrote, of a Fellowship meeting: "Flora in the chair looking very blue and ill, got out of bed to come",<sup>55</sup> so it is possible that Eldershaw's health was a further impediment to the business of novel writing.

All available evidence points to the likelihood that the collaboration, rather than "breaking down" absolutely at any point, continued in stops and starts, with Barnard working on the novel more at some points and Eldershaw at others. This conclusion differs slightly from Dever's, who writes: "[r]ather than the

<sup>53</sup> See Vance Palmer, in 'Tributes to Flora Eldershaw', *Meanjin* 4, 1956: 390.

<sup>54</sup> In Eldershaw's papers MSS 5601/1.

<sup>55</sup> Jean Devanny to Karl Shapiro, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 106.

collaboration having '[broken] down almost from the beginning', it would appear that they continued to work on the novel together despite the irregularities of the war years."<sup>56</sup> Although it is likely that Barnard and Eldershaw would have had to work "together" at some points, the evidence given above suggests that often they each worked alone. Surviving documents, as discussed, suggest that Barnard may have been more responsible for the initial draft of *Tomorrow*, but it is likely that Eldershaw was more involved than Barnard in re-shaping the novel after it returned from the censor in March 1944. An entry about *Tomorrow* in Nettie Palmer's diary reads in part:

The publisher took fright at some part of it, and sent the third section, isolated, to the censor — an invitation the censor, of course, could not resist, and Flora has been looking over it and feeling in despair about drawing it together with all those omissions.<sup>57</sup>

Letters from Barnard and Eldershaw convey the impression that it was Eldershaw who did a lot of the re-working of *Tomorrow*. On 31 July 1945, Barnard wrote to Jean Devanny: "*To-morrow* is still becalmed. Teenie has some ideas for picking it to pieces & re-doing but I'm not enthusiastic, I think the changes will upset the balance of the book & dilute it."<sup>58</sup>

In February, probably in 1948, Eldershaw wrote to Miles Franklin:

Yes, we are awfully glad to have *T&T* out at last, for its unpublished state seemed to inhibit any further effort. And the awful effort of having to close up the gaps left by the censor and adapting the end — never successfully accomplished — was very trying.<sup>59</sup>

However, the most conclusive evidence of Eldershaw's active involvement in the production of *Tomorrow* is the Mitchell Library typescript itself. As will be

---

<sup>56</sup> Dever, *Subject to Authority*. 45.

<sup>57</sup> Palmer Papers NLA MSS 1174/17/171.

<sup>58</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 31 July 1945, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 128.

<sup>59</sup> Flora Eldershaw to Miles Franklin, 22 February [1948?] Miles Franklin Papers, ML MSS 3659/1/CY 1262.



explained in Chapter Five, this typescript was substantially worked over after it was returned from the censor. In the early part of the typescript, in the sections that were not sent to the censor, the majority of emendations are in Eldershaw's hand. While some corrections are small, at times entire paragraphs are rewritten. Many small corrections are still substantive, in that the emendations have changed the meaning of the text.

The typescript and the letters that detail Eldershaw's involvement in the rewriting of *Tomorrow* provoke an important and difficult question: was Eldershaw more involved in the editing of *Tomorrow* than she was in the creation of the original draft? In many reports this is also the impression Barnard gave: that Eldershaw's was a *critical*, not a creative role. In later years she was to say that this was true of their collaboration as a whole.<sup>60</sup> As has been shown, there is ample evidence that Eldershaw was involved in *Tomorrow*, but if her greatest contribution was in redrafting, this may have given reason for Barnard to claim that *Tomorrow* was primarily hers. However, even if Eldershaw was more involved in the redrafting, the corollary is obvious: how do we distinguish between what is creative and what is critical? The question is one particularly germane to *Tomorrow*, a book that was redrafted over seven years and extensively rewritten after being cut by the censor. The first edition of the novel, the 1947 censored Georgian House edition, includes 2384 words that do not appear on the Mitchell Library typescript or in the typescript found after Vera Murdoch's death.<sup>61</sup> Did Eldershaw write them or did Barnard? No draft survives that can prove this absolutely either way, even if the details given above are taken into account.<sup>62</sup> And does the inclusion of these extra words

---

<sup>60</sup> See for instance, Bruce Molloy, interview with Marjorie Barnard, 26 July 1973, 'Some Political Aspects of the Australian Novel', 1930-59, MA Thesis, University of Queensland, 1974, ML MSS 2809 Add on.

<sup>61</sup> See Appendix One.

<sup>62</sup> Barnard often said that she didn't like revising. Of an essay she sent to Christesen she said: "I don't think that patching is ever an answer and should not want to either delegate it or do it myself. I have never returned to or reshaped anything I have

constitute “editing” or a creative contribution? In a book like *Tomorrow*, the division between what is creative and what editorial is blurred at best.

A letter from Marjorie Swain,<sup>63</sup> Eldershaw’s friend and the “sometime typist of Barnard Eldershaw manuscripts”<sup>64</sup> makes the point that “editing” can involve a lot of creative rewriting. As such, it offers a refutation of Barnard’s implicit assertion that an editorial contribution has less significance and authority than a creative one. Here, Swain refers to the Rorabacher biography and suggests that in the collaboration of *Tomorrow*, Eldershaw’s role in revising was particularly demanding:

How I should like to talk to the author! In view of the availability of sources I think she did a good job, but I kept coming up against things I felt were misrepresented or which gave only one side of the case, as for instance that Marjorie wrote ALL “Tomorrow...” Too little was made of the fact that M. Tossed [sic] over her writing — unrevised — for Eldie to go through with a blue pencil & write into the book.<sup>65</sup>

An eloquent answer to the problem of distinguishing between the creative and the editorial or critical also lies in *Tomorrow* itself. Knarf contends that a historical writer, like himself — and by implication like M. Barnard Eldershaw — is always reconstructing evidence “to replace . . . original significance” (p.204). He argues that the process is both imaginative and valid. If Eldershaw did indeed “reconstruct” the text of *Tomorrow*, rebuilding the “patterns” after its return from the censor, then Knarf himself would argue that this was a creative and important process.

---

written. It does not work for me.” Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 18 April 1974, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>63</sup> Marjorie Swain to Pat Eldershaw, 19 May 1983. Obtained from John Eldershaw’s personal collection. A copy is also in Flora Eldershaw’s papers, ML MSS 5601/2.

<sup>64</sup> Dever, ‘Subject to Authority’: 27.

<sup>65</sup> “Confessing to the difficulty she always found in going back over anything she had written in order to revise it, Marjorie exclaimed, “How magnificent to have a partner—to throw the thing in her lap and say ‘See if you can make something of it’” and then think of something else.” Rorabacher: 27.

The relationship between Knarf and Ord, as described in the novel, is an elaborate exploration of the authority of a writer. Knarf is constructed as the writer of the novel, 'Little World Left Behind',<sup>66</sup> and thus, in a sense, he is the third writer of a substantial part of *Tomorrow*. Alternatively, he can be viewed as the single voice for two authors, and a device through which a myriad of perspectives can be seen. He frequently alludes to and borrows "voices" from "the past" — unknown voices as well as prominent ones like those of Lawson, Koestler and Laski — and as such he is a fusion of voices and viewpoints from many past eras. As a device, Knarf provides a twenty-fourth century filter for the perspectives of characters in the twentieth century, allowing a more distanced outlook on historical events which were still alarmingly immediate when *Tomorrow* was first published.

Knarf is a reader, as well as a writer. He reads his book out loud to Ord, who feels, when Knarf has finished, that: "Knarf had spoken. In a world of the dumb he had really spoken, in the loneliness that bound them all he had communicated something (p.416 TTT)." Knarf is named for Frank Dalby Davison,<sup>67</sup> who had an editorial influence in the creation of the novel<sup>68</sup> both as a reader and as a listener. Eldershaw read the book aloud to Barnard and Davison to "get a birdseye view" of the novel while it was still in progress.<sup>69</sup> Later, Davison told Nettie Palmer that he "had turned Flora in a couple of foolscap pages of comment, including some on the scene of the burning of Sydney", a scene that he found unrealistic.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Barnard and Eldershaw originally planned to call this "novel inside a novel" 'If Man Grew Up', as the typescript in the Mitchell Library reveals. Barnard's papers MSS 451/2.

<sup>67</sup> There are many references to this. See, for instance, Sally McInerney, 'Recognition for a Writer who Wanted to Change Things Despite the Censor', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 November, 1983: 43.

<sup>68</sup> Frank Dalby Davison to Vance Palmer, January 1946, Palmer Papers 1174/1/6901-4.

<sup>69</sup> Rorabacher: 67.

<sup>70</sup> Frank Dalby Davison to Nettie Palmer, 3 January 1946, Palmer Papers NLA MS 1174/1/6911.

In the few times that Barnard spoke of the mechanics of a successful collaborative work she always emphasised the importance of talking with Eldershaw before writing anything down, discussing “every aspect until we came to agreement”:

The method that Flora Eldershaw and I found most workable was this: from the inception, or conception, of a novel we talked about it to one another, discussed it at length...getting the feel of it, coming to know it in depth, all this without putting pen to paper.<sup>71</sup>

Barnard also spoke of the importance of Flora's keen critical mind: “we talked the writing over, went for long walks, thought about it, and it matured slowly. She had a good critical mind and we very often changed things.”<sup>72</sup> Barnard also allowed, in one interview, that Eldershaw's “creativity was in the talking, before we set pen to paper.”<sup>73</sup> The writerly relationship between Knarf and Ord in *Tomorrow* is thus comparable to the one between Davison, Barnard and Eldershaw. The characters are not directly interchangeable; it would be specious to assume that Barnard is always Knarf, or that Davison or Eldershaw is Ord. As the documents above demonstrate, Eldershaw and Barnard both wrote the book and read it aloud at different intervals. It is likely, however, that Barnard *did* intend the characters to be representative of this writer/reader interaction.

It is equally possible to consider that the relationship between Knarf and Ord reflects parts of a writer's self, and the conflict that can exist between disparate voices in the creative process. Their dialogue in *Tomorrow* also demonstrates how these different elements are vocalised in a collaboration. Ord is typically

---

<sup>71</sup> Barnard, ‘The Gentle Art of Collaboration’: 126.

<sup>72</sup> Zoe Fairbairn, ‘Interview with Marjorie Barnard, May 1983’, *Writing Lives: Conversations Between Women Writers*, Ed. Mary Chamberlain, Virago: London, 1988: 40.

<sup>73</sup> Guilla Giuffre, *A Writing Life: Interviews with Australian Women Writers*, Allen & Unwin: Sydney, 1990: 131.

the editorial mind, and is often censorious: "Ord dashed cold water in the face of all this eloquence" (p.137). He also helps Knarf to define his motives, and brings self-consciousness to the structuring of the novel:

Ord nodded. "Simultaneous assault. Co-operation of the reader, the broken circuit, raw material of pattern, commentary by juxtaposition.(p.90)

Knarf represents the imaginative mind, someone who, unlike his son's friend (Sfax) is not overly concerned with "facts" and the science of exactitude. Although Ord is often dismissive of Knarf's outlook — at one point he exclaims, "when you leave your own domain your mind becomes pure clag to the bottom"(p.205) — he is occasionally seduced by the images and ideas that Knarf creates. It is made clear that Ord himself is a scientist, which within the logic of *Tomorrow* is the antithesis of an artist, but, as the novel progresses, he sometimes admits the validity of fictional "truths":

Ord didn't say, as he would certainly have said at any other time, "You are elevating a local and fortuitous occurrence into an historic moment. You're indulging yourself at the expense of the truth." This was part of the book, it had its own sort of truth, he admitted that. He didn't want to break the circle of a creative mood to which he had for once been admitted. (p.241)

Talking about Knarf's novel and reading it aloud changes the shape of it, and thus the interaction between Knarf and Ord is essential to its creation. Even if it is considered that the editorial and the creative can be contained in a single mind, Knarf acknowledges that his conversations with Ord help him to write the book: "[b]ut for Ord the book would never have been written — without the long walks through the countryside . . . in the passion of conflict the book would come alive to him, or so he hoped"(p.22). It is also necessary to Knarf that his book is read. He initially toys with the idea of leaving the manuscript of his book at the Pavilion, "the communal altar", which in some big Centres is "a vortex of criticism and emulation"(p.21), but at the isolated Tenth Commune, Knarf's

book only comes to life when he starts reading it with his friend. As has been argued previously, without Ord as an audience, 'Little World Left Behind' would not exist for readers of *Tomorrow*. As well as elucidating and criticising, Ord adds passages to the book's commentary and suggests that other passages should be taken out. In *Tomorrow*, many of the long rhetorical passages, usually adding a political, philosophical or literary analysis, are Ord's. As frequent interjections in the inner narrative of 'Little World Left Behind', they thus have an effect on how both *Tomorrow* and 'Little World Left Behind' are read. In summary, Ord's role as a critic, editor and commentator is vital for the production of 'Little World Left Behind' and the transmission of both *Tomorrow* and the internal novel. The drama between Knarf and Ord, therefore, exemplifies McGann's statement, that "authorship is a social and not a solitary act or set of acts."<sup>74</sup>

Despite the social activity that goes into creating the internal narratives of *Tomorrow*, it is Knarf who is recognised and privileged. Ord calls him a genius (p.215) and thinks that "he was perhaps, a great man. He had still the bared quick of his imagination when most of us were turning to wood"(p.90). When Knarf closes his book, Ord concedes that Knarf has been right, that an imaginative account of history is the most multifaceted and compelling one:

He had spent a life time studying this period, exhuming it detail by detail, with scientific care, and now he saw it fresh and living in the light of a creative imagination and it was desperate and ugly and sweet and full, in a way the careful measured life of today was not. (p.415-16 TTT)

Ord feels the pressure of Knarf's "exulted creation" (p.415 TTT) on him; he feels that he can neither criticise nor praise the book because he is too overwhelmed. It is not fully acknowledged that 'Little World Left Behind' has come together out of a merging of methods, voices and truths; Ord's viewpoint is

---

<sup>74</sup> Jerome McGann, 'What Is Critical Editing?' *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship*, 5, 1991: 25.

presented as being ultimately spurious. Knarf is described as being an individualist, someone who leads a deprived and lonely life outside of his work: "A man who by his work as a writer sought an audience found himself without an audience for his personal drama"(p.21). However, he is also revered by Ord because of his solitude. Ord's observation that "Knarf had spoken. In the world of the dumb he had really spoken", recalls Genesis, and the act of speaking the world into being, an allusion that is echoed in the final lines of *Tomorrow*: "This is the beginning", and "The earth remains"(p.456 TTT).

It was suggested above that Barnard could have intended the relationship between Knarf and Ord to directly represent the collaborative relationship between Davison, Eldershaw and Barnard. The documentary evidence suggests that Barnard was more responsible for writing at least some of the Tenth Commune sections of *Tomorrow*, and was therefore more involved in the invention of Knarf and Ord. The concluding section of *Tomorrow*, 'Nocturne', is the only section that is the same in all textual versions of the novel. It is also the only section of the Mitchell Library typescript that has no emendations and is thus the only section that has not been corrected by Eldershaw. The typing paper used for this section in the Mitchell Library typescript is also different from all of the other pages. Possibly, therefore, 'Nocturne' was completed earlier or later than other parts of the text and was not revised by Eldershaw. Moreover, the section remains uncorrected in the 1957 typescript version of *Tomorrow* which was probably arranged and edited by Barnard alone.<sup>75</sup>

It can be argued that *Tomorrow* contains references to the nature of its collaboration in the conversations between Knarf and Ord. Before Knarf reads his manuscript aloud, Ord takes the manuscript in his hands:

---

<sup>75</sup> See Chapter Five p.212.

I, too, have lived with this book for a long time. The thought that it was growing here, expressing a world we share and giving it back to life in a way I never could have done, has meant a lot to me. (p.43)

This suggests that Knarf has managed to articulate a world that Ord knows academically, without possessing enough vision to bring it to life. Ord has “lived through” the book’s creation, as Knarf has, but he himself is not the author. Barnard always saw herself as being the shy, romantic one in the M. Barnard Eldershaw collaboration, a perception that was supported by friends such as Nettie Palmer, and later by her biographer.<sup>76</sup> H.M. Green claimed, for instance, that: “there are suggestions that much at least of the humour and broad humanity of the partnership comes from one side of the partnership and much of the imagination and sensitive subtlety from the other.”<sup>77</sup> Thus, the differing personalities of Knarf and Ord could be seen to represent the intuitive and scientific factors that are needed for good historical fiction, as well as the contrasts between Barnard and Eldershaw, necessary to strike the spark of a good collaboration. It needs to be emphasised, however, that this latter view would support Barnard’s idea of the collaboration; since no accounts of Eldershaw’s collaborative experiences survive, it is impossible to tell whether she would agree. If it is the case, as hypothesised, that Barnard wrote more of the sections about the Tenth Commune, and that Eldershaw wrote more of the section describing World War Two, which included post-censorship revising, then the views of collaborative effort that are given within the novel could well be a distortion of the actual creative production between Barnard and Eldershaw. Neither Barnard nor Knarf were solitary writers, although each had perceived themselves to be so.

---

<sup>76</sup> See Louise Rorabacher: 16. “Both were brilliant young women but very different in personality: Flora was charming, vivacious, outgoing, aggressive, interested in people, organizations, causes; Marjorie was philosophic and artistic, shy and retiring, generous, happy to play an apparent second fiddle. The feministic bent common to their generation of women might be called dominant in Flora, recessive in Marjorie.”

<sup>77</sup> H.M. Green, *A History of Australian Literature Vol II 1923-1950*: 1097.



There are also biographical references in the novel. Knarf is described as having got "inside" the text, and made it his own: "He feels it,' thought Ord, 'Damn me, if he doesn't feel this, the cool, slippery beggar'" (p.101). As Ord has observed, Knarf is writing his autobiography (p.24); his character, Harry, is trapped in a loveless marriage like Knarf himself. Knarf's son, Ren, is Ben in 'Little World Left Behind': "Ren,' Ord thought. 'Knarf is bound up in Ren and doesn't know it. Even the names. I didn't think of it before'" (p.187). However, after describing Olaf Ramsay's death from pneumonia, Knarf tells Ord that he based the account on his wife's experience with the illness (p.170). It is frequently suggested in *Tomorrow* that Knarf has become so absorbed in the world of the novel that only the life of his writing is real for him; his own world is described as having a "tindery unreality" (p.416 *TTT*). The corollary to this is the possibility that Knarf has recreated the twentieth century in his own image; it is not clear whether Knarf is writing history or whether history is writing him. The implicit question here is whether we ever write about anything but ourselves. Again there are echoes of Knarf in Barnard's accounts of writing the book; she later said that writing *Tomorrow* became a compulsion, that it had said everything that she had to say and that it "became part of me. That is the book that did."<sup>78</sup>

Although Barnard usually minimised the significance of calling one of *Tomorrow's* main characters after Davison, nonetheless, details in Davison's life often paralleled those of Harry and Knarf.<sup>79</sup> There is a family account, for instance, of Davison's son Peter getting his head stuck between verandah

---

<sup>78</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, *Marjorie Barnard*, 17 April 1975; Zoe Fairbairn, 'Interview with Marjorie Barnard, May 1983', *Writing Lives: Conversations Between Women Writers*: 41.

<sup>79</sup> See, for instance, Barnard's comments in interview with Molloy, 1973: "It wasn't at all a portrait of Frank. You've got to find a name; a great friend, and I just spelled his name backwards." However, in interview with Guilla Guiffre, Barnard said that she called her character after Davison because "she cared" and that she hoped it was a tribute to him. *A Writing Life: Interviews With Australian Women Writers*: 141.

railings, in the same way as Harry's son Ben (p.91).<sup>80</sup> More crucial however, is the possibility that the marriages both of Knarf and of Harry in *Tomorrow* were based, at least superficially, on Davison's, whose relationship with his wife had, according to Barnard, been effectively "over and finished" before Barnard's affair with him.<sup>81</sup> Davison's liason with the much younger Marie ended his relationship with Barnard in 1943. Both Harry and Knarf have affairs with young women — Harry with Gwen and Knarf with a woman called Amila. Some details about Amila were cut out at the draft stage but appear in the Mitchell Library typescript.<sup>82</sup>

It is therefore profitable to speculate that the character of Knarf was not inspired singly by Barnard or Davison; he is rather a fusion of them both. Barnard was conscious that she had got inside this book as she had no other and that she "cared about it too much."<sup>83</sup> Like Knarf, her outside work receded while she was writing it; in the final stages of writing the book, her relationship with Davison had ended, and so she tended to her mother, worked all day, and came home to escape into the novel. Barnard also constructed herself as the imaginative part of the collaboration and thus the more crucial component: Ord's role is dismissed in the same manner as Eldershaw's.

However, Knarf is also a genius — and a man. Barnard said on several occasions that Davison had genius in him: "[h]e's the only person I've ever felt had a touch

---

<sup>80</sup> Communication with Robert Darby, 16 March 2001. Excerpt from letter, Marie Davison to Robert Darby, 27 October 1987: "Harry Munster was to some extent based on Frank. Her [MB's] dislike of his wife [Kay] came through. Their son and his scooter was a Davison family depression story."

<sup>81</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 1 January 1947: "I loved him from the first time I saw him. He was in love with someone else then and the bottom had fallen out of things. He was very unhappy and in straits with the Depression." Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 156. Although Davison's situation was different from Harry's in *Tomorrow* in many ways, this description could apply to both of them.

<sup>82</sup> Censored typescript in Mitchell Library, Sydney ML MSS 452(2): 31.

<sup>83</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, 17 April 1975.

of genius in him, and it's not a word to use lightly."<sup>84</sup> There are hints of Davison in the character of Murray Hart, a sensitive musical genius who is hounded by his materialistic wife in Barnard's 1943 story, 'The Woman Who Did The Right Thing'. Hart leaves his forty-year-old lover to begin an affair with a woman who is only twenty. Authorial sympathies in *Tomorrow* rest squarely with Knarf and Harry and their situations resemble both Murray Hart's and that of Davison as portrayed by Barnard. Knarf and Harry's wives, Lin and Ally, are depicted as cold, selfish and materialistic. They are women who do not understand the fine qualities of the men they are bound to, and they do not respond to their needs. As Modjeska has written, "[h]ere M. Barnard Eldershaw are much harder on women than they had been before; the women of the twentieth century, in this novel almost exclusively working class, are caught in oppressive circumstances, but are blamed for their inability to respond with more than selfishness, querulousness and thoughtlessness."<sup>85</sup> In *Tomorrow*, the identification with a masculine perspective is profound, in a way that had not been seen in M. Barnard Eldershaw's fiction since *A House Is Built*, at the beginning of their writing career. Thus, the possibility that Davison and Knarf share more than a name is strong; if Knarf is indeed a "tribute", as Barnard suggested, then he represents both an idealisation of herself and an idealisation of her recently lost lover.

Moreover, Knarf represents an ideal writer. The final passages of 'Afternoon' suggest that he has succeeded in reconciling the oppositions between scientific and novelistic discourse (p.416 *TTT*). The possibility of resolution is carried over into the next section of *Tomorrow*, where solutions to other conflicting forces are grasped at. Knarf is central to this because, as the creator of novels,

---

<sup>84</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, 17 April 1975. See also Marjorie Barnard's letter to Jean Devanny, 1 April 1947.

<sup>85</sup> Modjeska: 243.

he brings together the “facts” with the fullness of his imaginative vision, showing that

Nothing passed and nothing was lost. The love of life and the love of death were interchangeable and the same. Happiness and despair could be nourished at the same fountain . . . to die was as natural as to be born.(p.415 TTT)

Knarf’s role as a writer is crucial to his society, because he alone is able to articulate life with all its contradictions and complexity, containing oppositions within a single art form. As has been seen, *Tomorrow* does not necessarily succeed in containing its contradictory narratives in a cohesive whole, but Knarf’s book is promoted within it as a considerable human achievement. In creating a superior mode of art, Knarf himself holds the primary and solitary position of an artist, a creator and a god-like figure.

Thus the creative writer is privileged above all others, both within the worlds of *Tomorrow* and in the extra-textual narratives about its creation. In the effort to ensure the survival of *Tomorrow*, Barnard deliberately drew the focus to her central role. It was unlikely that this was the only reason that Barnard claimed authorship, as the next section discusses, but it is clear that the character of an individual ‘author’ was an essential ingredient in the media publicity for the book’s republication in 1983. Although Barnard had initiated the perception that she was the sole author of *Tomorrow*, it was also convenient for journalists and reviewers to encourage this perception. Newspaper articles announcing the release of the Virago edition had headlines such as: “Writer Beats Censor After 40-Year Wait”;<sup>86</sup> “Recognition For a Writer Who Wanted to Change Things Despite the Censor” and “The Remarkable Marjorie Barnard”.

---

<sup>86</sup> Cosetta Bosi, ‘Writer Beats Censor After 40-Year Wait’ in Eldershaw’s Papers MSS 5601; Sally McInerney, ‘Recognition For a Writer Who Wanted to Change Things Despite the Censor’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 November 1983: 43; Kristen Williamson, ‘The Remarkable Marjorie Barnard’, *The National Times*, 19 -25 August 1983: 32.

The censoring of *Tomorrow* was frequently alluded to at the time of this second publication; Virago announced that the new edition was the “full uncensored text” in a banner on the front cover. The notion of controversial opinions being silenced, combined with the figure of a writer who had fought the silencing for forty years, seemed highly marketable.

While newspaper articles from the 1980s relate how Marjorie Barnard “fought the censor”, the effect of censorship in Flora Eldershaw’s life is less commonly related. As Dever discusses in her paper, ‘The Case For Flora Eldershaw’, when interest in *Tomorrow* was finally rekindled, Eldershaw’s contribution was scarcely acknowledged. Dever cites the instance of the Patrick White Award ceremony, in 1983, in which the judges’ speech read: “In honouring Marjorie Barnard as a writer we also honour Flora Eldershaw”. Dever adds: “Eldershaw’s family was not even contacted.”<sup>87</sup> At the 1984 Premier’s Literary Awards, Barnard was given a special award, which made particular mention of *Tomorrow* as the pinnacle of Barnard’s achievement and contribution to Australian literature, but the speech given assumed that Barnard was the sole author of *Tomorrow*. While it was noted that *Tomorrow*’s encounter with a wartime censor and subsequent failure to find an audience had “put an end to Marjorie Barnard’s career as a novelist”, the fact that *Tomorrow* had also signalled the end of Eldershaw’s novelistic career was not mentioned.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Dever, ‘The Case for Flora Eldershaw’: 47.

<sup>88</sup> A booklet from the Premier’s Awards containing the speech is in Barnard’s papers, MSS 4869, Add on 1825.

## Two: Further Speculations

*"I could have had a dozen friends around me all day long. But there wasn't a friend that I loved and trusted above all the others, no lover, secret or declared. She had, I suppose, some nutrient hinterland on which she drew."*

Marjorie Barnard, *The Persimmon Tree and Other Stories*, London: Virago Press, 1985: 24.

Thus far, Barnard's claims for exclusive authorship have been outlined, the growth in their acceptance has been documented, and evidence that counters their truth has been given. Historically, Barnard slid from implicitly including Eldershaw as an equal creator of *Tomorrow*, to later suggesting that "actually I did most of the writing",<sup>1</sup> to asserting in articles in the 1980s that the novel was "entirely my own work as Flora Eldershaw, for reasons of geography and pressure of work, could not contribute."<sup>2</sup> Letters, first person accounts and a typescript contradict the latter remark, but Barnard, in her later life, continually insisted on its truth. Maryanne Dever has given the reason that has been discussed above: that Eldershaw's role was not valued highly enough by Barnard or later by academics because, rightly or wrongly, it was seen as an editorial one. Dever's thesis as a whole also deals with traditional definitions of authority, and the ways in which Barnard and Eldershaw's collaboration offers challenges to more conventionally perceived notions of literary and cultural production.

While, as discussed, it is problematic to distinguish between creative and editorial input in a collaboration, this does not shed light on why Barnard would eventually claim that Eldershaw had nothing to do with *Tomorrow*, dismissing even the possibility of a critical or editorial contribution. Thus, some space will be devoted here to possible reasons for Barnard's claims, as they have not been addressed by any scholar to date. Some material has only recently come to light with the death of Vera Murdoch, and the recovery of another typescript of *Tomorrow*. As already mentioned, this typescript was reconstructed by Barnard alone, and was probably the version that she hoped to use for a new edition. As it represents Barnard's final authorial intentions, she may have felt that this version, at least, was "hers".

---

<sup>1</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, 17 April 1975.

<sup>2</sup> Biographical (printed) pamphlet, circ. 1985, in uncollected papers of Marjorie Barnard, (hereafter "uncollected papers of Barnard").

The other previously undiscussed explanation for Barnard's erroneous claims is more problematic. The sources that will be cited make it probable that Barnard and Eldershaw did quarrel in 1949 and that from that time onwards, their friendship changed, both professionally and privately. There are few published records that give details of the personal relationship between Barnard and Eldershaw, and there are none from the later years of Eldershaw's life. It is likely that this information was not sought by interviewers, scholars and critics who were primarily concerned with writerly texts, and not with the writers' personal lives. However, these more intimate details are significant if difficulties in the private relationship between Barnard and Eldershaw had an impact on how their collaboration is now regarded. Dever did include a study of the personal aspects of Barnard Eldershaw's collaboration in her dissertation, but she too excluded, or did not have access to, some of the following information. Possibly it was deemed to be too speculative; however, recent interviews with the Eldershaw family, Molly Eldershaw's letters and the retrieval of Flora Eldershaw's Will mean that the speculations given here have more documentary support than they have had previously.

The history of Flora Eldershaw's later life, after the release of *TT* in 1947, offers a sobering example of the difficulties in maintaining a public life as a writer. Her increasing troubles with health and finances made it hard to find any job, let alone to continue her political and literary activities. Her early death also meant that many of her achievements went unrecognised, or were soon forgotten. On her death, Clem Christesen wrote to Barnard that, had Eldershaw lived, "she would have received [sic] eminence in her field . . . Her achievements, your achievements, were already substantial, but nothing like that which she and you were capable of achieving." Christesen added that, although he knew Eldershaw in a public capacity, he regretted never getting to



know her well, because even in the years of her greatest activity, "she was unwell, under a strain, and I was reluctant to impose on her time and energy."<sup>3</sup>

When Flora Eldershaw wrote to Miles Franklin, probably at the beginning of 1948, that "we are awfully glad to have T&T out", she also wrote to say that she had been ill for several months: "I didn't suspect anything wrong with me except fatigue arising from increasing age & the excessive work I knew I had been doing for years", she wrote, "until I was rejected on medical grounds for a permanent appointment."<sup>4</sup>

I then went to the doctor who assumed a very portentous attitude and lectured me gravely about dangerously high blood pressure, arteriosclerosis, cardiac trouble & all the rest of it. However I obediently did as I was told & went to my sister's farm & spent six weeks in bed & 6 more just pottering.<sup>5</sup>

Eldershaw's good health was never really to return. Since leaving her job as Headmistress at the Presbyterian Ladies College at Croydon in 1940, she had been combining a demanding job with work on the Fellowship of Australian Writers and other committees, including the Commonwealth Literary Fund advisory committee. These commitments were combined with travelling between Sydney, Melbourne and Canberra, as well as working on *Tomorrow*, so it was not surprising that Eldershaw became run-down and ill.

Out of the few surviving documents about Flora Eldershaw's state of health and well-being in the last ten years of her life, Molly Eldershaw's letters are the most lucid and informative. Molly, or Mary, was one of Flora's older sisters and

---

<sup>3</sup> Clem Christesen to Marjorie Barnard, 28 September 1956, *Meanjin* Archives, Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne (hereafter "*Meanjin* Archives").

<sup>4</sup> "After close of war in 1945, took an active part in organising the work of the Department on a peacetime & continuing basis . . . Was myself recommended by Dept. for permanent appointment as Controller but medical officers of the Board found me unsuitable on account of high blood pressure." Note in Eldershaw's hand, Flora Eldershaw's papers, ML MSS 5601/1.

<sup>5</sup> Flora Eldershaw to Miles Franklin, 22 February [1948], Miles Franklin's papers, ML 3659/1 CY1262.

had been the housekeeper at the Presbyterian Ladies College when Flora had been the headmistress.<sup>6</sup> In the final years of her life, when she was no longer strong enough to look after herself, Flora went to stay with Molly on her property at Sackville, near Wagga Wagga.<sup>7</sup>

Molly's letters to her brother Pat Eldershaw — now in the Eldershaw family's possession — are undated, but it is likely that they were written in the late 1940s and 1950s. In one telling piece of correspondence, Molly wrote to Pat to say that she was shocked by how "Teenie" looked "more frail and less controlled than at any time, even when she first came out of hospital."<sup>8</sup> Molly's letter related how Flora was marking exam papers for extra cash and applying for other jobs, despite her frail physical and mental state: "I tried to dissuade her last night but all she would say is 'If I don't try I may as well die and have done with it', and weeps bitterly."<sup>9</sup> She suffered angina and "heart turns" during this time and eventually, in 1955, she went back to Wagga Wagga, where she stayed until she died.

The other pressing problem, as recorded by Molly, was that Eldershaw no longer had a permanent home. Since securing the job in the Public Service she had been constantly travelling and, with her health failing, she was without a place to stay. Her money problems were also acute. Members of the Eldershaw family remember her marking English Leaving exams in 1954 and 1955 for extra money. She also worked for a superannuation consultancy firm in the final years of her life, but apparently did not get paid regularly for several years.<sup>10</sup>

In the letter quoted above, Molly wrote:

---

<sup>6</sup> Information provided in conversation with John and Jenny Eldershaw, Mosman, November 1995.

<sup>7</sup> Correspondence, Mary Eldershaw to Pat Eldershaw, undated, in John Eldershaw's private collection.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Both details from interview with John and Jenny Eldershaw, Mosman, November 1995.

I am desperately worried too and it had been most unfortunate that Marjorie [Barnard] was away and she could not talk to her. I wrote to Marjorie last night and told her how concerned I was and said how terribly sorry I was that right now, when Teenie needed her home, that Vee [Vera Murdoch] in all probability doesn't want to go yet. Teenie said, "I know Marjorie would want me. Even after my last tragic error I have every confidence of not ever being a pest or a hindrance to her." Teenie feels that if she is not harrassed by looking for a place to live and can get up each morning and work steadily at corrections she can do it.<sup>11</sup>

Some of the above is better understood by looking at other letters by Barnard and by Molly Eldershaw. In the winter of 1949, Marjorie Barnard's mother had finally died. Barnard told Miles Franklin that, although "I don't exactly mourn for her", she was lonely, and that "[f]riends, a mother and daughter, are coming from Melbourne at the end of this month . . . to stay for the rest of the winter with me. I'll be glad to fill this house."<sup>12</sup> These friends were Vera Murdoch and her mother. Barnard had known Murdoch since meeting her on a voyage to England in 1933,<sup>13</sup> but this was the first time they had lived together. From this time onwards, however, the two were inseparable. They lived together for nearly another four decades until Barnard's death in 1987. Until 1976, Vera Murdoch stayed with Barnard at her family's house in Stuart Street, Longueville, then the two of them moved to a more modest house at Point Clare, on the central coast of New South Wales.

---

<sup>11</sup> Mary Eldershaw to Pat Eldershaw, in John Eldershaw's private collection.

<sup>12</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Miles Franklin, 1 July 1949, Miles Franklin's papers, ML 365/32/59.

<sup>13</sup> The two women gave accounts of this in their later lives. See, for example, Sally McInerney's article: "The women met on a boat ("rather an elderly ship, the *Esqualino*") in 1933 and have been friends for 50 years." 'Recognition for a Writer Who Wanted to Change Things Despite the Censor', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 November, 1983: 43. It was this voyage which proved to be the inspiration for *The Glasshouse*. In Barnard's uncollected papers, a signed passenger list for '*Esquilino*', "Homeward from Sydney March 13, 1933", confirms Murdoch and Barnard as passengers, as well as a woman called "Stirling", the name of the protagonist in *The Glasshouse*.

Another letter from Molly sheds light on how Murdoch, rather than Flora Eldershaw, came to be with Barnard at the time of Barnard's mother's death:

I think the biggest mistake Teenie ever made was not to go at once to Marjorie Barnard when Mrs B. died, but she was busy mucking with Aileen and didn't go. If she had she could have got a job and put something into the house Marjorie would have been quite happy for them to be together.<sup>14</sup>

"The house" that Molly Eldershaw refers to is almost certainly Barnard's parents' home at 2 Stuart Street in Longueville. Flora Eldershaw's Will untangles the significance of this reference, and clarifies why Molly felt that Barnard had a responsibility to help Flora find a home. The Will bequeaths, "to my brother Percy Hoptown the sum of two hundred pounds, also my cottage at 2 Stuart St. Longueville — if it should be mine".<sup>15</sup> The qualification is a puzzling one; why should Eldershaw be uncertain about whether or not she owned the cottage? The most probable supposition is that there was an agreement between Barnard and Eldershaw that Eldershaw could stay at — and perhaps even own — the cottage on Barnard's property.<sup>16</sup> However, when Eldershaw stayed with Aileen Palmer, at the time of Barnard's mother's death, it would appear that any agreement was revoked and Eldershaw never went to live there. As Molly suggests, it is also likely that Eldershaw had little money. Instead, Vera Murdoch moved in permanently.

It would seem likely that Flora Eldershaw's failure to go to Sydney to comfort Barnard at the time of Barnard's mother's death is the "tragic error" that is referred to both by Flora Eldershaw and her sister. Aileen Palmer and Flora Eldershaw were close friends<sup>17</sup> and were living together, so Eldershaw's

<sup>14</sup> Mary Eldershaw to Pat Eldershaw, John Eldershaw's private collection.

<sup>15</sup> Uncollected papers of Barnard.

<sup>16</sup> In the film in which Barnard is interviewed by Elizabeth Riddell at her then home at Longueville, the cottage adjacent to the main house can be seen.

<sup>17</sup> Aileen Palmer was having increasing mental and emotional difficulties at this time. As Eldershaw was close friends with Palmer, this would have also put her under additional stress. Palmer had entered a psychiatric clinic for the first time in 1948, "in the first of a number of such episodes, which over the years came to be of longer and longer duration." Judith Keene, 'Aileen Palmer's Coming of Age'. *Crossing*

preference may have seemed to Barnard to be a rejection. As is well documented, Barnard and Eldershaw had shared a 'salon' at Orwell Street in Potts Point for many years, but after the possibility of Eldershaw having the cottage at Longueville faded, they were never to share accommodation again.<sup>18</sup> In any case, Vera Murdoch seems to have physically taken Eldershaw's place and possibly, at least temporarily, to have replaced her emotionally too. Visitors to Murdoch's and Barnard's house at Point Clare many years later were told a story by Murdoch of a trip with Barnard and Eldershaw to the theatre, where Flora left at half time in "a jealous fit".<sup>19</sup> Possibly, however, there was jealousy on both — or all — sides.

As Dever has remarked: "The role played by Vera Murdoch in this latter day construction of Barnard as the 'true' force behind the collaboration, and *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* in particular, should not be underestimated".<sup>20</sup> Other academics attempting to interview Barnard in her later years have also noted the extent to which Murdoch protected Barnard and played the role of a literary gatekeeper. In 1980, Drusilla Modjeska wrote to Carole Ferrier to say that an interview with Barnard was not possible, in part because it was very difficult to "get her alone & away from the woman who lives with her and answers for her."<sup>21</sup> As Barnard's eyesight deteriorated Murdoch often wrote letters for her, making decisions about publication matters and signing herself "the writer in residence."<sup>22</sup>

---

*Boundaries: Feminisms and the Critique of Knowledges*, Ed. Barbara Caine, E.A. Grosz, Marie de Lepervanche, North Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1988: 189.

<sup>18</sup> See *As Good As A Yarn With You*, Ed. Carole Ferrier, Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press, 1992 (hereafter *As Good As A Yarn*): 36; Drusilla Modjeska, *Exiles At Home: Australian Women Writers 1925-1945*, [1981], Second Edition, North Ryde: CollinsAngus & Robertson, 1991: 205.

<sup>19</sup> Personal communication, 15 March 2000.

<sup>20</sup> Maryanne Dever, 'Subject to Authority' A Study of M. Barnard Eldershaw', Unpub. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1993: 40,1.

<sup>21</sup> Drusilla Modjeska to Carole Ferrier, 22 December 1980, Drusilla Modjeska's papers, NLA MS 8320/6.

<sup>22</sup> Examples of this are in Barnard's uncollected papers.

Murdoch consistently sidelined Eldershaw's position in the collaboration. Interviews with Barnard in later years were inevitably interrupted and taken over by Murdoch's interjections and it became increasingly difficult to distinguish between the opinions of the two, if there was a distinction to be made. Sally McInerney's article, 'Recognition For a Writer Who Wanted to Change Things Despite the Censor', for the *Sydney Morning Herald* in 1983, is a good example:

'You always said she had the critical ability,' Vera Murdoch added; Marjorie Barnard agreed readily. 'By the time *TTT* was written,' Vera went on, 'Flora had moved to live first in Canberra, then in Melbourne, so she didn't have a lot to do with the book. And Flora did not actually approve of it'.<sup>23</sup>

In Candida Baker's, Zoe Fairbairn's and Giulia Giuffre's articles, Murdoch's domination of the interviewing process can also be noted. In Fairbairn's interview, which does not print the transcript, Barnard is recorded as saying that "M. Barnard Eldershaw' was a good combination." Fairbairn adds:

It was even used for *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, which Flora Eldershaw had not liked very much, and which Vee insisted was more Marjorie's work than Flora's (and Marjorie did not deny this).<sup>24</sup>

In Giuffre's transcript of her interview with Barnard, the extent of Murdoch's input is more evident. Giuffre explains in an introductory note that, "I decided to leave a number of Vera's comments in the published version because otherwise some of Marjorie's statements would not have made sense." Giuffre also explains that Barnard was frail and that the "mutual love, tolerance and respect between the two women was itself at least as interesting as anything I had to ask Marjorie."<sup>25</sup> Nonetheless, the interview demonstrates how the

<sup>23</sup> Sally McInerney, 'Recognition for a Writer who Wanted to Change Things Despite the Censor': 43.

<sup>24</sup> Zoe Fairbairn, in *Writing Lives: Conversations Between Women Writers*, ed. Mary Chamberlain, Virago: London, 1988: 41.

<sup>25</sup> Giulia Giuffre, *A Writing Life: Interviews with Australian Women Writers*, Allen & Unwin: Sydney, 1990: 131.

women's opinions on the writing of *Tomorrow* had become intertwined, and emphasises the extent to which Murdoch had influenced Barnard's attitude towards the book and Eldershaw:

VERA: . . . It was basically your book, because Flora was first in Canberra and then in Melbourne. She didn't like it either.

MB: It was more my book, for geographical reasons and one thing and another.

GG: Why didn't Flora like it?

MB: I don't know, I suppose it had its faults. All books have faults. I think perhaps she didn't like me going off by myself.

VERA: No, oh really! No, I think she didn't always agree with it because she was much more a Labor Party person than you ever were. She felt it ought to go further over towards a socialist world or something like that.

GG: Did she say that to you?

MB: No, but that's where she was, you see. There was a sort of confusion between us.<sup>26</sup>

It was Barnard who had been a member of the Labor Party,<sup>27</sup> and not Eldershaw, but what has greater significance here is the likelihood that Murdoch knew little at first hand about the creation of *Tomorrow*. Although Barnard had met Murdoch and her parents in 1933, Murdoch did not come to live with Barnard in Sydney until 1949, five years after *Tomorrow* was completed and two years after it was published. Before this time she lived in Melbourne, and was thus geographically distant for the entire period of Barnard's collaboration with Eldershaw. Murdoch was not known as a literary person<sup>28</sup> and admitted that she had never actually read the book.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Giulia Giuffrè, *A Writing Life: Interviews with Australian Women Writers*: 135. As remarked on by Dever ('Subject to Authority': 42), Candida Baker's interview also demonstrates how Murdoch could monopolise the interviewing process. *Yacker 2: Australian Writers Talk About Their Work*, Sydney: Pan Books, 1987: 28-41.

<sup>27</sup> "Today is remarkable for two events: I am being received into the local branch of the ALP. . .", Marjorie Barnard to Nettie Palmer, 13 February 1940, Palmer Papers, NLA 1174/1/5703.

<sup>28</sup> For example David Marr remarks of Patrick White's play, *The Cheery Soul*: "White's Miss Docker. . . [has] a dash of Marjorie Barnard's companion Vera Murdoch, a worthy woman but a great talker whom White found 'One of the most crashing Philistines I have ever met.'" David Marr, *Patrick White: A Life*, Vintage: Milson's Point, 1991: 408.

<sup>29</sup> Personal Interview at Point Clare, November 1995.

Murdoch's assertion that Eldershaw did not like the book is also tenuous at best. It is true that in 1947 Eldershaw wrote to Vance Palmer that: "I feel nothing but a sick distaste for '*Tomorrow...*' and wish we'd never written it."<sup>30</sup>

However Barnard had expressed a comparable weariness with and dislike for *Tomorrow* after the censorship, the long period of rewriting, and the further wait to get the novel published. She wrote to Eleanor Dark that "There are corns and callouses on my brain from thinking of the beastly thing. I no longer care about it. (That's an illusion, probably, but a strong one.)"<sup>31</sup> In a letter to Jean Devanny in 1945, in which Barnard wrote that "Teenie has some ideas for picking it [*Tomorrow*] to pieces...", she also wrote:

When I say can't about that sort of thing it is the dead finish, means I have exhausted all I have to say & there is no more. So *To-morrow* hangs like a carcass in a butcher's shop, dead meat and deteriorating.<sup>32</sup>

When Eldershaw's solitary remark is compared with Barnard's and with Dever's records, which cite several occasions on which Eldershaw said that she valued it more than any other novel,<sup>33</sup> it is likely that Eldershaw, like Barnard, merely experienced frustration with the book's seemingly interminable production.

It is well known that after *Tomorrow* came out Barnard and Eldershaw never collaborated again. Eldershaw's health and subsequent financial crisis, as well as Barnard's despondency at the reception of *Tomorrow*, are reasons enough for this. The additional information included here, detailing Eldershaw's failing physical and mental condition, which was compounded by work commitments and money worries, demonstrates how impossible it would have been for Eldershaw

---

<sup>30</sup> Flora Eldershaw to Vance Palmer, [1947?] Palmer Papers MLA MSS 1174/1/7262.

<sup>31</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 26 June 1944? , Eleanor Dark's papers, NL 4998.

<sup>32</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 31st July 1945, reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 128.

<sup>33</sup> Dever, 'The Case For Flora Eldershaw': 46.



to have continued with a writing career in the latter years of her life. However, a quarrel would have also affected any further plans by Barnard and Eldershaw to collaborate. Members of the Eldershaw family remember a rift "in 1953 or 54 over something — no one ever knew"<sup>34</sup> and John and Jenny Eldershaw, Flora's nephew and niece, recalled that "Mum and Dad were upset that Marjorie Barnard dropped her when [she was] ill."<sup>35</sup>

Later letters indicate however that Barnard and Eldershaw were in contact with one another again; in April 1954, for instance, Barnard wrote to Clem Christesen that she was "going to Sackville to spend a couple of weeks with her [Flora] after Easter."<sup>36</sup> Nonetheless, letters at the time of Eldershaw's death, on 20 September 1956, suggest that Barnard and Eldershaw were no longer close. When Clem Christesen wrote a letter of sympathy to Barnard, he enclosed an open cheque so that she could buy "some floral tributes to be placed on her grave on behalf of Melbourne writers and the Fellowship."<sup>37</sup> Barnard replied that because she had been in Queensland, she had "only learned of it [Eldershaw's death] when I saw last Saturday's paper"<sup>38</sup> and therefore had not attended the funeral. It was an impersonal way for Barnard to learn of the death of someone who had been central to her life for many years, and it is strange that no one telephoned or telegraphed Barnard to give her the opportunity of attending the funeral. Even allowing for the expense and inconvenience of such communication and travel by modern standards, Barnard was, by this time, in a strong financial position and in theory could have afforded it.<sup>39</sup> Molly

---

<sup>34</sup> Interview with John and Jenny Eldershaw, November 1995.

<sup>35</sup> Interview with John and Jenny Eldershaw, November 1995.

<sup>36</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 9 April 1954, *Meanjin Archives*.

<sup>37</sup> Clem Christesen to Marjorie Barnard, 21 September 1956, *Meanjin Archives*.

<sup>38</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 25 September 1956, *Meanjin Archives*.

<sup>39</sup> There are various documents suggesting that Barnard's financial situation after the death of her mother was a comfortable one. On 12 December 1957, she wrote to Jean Devanny that: "I'm going to retire from the historical field . . . & live the life of a hedonist, as far as I can afford to." (in *As Good As A Yarn*: 398). Documents in Barnard's uncollected papers not only reveal that Murdoch and Barnard owned tens of thousands of dollars worth of shares between them, but that they took many overseas

Eldershaw's letters also indicate that she did phone Barnard to speak about Eldershaw on earlier occasions.

Barnard accepted Christesen's offer to write a tribute to Eldershaw in *Meanjin* and wrote to him:

I feel that her death was the least part of the tragedy that clouded her last years, the disappointment, illness, despair [sic]. She deserved so much better of life . . . I've written in haste and with difficulty. Some of the thoughts that are dogging my mind [sic]. I wish it were better done. The more one feels the more difficult it is to express.<sup>40</sup>

Barnard's contribution to 'Tributes to Flora Eldershaw' was graceful but brief. She focussed almost exclusively on the "dark-haired vivacious girl" whom she had known at university, explaining that while many were writing "to praise Flora Eldershaw and evaluate her work" only a few would remember her as a "promising young student".<sup>41</sup> Only one sentence refers to the thirty-year relationship that followed Barnard's meeting with Eldershaw at the University of Sydney: "Later this friendship was to withstand what everyone agrees to be the acid test of collaboration in writing." It was a remarkably brief summary of what, if their collective novels, stories, plays, historical works, lectures and letters are acknowledged, must have been a varied, productive and highly challenging thirty years together.

Barnard insisted in many interviews that she and Eldershaw never quarrelled, but the interviewers' questions inevitably focussed entirely on their writing relationship. A typical example is Zoe Fairbairn's interview with Barnard, recorded not long before the latter's death:

---

trips. There are travel itineraries and/or diaries for the years 1951, 1961, 1964, 1967, 1971 and 1979.

<sup>40</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Clem Christesen, 25 September 1956, *Meanjin* Archives.

<sup>41</sup> Marjorie Barnard in 'Tributes to Flora Eldershaw', *Meanjin* 4, 1956: 391.

What did they do about jealousy, disagreement, ownership of ideas and conflict?

'There was no conflict', Marjorie told me. 'I can't say where the first idea for a book came from because we both put in things . . . There was never any trouble between my collaborator and myself, we arranged everything before we put pen to paper.'<sup>42</sup>

In this interview, as in others, Barnard interprets the query about "conflict" between Eldershaw and herself as relating exclusively to the construction of their books. Few studies have mentioned the relationship outside the writerly collaboration and all surviving publications indicate it was not deemed relevant to ask. One exception to this is Barnard's own article, 'The Gentle Art of Collaboration'. While Barnard writes of *Tomorrow*, "It was my book", she concludes with the lines:

Flora and I remained friends until her sad and early death. Collaboration had cemented friendship and not broken it. And so I claim it was successful and that the novels written together were better than lonely efforts would have been.<sup>43</sup>

This statement needs to be considered in conjunction with the documentation given in the rest of this section. It implies that the friendship, like the collaboration that grew from it, was not broken absolutely at any point. It is not possible to know whether Barnard began to claim that she alone wrote *Tomorrow because* she had fallen out with Eldershaw. However, because it is certain that Eldershaw contributed substantially to *Tomorrow*, and it is likely that a disagreement did occur, a link between Barnard's claim and a disagreement with Eldershaw is worthy of speculation.

This story, the narrative of the entwined authorship of Barnard and Eldershaw, holds hints of intimate conflicts that can only be guessed at. Explanations are

---

<sup>42</sup> Zoe Fairbairn, 'Interview with Marjorie Barnard, May 1983' in *Writing Lives: Conversations Between Women Writers*: 40.

<sup>43</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'The Gentle Art of Collaboration', *Ink No.2: 50th Anniversary Edition*, ed. Hilarie Lindsay, Sydney: Society of Women Writers, 1977: 128.

barely gestured towards in official documentation; Rorabacher writes, for instance, of Barnard and Eldershaw that “Both loved, belatedly; neither married.”<sup>44</sup> She offers no further elaboration. Who did Eldershaw belatedly love? Was Barnard’s belated love for Davison or Murdoch or both? Suggestions are too elusive and diffuse to be a subject of this study.

Barnard’s ‘The Persimmon Tree’, published as Barnard’s affair with Davison was ending in 1943, was chosen as an opening for this section because it expresses the impossibility of absolute definitions, and the imperative to dwell in subtleties and ambiguities. The story also deals with the kinship and distances that can exist simultaneously between human beings. In it, a convalescing woman watches another woman living in a flat opposite her own over a period of weeks, as late winter turns to spring. The unknown woman both mirrors the ill woman and exacerbates the pain of her isolation; she is at once mysterious, identifiable and obscurely desirable. The more the ‘watched’ woman is revealed, the more inaccessible and closed off she becomes to the woman who watches her. The final paragraph is both ‘exposing’ and enigmatic:

Very slowly she raised her arms and the gown fell from her. She stood there naked, behind the veil of the curtains, the scarcely distinguishable but unmistakable form of a woman whose face is in shadow.

I turned away. The shadow of the burgeoning bough was on the white wall. I thought my heart would break.

While ‘The Persimmon Tree’ is obviously, amongst other things, a gentle exploration of a woman’s sexuality, it would be a mistake to assume that this is the only possible interpretation, or even the most compelling one. The quiet anguish in the final line of the story is acute because it expresses desire that can never be realised, but it is as much about the emerging and struggling self of the

---

<sup>44</sup> Louise E. Rorabacher, *Marjorie Barnard and M. Barnard Eldershaw*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973: 15.

narrator as it is about the woman in the other window. The longing to be reunited with the 'other' in this story, and the recognition of the separateness and distance that prevent this, create the tension and the balance. The image of the budding persimmon tree and the window that is slowly unshuttered and opened echoes the transformation that is also taking place in the internal life of the convalescing woman. However, the transformation is incomplete, and the conclusion of the story contains the fear that it will always be so. Love between women, like a collaboration between writers, contains few official codes allowing full acceptance and knowledge. The rest remains in shadow.

## Chapter Five: The Textual Jigsaw

*"Author's intentions', first or final, has to be one among several criteria we use when trying to edit. But if the concept is indeterminate even within the arena of the author's solitary activities, its indeterminacy multiplies when we remember that authorship is a social and not a solitary act or sets of acts . . . it cannot be carried on without interactions, cooperative and otherwise, with various persons and audiences."*

Jerome McGann, 'What is Critical Editing?', *TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 5, 1991: 25-6.

# One: The Manuscripts

*"He was making a marvellous job of it, piecing it together almost out of dust, you might say, with only an old fragmentary inscription that no one had been able to trace before to guide him."*

*Tomorrow: 15*

Although the study of the texts of *Tomorrow* that is given in this chapter is not in itself a preparation for a scholarly edition, many of the issues provoked by these texts are addressed by the textual criticism usually associated with the preparation of scholarly editions. In the last chapter, the difficulties of locating the authorship of the novel were discussed. As there are four different textual versions of *Tomorrow* in existence, locating an authoritative version of the novel is doubly problematic. George Thomas Tanselle declared that:

Scholarly editors may disagree about many things, but they are in general agreement that their goal is to discover exactly what an author wrote and to determine what form of his [sic] work he wished the public to have.<sup>1</sup>

*Tomorrow's* textual history, as outlined here and in the previous chapter, demonstrates the difficulty — and perhaps the impossibility — of realising the goal described by Tanselle. As the last chapter has discussed, who is/are the author/s of this novel and are her/their claims to authorship reliable? Can we tell exactly what the author/s wrote from the typescript in the Mitchell Library; alternatively, can the typescript uncovered in 1999 be seen to represent the form of work that the author/s wished the public to have? These questions are the subject of this chapter and the conclusion, and they illuminate issues pertaining to intention, authority and textual stability that concern both literary theorists and textual critics.

In the opening pages of *Tomorrow*, Knarf remembers the excavation that he had observed on a trip to “the Centre on the coast” (p.13) and how a stone figure of “an infantryman in a slouch hat”, a “Brooding Anzac” (p.14) was found, the only figure to survive intact from “a frieze of . . . stone men” (p.15). The rest of the frieze is in pieces; a curator is working on reconstructing it, using the “fragmentary inscription” to guide him. Ord is depicted as feeling bitter about

---

<sup>1</sup> G. Thomas Tanselle, ‘The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention’ in *Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing*, Virginia: University Press of Virginia, 1990: 27.



this, because he feels that the project should have been communal (p.14). As with the creation of Knarf's novel and M. Barnard Eldershaw's novel, the recreation of the statue provokes disputes about ownership, authorship and collaboration.

An editor or a textual critic seeking to examine the texts of *Tomorrow* shares the position, problems and responsibilities of this curator, as both must try to get a sense of the whole work and its creation by piecing it together; there are some leads and sources that are untraceable and only certain fragments can ultimately be constructed from what might have been a larger whole. 'Texts' that claim to be authoritative need to be interrogated, although, as it has been argued, the discovery of another typescript of the novel (that "no one had been able to trace before") gives a more solid basis for reconstruction than the fragments that Ord's curator must contend with (p.15).

As with the Brooding Anzac, the meanings attributed to the traces of the 'original' artwork — in this case ML ms — may not represent all the intentions of the 'original' artists. As Knarf realises, the fundamental importance of the artwork remains, as a link between the past and the present, and as something to which significance can still be ascribed. In Knarf's world, a new generation of artists and critics are contributing to the recreation and meaning of a four-hundred-year-old work. The curator's task is, arguably, as creative as the original sculptor's, as he must use his intuition, as well as the traces of inscription, to piece together the work. The piecing together of the statue is therefore a social, collaborative and artistic act, in much the same way that a critical reconstruction of the texts of *TTT* must be.

The discovery of the typescript that Barnard created, probably in 1957 for Viking Press, challenges many commonly-held assumptions about the editorial

fate of *Tomorrow*. This chapter will give a closer textual analysis, and a comparison, of the four extant texts of *Tomorrow*: the Georgian House edition published in Melbourne in 1947; the typescript with the government censor's markings that is currently in the Mitchell Library in Sydney and the Virago edition published in London in 1983. Finally, the 1957 typescript, which has never been published and is currently owned by a private collector, is considered. The analysis aims to elaborate on and support some of the contentions given in previous chapters: in particular, that there are problems associated with the Virago edition of the novel and that, contrary to the assumptions of many readers after the publication of that edition, a full authoritative version of the novel has never been published.

This chapter will begin by looking at the Mitchell Library typescript, outlining some of the traces that are unknowable or inconclusive and speculating on the composition of the typescript. At the time of writing, only two short studies have discussed the textual variants of *Tomorrow*. Ian Saunders' 1993 paper, 'The Texts of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*: Author, Agent, History', is the only one to point out that an entire typescript of *Tomorrow* was never subject to the censor's scrutiny. Saunders is also the only scholar to comment on the fact that "the first 248 pages of the Virago edition are a photographic reproduction of the corresponding pages in the 1947 Georgian House edition."<sup>2</sup> However, it is not just the first 245 pages of *TTT* (as the page numbers begin at 3) that are "a photographic reproduction" of *TT*. In fact, the majority of *TTT* is photo-offset from *TT*. Only 168 pages in the 'Afternoon' section, corresponding to 171 pages of ML ms, have been reset and thus a total of 285 pages in *TTT* are photo-offset from *TT*. Most of the reset 168 pages correspond with the 144 pages of typescript that were sent to the censor, although as Saunders notes,

---

<sup>2</sup> Ian Saunders, 'The Texts of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*: Author, Agent, History', *Southern Review: Literary and Interdisciplinary Essays*, 26:2, 1993: 244.

some of the pages of the typescript immediately preceding those stamped by the censor show deletions that the *TTT* edition has also attributed to the censor.

These observations will be discussed in further detail in this chapter.

Saunders also notes that the typescript in the Mitchell Library reveals that:

Along with the censor's markings in red ink, there are a great many in pencil, and blue and black ink — some of which fall on pages not submitted to the censor. The red ink deletions are wholly restricted to the submitted pages. Moreover, where the two colours occur in the same passage, the red is inevitably applied to a single phrase, clause or sentence, while the black extends the deletion further.<sup>3</sup>

As he concludes, many of the cuts that are attributed to the censor by the editors of the *TTT* edition are clearly not the work of the censor at all. Rather, the emendations to ML ms were extended, after its return from the censor, either by the authors, an editor or the publisher at Georgian House, or by another unknown hand.<sup>4</sup> It is probable that some scholars who have written about the censored typescript have not recognised the variety of emendations because they have examined a photocopy or microfilm copy of the typescript. It is only when the censor's copy is viewed that the different hands and different coloured pens can be clearly observed.

The only other scholar to discuss the censor's cuts on ML ms in any detail is Robert Darby in 'Censored. . . and again. . . and again: Marjorie Barnard's struggle to publish pacifist arguments, 1939 — '47'. His focus, the title suggests, is on Marjorie Barnard's attempts to publish her political opinions and the implications of the censorship of Barnard's 'The Case for the Future' and

---

<sup>3</sup> Saunders: 246.

<sup>4</sup> Frank Dalby Davison may have marked ML ms at some point, as he had read the novel in typescript and provided comment. He wrote to Nettie Palmer in 1946 that he had "turned Flora in a couple of foolscap pages of comment." Davison to Nettie Palmer, 3 January 1946, The Palmer Papers, NLA MS 1174/1/6911.

of *Tomorrow*.<sup>5</sup> However, this paper does contain a short section challenging the position of Anne Chisholm, who suggested in the Introduction to the Virago edition of *TTT*, that one of the censor's aims was apparently "to weaken and blur the impact and credibility of the account of how . . . people, sick of war and propaganda, followed the Peace Party and withdrew from the war machine."<sup>6</sup> Darby argues that the censor had no such aim and was merely "applying the censorship directions in a literal-minded and . . . woodenly bureaucratic manner."<sup>7</sup> Darby's is the only study to emphasise that the censoring of the novel conforms to the special nature of wartime censorship under the National Security Act. Saunders remarks, for example that, "Rather delightfully, the only areas in which the censor is completely thorough is in removing all references to the word 'censor' itself."<sup>8</sup> However, as Darby's paper makes clear, National Security Regulations "prohibited reference to the fact of material having been censored, and this could be stretched to cover the very existence of a censoring mechanism."<sup>9</sup> Many examples of the censor's adherence to the Consolidated Censorship Directions will be examined in the following section.

In comparing the ML ms and the two published versions of the novel, it is necessary to make some general observations and speculations about the construction of the typescript. Sample pages of ML ms are given in Appendix One; on these pages it can be seen that some corrections and alterations to the typescript, both accidental and substantive<sup>10</sup> in nature, have been made as the

---

<sup>5</sup> Robert Darby, 'Censored. . . and again. . . and again: Marjorie Barnard's struggle to publish pacifist arguments, 1939—'47', unpublished paper for the History of the Book in Australia conference, RMIT, 21-22 November 1997. In my copy of the paper, the pages are unnumbered; I have numbered them from 1 to 26.

<sup>6</sup> Anne Chisholm, Introduction, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, London: Virago Press, 1983: xiii.

<sup>7</sup> Darby: 20.

<sup>8</sup> Saunders: 246.

<sup>9</sup> Darby: 23.

<sup>10</sup> The use of these terms here follows W.W. Greg, who in his essay 'The Rationale of Copy-Text' made a distinction between substantives (words as units of meaning) and

typist was typing.<sup>11</sup> All typing in ML ms is of a fairly low standard and there are mistakes on most pages. It is therefore probable that Barnard or Eldershaw, neither of whom was a professional typist, typed most of ML ms, since it is most unlikely that anyone else would make substantive corrections to the text while typing.

The pages reproduced in Appendix One are also noteworthy because they give clear examples of Barnard's and Eldershaw's handwriting. Barnard's handwriting appears after ML ms p.5, l.9. Her handwriting sometimes slopes slightly to the left, her 't's are often crossed extravagantly and the loops on her 'g's are irregular. Eldershaw's handwriting appears on p.22, and is a neat copperplate, befitting her profession as a schoolteacher. Her writing is more evenly spaced and consistently formed than Barnard's. The prevalence of Eldershaw's handwriting on this typescript adds weight to the argument that Eldershaw was significantly involved in the construction of the novel. With one possible exception, Barnard's handwriting does not appear on the typescript from p.5 of ML ms to the censored section in 'Afternoon';<sup>12</sup> all typescript emendations are in Eldershaw's hand, making it clear that Eldershaw did contribute significantly to the novel, in an editorial capacity at the very least.<sup>13</sup> Since the early parts of ML ms are marked with both a black and a blue pen, a feasible hypothesis for the construction of this part of the text is that it was typed by Barnard and then gone over twice by Flora Eldershaw. All the minor

---

accidentals (spelling, capitalisation, and punctuation). From *Art and Error: Modern Textual Editing*, eds. Ronald Gottesman and Scott Bennett, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1970: 17-36.

<sup>11</sup> For instance, ML ms p.16, l.3: "The colossus was seated, hands on knees" has been changed to "The colossus sat", while the typist was typing. On ML ms p.22, l.12, the word "century" has been corrected from the misspelt "centurt".

<sup>12</sup> The page numbering in ML ms is not continuous. 'Aubade', 'Morning', 'Symposium' are numbered from 1 to 316. 'Afternoon' is numbered from 1 to 276, with two unnumbered pages at the end. In addition, because of the page reshuffling, there are two lots of pages in this section with the numbers 190, 191 and 192. 'Aubade' is numbered from 1 to 34.

<sup>13</sup> The possible exception is ML ms p.94, l.4 in 'Afternoon': "slight" has been changed to "sly" or "shy" in what could be Barnard's hand. See footnote 21 in this section.

corrections, such as changes to punctuation, appear to have been made by Eldershaw, as far as one can determine when the changes are minute. Accidentals, like spelling corrections, are usually made in a black pen, while the substantive alterations are made in blue pen.

On several occasions Marjorie Barnard referred to the "mutilated body" of ML ms.<sup>14</sup> It can be assumed that she was thinking of the censor as the 'mutilator', but ML ms would have had a complicated history even without the censor's intervention, as it was compiled from a number of versions or copies of texts to form a complete document. The typescript is made up of several different kinds of paper and includes different coloured carbons, as well as original sheets,<sup>15</sup> but the original or originals of the carbons no longer appear to be extant.<sup>16</sup> The typefaces also vary and the pages are in variable condition; while some have been well preserved, others are torn, stained, and have been mended with tape. Additionally, as will be further examined in the next part of this chapter, the 'Afternoon' section of ML ms was renumbered several times and pages were reshuffled and taken out. Other pages appear to have been drafted and inserted at a later date. The two final pages of 'Afternoon', for instance, are unnumbered.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> See for instance 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written': 329. Anne Chisholm also uses this expression in her introduction to the Virago edition of the novel, Chisholm: xiv.

<sup>15</sup> In the first volume of ML ms, pp.51-91 are purple carbon copies and pp.92-186 are blue carbon (with an inset on p.172 typed in black). In the second volume, pp.1-5 are purple carbons, as is p.37 of 'Nocturne'. As mentioned, there are many different types of paper. 'Nocturne' is typed in its entirety on what appears to be carbon paper, although it is not a carbon copy.

<sup>16</sup> On 9 May 1944, Barnard wrote to Eleanor Dark: "I hope to have a copy of the MS available when Eric [Dark's husband] is in Sydney later in the month. There are 3, 1 in Melb, (2) the censored copy, and (3) another. It's No 3 I have earmarked for you. It's a haggard looking affair but legible." Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn With You*, Ed. Carole Ferrier, Oakleigh:Cambridge University Press, 1992 (hereafter *As Good As A Yarn*): 116. It is not possible to know whether the censored copy here is ML ms, since as discussed the ML ms was probably cobbled together later, or what the other two copies looked like, as they have not been located. Presumably, as Barnard was giving copies of these typescripts to friends to read, there were two carbon copies of the original.

<sup>17</sup> On 26 [?June 1944], Barnard wrote to Eleanor Dark, about these two pages. Dark had obviously queried whether some pages were missing in the typescript she had been given to read: "About the missing pages in *Tomorrow*, I don't think they are. I've been able to check with another copy. There are two pages after the inset novel,

The 'Nocturne' section differs from the rest of ML ms, as it contains no handwritten changes and few emendations. It also has different page numbering from the rest of ML ms, as the pages are numbered from 1 to 34. This section has been typed on carbon paper and there are many minor variants between ML ms version and the corresponding pages in *TT*, showing either that this section was set from a missing draft, or that some in-house emendations were made.<sup>18</sup> The character Oran appears as 'Vern' throughout this section, which also suggests that this version of 'Nocturne' was drafted earlier than other portions of ML ms; in the 'Symposium' section 'Oran' is used, as it is in both published versions of the novel.

When Edgar Harris wrote to Barnard and Eldershaw to inform them that he was sending part of their novel to the censor, he told them he had "submitted 132-276 of the second part [of the typescript]."<sup>19</sup> If the pages of this section were numbered without repetition, this would mean that 144 pages were censored. However, 148 pages bear the censor's stamp in ML ms, although these pages bear the numbers 132-276. The reason for this anomaly is that this section of ML ms also includes pp.154a, 154b and 154c, p.181a and p.248a.<sup>20</sup> As all of the additional pages give details about Arch Castles, perhaps his background and character were expanded on after an earlier draft of the novel had been completed. Alternatively, Eldershaw and Barnard could have each written

---

before the beginning of Nocturne. Just 2 & no more. And not numbered as typed out of order." Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 118.

<sup>18</sup> p.6 of 'Nocturne' in ML ms is reproduced in Appendix Two; it can be seen that the punctuation on ll. 15-16 has been changed in *TT* p.433, ll.3-4. Also note line 27 on ML ms page: on *TT* p.433, l.13, "Vern" has been changed to "Oran" and "to-day" to "today".

<sup>19</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944, Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/4.

<sup>20</sup> There is also a page marked 218-19. As the original p.219 has been taken out, this means that there are four more pages in the censored section of the typescript than the page numbering would suggest.

sections of the narrative and fitted them together later; the many different types of paper in this section of ML ms support the latter possibility.

Appendix Three gives an indication of the extent of the reshuffling and renumbering of pages in the 'Afternoon' section of ML ms. It can be seen that most pages have been renumbered once and a few have been renumbered twice, and so it is possible that earlier drafts of the novel, read by friends and perhaps by Harris, had a very different narrative sequence. With three exceptions — pp.190A, 191 and 192 — the final number on each page is consecutive. In ML ms, these pages are placed in between 132 and 136; they were previously numbered 133-135. This change makes sense when it is observed that the events described on these pages — concerning a Japanese plague — occur later in *TT*, approximately at the point of p.190 in ML ms. Pages 187-195 of ML ms have been cut completely from the text of *TT*, probably because it was not possible to restore this narrative section after the censor's deletions. It would therefore appear that the pages about the plague were renumbered for *TT* after the censoring, but when ML ms was bound they were returned to their earlier narrative position.

It is thus difficult to ascertain whether Barnard and Eldershaw sent Harris ML ms already heavily annotated, or whether Harris first viewed a different draft of the novel. The original numbering on pages in the 'Afternoon' section indicates that nine pages are missing from an earlier draft, assuming that the earlier draft was also numbered continuously and consecutively. Concomitantly, there are nine repetitions of page numbers in the original numbering. Given that some pages have been numbered three times, it is likely that this section of ML ms underwent at least three major revisions. While it is not known if Barnard and Eldershaw sent marked-up typescript to their publishers, the shortage of paper during wartime could have prevented the whole document



being retyped. As previously discussed, it is likely from the quality of the typing that Barnard and/or Eldershaw typed ML ms, and that it was a difficult task for someone who was not a professional. Perhaps it was too costly to employ a typist and too daunting for them to personally retype the many hundreds of pages of work.

ML ms differs substantially from *TT* between p.18 and p.276 of the 'Afternoon' section. Although the censor's stamp does not appear on ML ms until p.132 in the 'Afternoon' section, there are six significant deletions made in black ink before the censor's first cut, on p.190a in the 'Afternoon' section. The reinstatement of these cuts in *TTT* will be discussed later in this chapter.<sup>21</sup> Page numbers have also been shuffled here; p.18 is also marked in hand as p."19, 20", suggesting that two pages have been removed. As mentioned previously, *TT* has a different narrative sequence from ML ms and it includes an extra 2384 words, which are not in ML ms or in *TTT*.

It follows then that another draft of this 'Afternoon' section, which formed part of the source material for *TT* in 1947, must have existed. It is probable that Barnard and Eldershaw did not completely retype the novel after it had come back from the censor, and that the text for *TT* was formed by combining a revised 'Afternoon' section, and a possible revision of the 'Nocturne' section, with ML ms. This is because most of the first half of *TT* was created from ML ms, as pages given in Appendix One demonstrate.<sup>22</sup> It is probable that Barnard

<sup>21</sup> In addition to the omission of this material from *TT*, small details suggest that ML ms was not used as source material for *TT* from this point (ML ms p.18) until the end of the 'Afternoon' section. On p.61, l.18 in the 'Afternoon' section of ML ms, "all fields" has been tentatively changed by hand to "air" fields; these words then appear as "oil fields" in *TT* p.277, l.37. On ML ms p.94, l.4 in 'Afternoon', an alteration has been made, in what looks like Barnard's hand, from "slight" to "sly" or "shy". In *TT*, this change is not upheld.

<sup>22</sup> Copies of pp.5 and 22 in 'Aubade' and p.299 in 'Morning' in ML ms are in Appendix 1. Here are a few examples that demonstrate that most of the first half of *TT* was created from ML ms: ML ms p.5, l.3: "before" has been crossed out and amended in handwriting to read "earlier". On *TT* p.8, l.6 this change has been incorporated. More significantly, four lines of handwriting that have been inserted in between ll. 9-

and Eldershaw submitted additional material for their novel to Georgian House in 1946,<sup>23</sup> and it can be assumed that the manuscript or typescript of this redrafted section of the novel is irretrievable; it is highly unlikely that any Georgian House archives, which might have contained source material or galley proofs for *TT*, are extant.<sup>24</sup>

ML ms thus gives the impression of being, as Philip Gaskell has put it, "a means of composition, not an end."<sup>25</sup> Some textual scholars, like Gaskell, have argued that early printed editions make better copytexts than manuscripts because printed editions are closer to a final authoritative version than a manuscript that has been almost simultaneously created and amended. In the case of *Tomorrow*, of course, the censoring of ML ms complicates the issue of copytext and authoritative versions. As a document, ML ms is both a long way from representing an 'original' draft of *Tomorrow*, because it has been cobbled together from different sources and amended by several different hands, and also a long way from representing final authorial intention, because it was censored and then amended further to accommodate the changes made by the censor.

The construction of ML ms from sections and fragments of other typescripts by Barnard raises the question of what the intent of this construction was, and what

---

13 on ML ms p.5 appear on p.6, ll. 14-18 of *TT*. Page 22 contains handwritten amendments on ll. 3, 4, 11, 12, 16 and 25. All these amendments are incorporated into p.19 of *TT*, ll.14, 15, 22, 23, 26, 27, 36 respectively. ML ms p.299, l.23 has a handwritten amendment. It is included in *TT* p.222, l.31.

<sup>23</sup> Although no exact date is known, the approximate date given here is based on two of Barnard's letters. In the first, to Eleanor Dark 25 August 1945, she writes, "We're doing a little dismal research on *Tomorrow*. The great mass daunts revision." Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 131. In the second letter, to Jean Devanny, 1 January 1947, Barnard writes that *Tomorrow* is "set up" (in *As Good As A Yarn*: 158). It is therefore probable that a revised section of typescript was submitted to Georgian House sometime in 1946.

<sup>24</sup> In 1999, Brian Harris, whose father Edgar Harris founded Georgian House with George Jaboor in 1943, claimed that it was highly unlikely that any Georgian House archives were extant, since Paul Jaboor had bought out the Harris family in the 1970s and had later gone bankrupt. Personal communication, August 1999.

<sup>25</sup> Quoted by Jerome J. McGann in his *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983: 6.

Barnard hoped to represent. It is evident that the recently discovered privately owned manuscript was composed using the Mitchell Library manuscript as a guide, as Appendix Six demonstrates. Possibly then, Barnard constructed ML ms in 1957, as a guide for the creation of the P ms. However, the pages of ML ms could have been bound together in two volumes as late as 1960: in this year Barnard gave the typescript to the Mitchell Library, and wrote "Marjorie Barnard, Oct. 1960" in the left margin of the first page. It is also pertinent to ask why Barnard would choose to omit some revisions made after the censorship, and why she incorporated an apparently earlier version of 'Nocturne'. As David Greetham remarks:

It may be that a demonstrably non-authorial state (e.g., one produced through corrupt transmission or through the constraints of censorship) may have greater social prominence and have contributed more to the social "meaning" of the work than a witness with clearly more substantial claims to represent authorial intention.<sup>26</sup>

Given Greetham's view here, the motive of Barnard's project in compiling ML ms may be queried. In so far as it can be determined, Barnard's action appears to have been an attempt to 'restore' *Tomorrow* to its pre-censored state. As has been discussed, this effort probably represents only her own authorial intentions, and not those of her collaborator, particularly since it appears as though Eldershaw was largely responsible for the post-censorship revisions. Barnard might have also wished to leave a typescript that illustrated the censoring for posterity. Prior to *TT*'s publication, Barnard sent the copy of the censored typescript to several friends and entreated some to note the censoring. To Jean Devanny she wrote that she intended to keep the censored manuscript "as an exhibit. If we ever have a censorship exhibition I'll send it along — very illuminating."<sup>27</sup> As a document, then, ML ms sits somewhere between a

---

<sup>26</sup> David Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*, New York: Garland, 1992: 363.

<sup>27</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 1 January 1947. Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 158.

representation of first — and final — authorial intentions and Greetham's idea of a work that contributes social "meaning"; with its many censorings, emendations and corrections, it also conveys the impression of being a work in progress.

It can be seen then that ML ms has never been used in its entirety as a copytext. The first published version of *TT* was created from at least two separate documents: ML ms and the missing version of 'Afternoon'. As *TTT* contains only 168 reset pages, it does not use ML ms in its entirety either. The remainder of this chapter will deal with some variants between *TT* and ML ms that suggest irregularities in the construction of the first published edition of the novel. Firstly, a curious mistake with the header of p.249 in some copies of *TT* needs to be mentioned. In Appendix Four, this page is reproduced from two different copies of the 1947 edition. On one page the header correctly reads 'Afternoon', and on the other page an error has been made: the header reads 'Symposium'. The fact that these two pages are copies of the same edition means that this error was picked up and corrected part way through the print run.<sup>28</sup> The mistake is significant, however, because it occurs on the first page in *TT* to differ substantially from ML ms: p.249 in *TT* corresponds to p.18 in the 'Afternoon' section of ML ms. While it is impossible to form any definite conclusions on the subject, it might be speculated that the mistake occurred because a different, now missing, draft of the text was first needed at this point. In November 1946, Barnard wrote to Devanny that "*To-morrow and To-morrow and To-*

---

<sup>28</sup> There was only ever one print run, of 5000 copies, for the Georgian House edition. Records in the Mitchell Library ML MSS 451/5 show that 3672 copies had been sold by 31 December 1948. The same records indicate that 2859 copies of the 1948 Phoenix House edition had been sold by 16 June 1949. Five copies of the Georgian House edition were checked for the header error on page 249; of these five, three showed the error and two did not. Three copies of the Phoenix House edition, an English imprint of the Georgian House edition, have also been checked, and none of these displayed the error on page 249. Obviously, it cannot be concluded from such a small sample that no Phoenix House editions contain the error. However, the Phoenix House edition was produced at a later date, most probably after the error had been picked up in the Georgian House print run.

*morrow* is set up, Georgian House is publishing it slowly & by degrees.”<sup>29</sup> It is not clear what Barnard meant by this, but the letter below from Edgar Harris to Eldershaw on 22 November 1946 strongly suggests both that the authors had recently submitted the corrected proofs for the edition, and that various shortages in post-war resources held up publication to the extent that perhaps both the typesetting and the printing of the novel were being done “by degrees”:

Many thanks for your letter of 19th November and the final galleys of TOMORROW. The printer is making up the pages, but perhaps you would just be satisfied if we checked them over. If you would like to see them, they can be sent along as they come through.

As you know, we had hoped to publish the book last month, but the shortage of type setting metal and the various industrial hold-ups have made it impossible. It is very hard to guess when we may have it out but if the binding position is clear when the book is printed, I would say March is a possible date.<sup>30</sup>

If the text was set up in two or more stages, due to a shortage of typesetting metal or other “industrial hold-ups”, it would be more feasible for mistakes in continuity to occur, such as the mix-up in page headers described above.

The last two sections of ML ms to be examined here are two key passages in the ‘Morning’ section, which, unlike the rest of this section, do not correspond with *TT*. This examination also highlights some problems in the Virago edition which have occurred because, as previously mentioned, a large part of *TTT* is photo-offset from *TT*.<sup>31</sup> The first passage does not appear in *TT*, although it does

<sup>29</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Jean Devanny, 16 November 1946. Reprinted in *As Good As A Yarn*: 153.

<sup>30</sup> Edgar Harris to Flora Eldershaw, 22 November 1946. In Barnard’s papers, ML MSS 451/5.

<sup>31</sup> The following are just a few examples demonstrating the replication between *TT* and *TTT* until p.249 in both editions. As would be expected, the font size, spacing, line numbers, paragraphing, misprints and typographical errors are identical in *TT* and *TTT* until p.249. Page 37, l.21 in both editions has the misspelling “begining.” Page 158, l.27 in both incorrectly print “lifetime” instead of life line (see p.214, l.15 in ML ms). Page 182, l.6 in both has the typographic error “fel” instead of “feel”. Page 216, l.10 in both editions prints “were” instead of “was”. The ‘Nocturne’ section in both editions is also identical. For example, in a close examination of p.440 of *TT* and p.430 of *TTT* it can be seen that l.34 on both pages contains the word “ugly” with a broken “y”.

appear in ML ms; the second appears in *TT*, but not in ML ms. These anomalies were apparently not noted when the Virago editors were preparing *TTT*. The first passage of note here was referred to by Edgar Harris in his letter of 22 March 1944, when he wrote to Barnard and Eldershaw that "Apart from two words at the beginning of page 206 of the first part, which we think may have to be altered for police censorship reasons, the balance of the ms. is acceptable as it stands."<sup>32</sup> Page 206, line 1 in the "first part" of ML ms reveals his objections, and contains the "two words":

Love was a fairy tale told so often that people believed it. There was fucking but not love. Fucking wasn't enough. It left you empty and disappointed.

However, at some later point, something on the previous page obviously also caught the attention of someone at Georgian House:

Lot of bother keeping the world going just for that. Like the man who spent years learning to bend backwards and put his head between his legs just so he could piss in his own face (p.205, l.22-4).

In both *TT* and *TTT*, these lines are simply omitted and the lines on p.206 appear (on p. 152, l.22-4 in both versions, as this section was photo-offset) as:

Love was a fairy tale told so often that people believed it. There was sex, but not love. It wasn't enough. It left you empty and disappointed.

These subtle variants have not been picked up by previous scholars of *Tomorrow*, probably because *TTT* reproduced *TT* in this section of the novel and therefore also reproduced this other censorship. The Virago publisher missed the opportunity to reinstate two passages which were considered obscene in the 1940s, but which would have been acceptable in the 1980s. Barnard and Eldershaw would have been aware that their version was unlikely to be passed

---

<sup>32</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944, Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/4.

by the police censors, so perhaps they were being deliberately, and playfully, provocative at this point.<sup>33</sup> A letter to Eleanor Dark from Barnard, written after the completion of the first draft of the novel was submitted to Georgian House, indicates that its censorship was not entirely unanticipated, although it is not clear if Barnard was referring to special war-time regulations here: "The censor may not like it. Frank [Dalby Davison] thinks it will get by on the theory that censors are incorrigibly stupid."<sup>34</sup> The obscenity and the scatological reference, however, would have been cut under the normal censorship regulations governing morally objectionable literature.<sup>35</sup>

The other anomaly between the 'Morning' section in ML ms and the two published editions of the novel is a more significant one. While all the other changes that appear in the published versions of the novel, but not in ML ms, are included in the 'Afternoon' section of the novel, there are 790 additional words in the 'Morning' section of *TT* and *TTT*, on pp.204-6 of both editions. They are missing from the corresponding page in ML ms, p.280, which adds an impression of ML ms as a huge, incomplete puzzle.<sup>36</sup> Some readers questioned the appropriateness of this passage: as discussed, Marjorie Pizer complained in 1947 that Knarf's and Ord's discussion at this point was "a literary argument, quite irrelevant".<sup>37</sup> For some, then, the style and argument of this passage did not accord well with the surrounding narrative.

It is likely that many readers missed the import of this passage, since it has never been mentioned in published material on the novel. In this section, it is

---

<sup>33</sup> In a 1975 interview, Barnard said that only one word in *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* was obscene. Marjorie Barnard to Elizabeth Riddell, *Marjorie Barnard*, 17 April 1975, produced and directed by Keith Salvat, Keisal Films.

<sup>34</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Eleanor Dark, 21 October 1943, printed in *As Good As A Yarn*: 106.

<sup>35</sup> Darby: 9.

<sup>36</sup> See p.223 in this chapter.

<sup>37</sup> Marginalia, in Franklin's copy of *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, 1947. Now in Miles Franklin's papers, ML MSS 3691, Book 30-KH 605.

possible that Barnard and Eldershaw, using Knarf as a mouthpiece, were hinting that the book had been censored, and that Knarf has therefore had to change the pace of some of his narrative. When Ord complains that Knarf is twisting the facts, Knarf replies:

I've had to do a lot of that, and not in the way you suggest. *I've had to do it.* Not here, but further on, I've manipulated time. I've pressed events closer together than they actually were. Something had to go, and time was the expendable . . .  
 I've taken a pleat in time. I have kept events to the order of events, but I have brought them closer to one another. The uneasy years between World Wars II and III, since they yielded little except uncertainty, I have dwindled down. They were one and the same war divided into two parts by a truce and a reshuffling. The pestilence was later than I set it, the fall of the City, about twenty years later . . . The bombing of Sydney, for instance, that's wrapped in obscurity — nobody knows now what happened on that night.  
 (pp.205-6) [emphasis added]

This passage is reproduced at some length here because it demonstrates how ML ms differs from *TT*, the first published version of the novel. It is important to note that Knarf repeats that he has *had* to make these changes, possibly a veiled suggestion to readers that the copy of the book that they are reading has been altered from the original. Knarf offers no explanation for these compulsory “manipulations”, except to say that the expansiveness of the period of history that he was writing about made it difficult to be cogent — and that “something had to go.” However, the passages that Knarf describes above had to be changed by Barnard and Eldershaw after the censoring. In *TT* — but not in *TTT* — Knarf later stresses again that he has had to “telescope the years” and that he has not followed all the meanderings and repetitions of history (p.368 *TT*). For this reason, the passage above has greater resonance in *TT*. Knarf's comments about the war also make more sense in *TT*. While in this version there is a division between the wars, in *TTT* no real peace or armistice is described; the two wars are indeed “one and the same”. The “truce” that Knarf refers to in the passage above is the truce between Germany and Russia, a detail which is completely censored in ML ms. Crucially, page “reshuffling” in ML ms also means that the



“pestilence” (the Japanese plague p.366-368 *TT*, p.320-321 *TTT*) and the bombing of Sydney occur at different points in the narrative of ML ms from the version in *TT*. *TTT*, which follows the ML ms at this point, therefore contains a contradiction. It follows the uncensored version of the time sequence of events, as described above, and yet, because the earlier sections are photo-offset from ML ms, it also contains the passage on pp.205-6 which informs the reader of a differing order of events and perhaps warns that the book has been censored.

As this passage does not appear in ML ms, it is likely that these extra 790 words were added to a draft or to proofs when *TT* was being set up, after the typescript had been censored, when the authors were rewriting sections of the novel to accommodate the gaps left by the cuts. This strengthens the likelihood that the passage does contain a message from Barnard Eldershaw about the censorship and the subsequent rewriting. In 1944 any mention of censorship was strictly forbidden under the National Security Act, so it is conceivable that Barnard and Eldershaw could have concocted a way of indirectly conveying something about their novel’s fate. However, the words were not included when Barnard bound the typescript that constitutes ML ms.

Marjorie Barnard’s fears of the consequences of acquiescing to a reprinting of *TT*, rather than waiting for the book to be totally reset, were discussed in Chapter Three. Unfortunately, contrary to perceptions made popular by the Virago publication, no one has ever “come at the expense of resetting” the novel, and, as Barnard anticipated, the abridged Virago edition has thus far “put paid to its issue . . . in complete form.”<sup>38</sup> It is not possible to know whether Barnard was aware that Virago had not reset the majority of the book, but her agent Tim Curnow stated that “to my knowledge Marjorie had no great problem with the Virago edition which, of course, appeared with her approval and before

---

<sup>38</sup> Marjorie Barnard to Tim Curnow, 10 January 1979, Barnard’s uncollected papers.

her death.”<sup>39</sup> Perhaps, however, the photo-offsetting was one of the unspecified difficulties that Barnard later insisted that she had with the edition.

In his discussions with Ord, Knarf compares the difficulties of completing an “enormous jigsaw puzzle” to the effort of constructing his novel (p.316). Ian Saunders borrows this metaphor in his discussion of ML ms: “with its missing pages, alternative versions and many coloured deletions” it also resembles a huge, complicated puzzle.<sup>40</sup> More ‘pieces’ or fragments of text are now available, and previously unacknowledged blocks of added and deleted material can also be identified. However, since there are sections of manuscript or typescript, and at least one complete typescript,<sup>41</sup> that no longer appear to be extant, this particular puzzle cannot be completed. This is not the only riddle concerning the texts of *Tomorrow* : the next section discusses the difficulties in reading the novel from the viewpoint of a wartime censor, and examines the further problems that arose when Virago, in search of the original version of the novel, decided to ‘undo’ the censor’s work.

---

<sup>39</sup> Personal communication, 8 June 1995.

<sup>40</sup> Saunders: 246.

<sup>41</sup> See footnote 16 in this section, in which Barnard refers to two other typescript copies of the novel.

## **Two: The National Security Act and Virago**

*“Tell me,” Ord said, speaking more gently than usual, “what the world looked like in the years of fury. I’ve handled the fragments of the puzzle often enough but I haven’t put them together.”*

*Tomorrow: 317*

One of the most difficult dilemmas in textual theory is, as Donald Pizer puts it, “the degree to which editors should restore to modern eclectic editions material that the author himself [sic] has cut or revised under either direct or oblique pressure”. If a textual editor seeks to represent the author’s intentions, he or she needs to distinguish between revisions made to clarify the author’s intentions, and revisions that are made “to make a work more acceptable or saleable in the marketplace”.<sup>1</sup> This dilemma is illustrated in the examination of the ‘censored’ material in *Tomorrow* that follows. This material presents examples that are more problematic than the cases that Pizer cites, which deal with the issue of self-censoring. Here, the challenge is to determine what material has been self-censored and what material has actually been removed by a government censor. Markings on the Mitchell Library typescript suggest that the typescript has been subject to both kinds of excisions, although this has not been made clear in the Virago edition, the most recent edition of the novel. Therefore this section will give a close analysis of the textual variants between ML ms and *TTT*. As already noted, most differences between these two versions are in the ‘Afternoon’ section of the novel; thus this analysis concentrates on pages 18-278 in the second half of ML ms, which correspond with the reset portion of *TTT*, pages 249-416. The aim is to locate some of the different origins of emendations made on ML ms; to pinpoint the reasons for the cuts where possible; and to examine the representation of these emendations in *TTT*. This section describes the markings on ML ms, and the nature of the deletions, while the concluding section analyses the narrative distinctions between the two editions, and the critical difficulties involved in representing a ‘complete’ version of the novel. The predicament highlighted by Pizer — that is, the difficulty of determining the difference between author, editor and censor — is returned to at the end of this section.

---

<sup>1</sup> Donald Pizer, ‘Self-Censorship and Textual Editing’ in *Textual Criticism and Literary Interpretation*, Ed. Jerome J. McGann, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985: 144.

Close attention will be given here to the Consolidated Censorship Directions of 1943 and the ways in which the deletions on ML ms conform, or might conform, to these directions. The directions are specified under three headings: the 'Absolute Prohibitions By Law', based on the National Security (General) Regulations; the 'Chief Publicity Censor's General Directions'; and the 'Chief Publicity Censor's Special Directions', which contains 83 items.<sup>2</sup> The majority of the cuts made in *Tomorrow* appear to pertain to aspects of the general directions and regulations, particularly those relating to "influencing public opinion", "causing disaffection" and "prejudicial criticism".<sup>3</sup> A few cuts relate to items in the special directions, in particular the prohibition of all references to censorship. However, as will be seen, many of the cuts made on ML ms were clearly not the work of the censor.

In the discussion that follows, it is assumed that the publicity censor who deleted passages in ML ms did so with a red pen. Barnard herself, in 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written,' stated that the censor had "red-pencilled the latter part of the book".<sup>4</sup> Pen markings in this colour occur exclusively on the pages with the censor's stamp in the right hand corner and are consistently neat and horizontal, unlike many marks on the typescript. The censor was unlikely to have used different pens; it appears he read the typescript all on one day, as the stamps are all dated 17 March 1944. Moreover, if it is concluded that the censor's marks are the ones made in red, a logic can be traced for the majority of the markings on ML ms. This logic confirms Robert Darby's argument: that the censor's cuts clearly and

<sup>2</sup> As the directions of 1943 were in operation from 30 April 1943 until 31 October 1944, it is this version that the censor, or censors, followed when censoring *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* in March 1944 [AA B5661/1, item 1942/4083]. Also see Appendix 5 for a copy of the first two parts of the directions.

<sup>3</sup> Respectively, National Security (General) Regulation 42 (1.), and Chief Publicity Censor's General Directions (f) and (g).

<sup>4</sup> Marjorie Barnard, 'How *Tomorrow and Tomorrow* Came To Be Written', *Meanjin*, 3, 1970: 329.

exclusively conform to the censorship regulations. Evidence also suggests that the censor was a man, but at this time it is not possible to trace his identity, or whether more than one person looked over the typescript.<sup>5</sup> We do know that one person stamped it: all stamps bear the characters "V.P.C. 28", which presumably stands for "Victorian Publicity Censor #28".

As discussed in Chapter Three, archived correspondence indicates that Barnard gave permission to photocopy 144 pages of ML ms in 1982, possibly to enable preparation of the Virago edition. Although 148 pages of ML ms have the censor's stamp on them, it is likely that, since pages 132-276 were censored, it was thought that only 144 pages needed to be photocopied.<sup>6</sup> If this was the case, and these photocopies were used as a guide to set up *TTT*, an error in Anne Chisholm's Introduction to the edition can be explained.<sup>7</sup> Chisholm states on p.xii that "The deletions, in red ink, add up to some 393 lines." Virago restored a total of 393 lines, which equate to about 340 lines in ML ms, but these 340 lines are not all deleted in red ink. The number of lines deleted in red ink in ML ms add up to 194.5. Therefore, the cuts made by the censor on ML ms are about half the number that has previously been claimed. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the rest of the deleted lines are crossed out in pencil, blue and black ink. Some of the lines that have been "restored" in *TTT* were not deleted in ML ms at all, although they do not appear in *TT*.

---

<sup>5</sup> John Hilvert writes: "Not only were censors generally drawn from the ranks of journalists, they were to be male journalists. An annotation on a woman's application for a censorship position reads 'it is contrary to policy to employ women censors here.'" In *Blue Pencil Warriors: Censorship and Propaganda in World War II*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1984: 42.

<sup>6</sup> The reason that 148 pages were censored and not 144, as it first appears, is that four pages in this section of ML ms bear the numbers 154a, 154b and 154c, and 181a. See p. in section one in this chapter.

<sup>7</sup> Virago reset a total of 168 pages for their edition, which corresponds with 171 pages of ML ms. It is therefore likely that further pages were photocopied at some later stage although no record of this survives.

This apparent lack of awareness of the colour of the markings on ML ms could also explain why, in *TTT*'s 'List of Cuts Restored' (p.xvi), six deletions are cited as occurring before the censor's stamp appears. The 'Notes on Cuts' (p.xv) acknowledges the uncertain status of these six reinstatements, but still conveys the impression that all cuts were probably the work of the censor. As noted in the previous section, the first passage to appear crossed out in ML ms is on p.18 of the 'Afternoon' section. Pages 111, 117, 119 and 126 in this section of ML ms have also had sentences crossed out. However, all these deletions have been made in black pen, and the censor's stamp does not appear until p.132 of ML ms. It is therefore highly improbable that any of these deletions were the work of the censor, although they have been identified as such in *TTT* and restored on pages 249, 308, 311, 312, 316 and 319 respectively.<sup>8</sup> It is more probable that these sentences and paragraphs were excised by Barnard Eldershaw as they were redrafting the typescript after it had been censored, or by someone at Georgian House who was concerned that the content could contravene censorship regulations.

As the publicity censorship directions<sup>9</sup> in Australia applied to "editors, printers, publishers and wireless stations", Edgar Harris would have been aware of the possibility of being served an "order to submit", requiring approval to be given for all material intended for publication.<sup>10</sup> Both Darby and Hilvert note that the effect of this system was to make newspaper publishers and

<sup>8</sup> While the 'Notes On Cuts' page at the beginning of the *TTT* edition states that "it is possible, though given their content not likely, that some of the deletions on the unstamped pages were not made by the government censors but by the author or publishers for other reasons", the following page includes the deletions in the 'Lists of Cuts Restored', along with material that was cut by the censor.

<sup>9</sup> Paul Hasluck noted that "In a discussion of wartime censorship it is necessary to keep in mind a distinction between communications censorship (the censorship of letters, telegrams, cablegrams and the like) and publicity censorship, which was concerned with what was published in press, radio, the cinema or other publicity mediums." In *The Government and the People: 1939-1941*, Canberra, 1952: 179. *Tomorrow* was therefore censored by a publicity censor, with the 'Chief Publicity Censor's Special Directions' being used as a guideline, along with other sections of the 'Consolidated Censorship Directions.'

<sup>10</sup> Darby: 11. See also Hilvert: 42-3.

printers collaborate with the censors, as they had to anticipate whether a work was censorable by declining it or by submitting it for approval. These regulations usually affected newspapers more than publishing houses, but Harris was obviously nervous enough to voluntarily submit *Tomorrow*. Some of the likely reasons for his anxiety are given at the conclusion of this discussion. Given this system for applying the directions, it is possible that Barnard and Eldershaw, or Harris — or another editor at Georgian House — censored some sections of the typescript that the censor did not see. This would explain the existence of some of the black pen deletions on material that possibly, although not definitely, contravened regulations. It is thus conceivable that the Virago confusion over the censoring of potentially inflammatory material, on pages that do not bear the censor's stamp, was due to a publisher or editor who was also performing the role of a censor.

A deleted passage on p.18 — renumbered 19 and 20 — in the 'Afternoon' section of ML ms.<sup>11</sup> offers a good illustration of subject matter that was not clearly forbidden by censorship regulations, but was nonetheless possibly dubious enough for an apprehensive war-time publisher to censor it himself. This typescript page corresponds with the first reset page in both *TT* and *TTT*, which both have the page number 249. Three paragraphs have been crossed out, from l.22 on p.18 to l.13 on the next page, which is numbered 21. The lines have been excised using black ink and diagonal scoring, which implies that the excisions were not the work of the censor. Most of the content of the deleted lines does not appear to have warranted censorship; they cover the Russo-Finnish war of 1941, which by 1944 was well-publicised historical fact, as well as some innocuous meanderings about hairdressers and reason.<sup>12</sup> However,

---

<sup>11</sup> All page numbers for ML ms in this section are henceforth references to the 'Afternoon' section of ML ms.

<sup>12</sup> While the reference to the Russo-Finnish war was not censorable, Barnard, Eldershaw or someone at Georgian House, may have recalled a Moscow cablegram to *Tribune* on 6 April 1940, which was suppressed for alleging Finnish atrocities against



a passage criticising the National Security Act was perhaps a borderline case for censorship. This passage, which argues that the Act “severed at its root that democratic principle of government for which the war was, presumably, being fought”, ironically echoes the sentiment expressed by Robert Menzies when the National Security Act was passed in 1939: “the greatest tragedy that could overcome a country would be for it to fight a successful war in defence of liberty, and lose its own liberty in the process”.<sup>13</sup>

In the first confidential booklet of Censorship Rules, issued on 29 August 1939, the official policy concerning matters of opinion was that “legitimate criticism” would not be suppressed; however, “No attempt is made to define the limits of ‘legitimate criticism’.”<sup>14</sup> It is possible then, given that a work such as *Tomorrow* can be seen in its entirety as “provocative in the extreme”,<sup>15</sup> much would be left to the discretion of the individual publicity censor, or censors. Given the “order to submit”, publishers would also have been obliged to assess whether their material was “legitimate criticism” and thus permissible.

After the National Security Act was passed on 13 September 1939, the National Security (General) Regulation (Statutory Rules 1939 No. 87) was gazetted, which assisted censors less in determining “legitimate criticism” than in specifying what was illegitimate. For instance, Regulation 41 (1.)(a), which is reprinted in the directions for 1943, states that a person shall not:

endeavour to cause disaffection among any persons engaged (whether in Australia or elsewhere) in the service of the King or the Commonwealth,

---

the Russians and containing an attack on Britain and France, and decided not to risk the reference to “stirring up of enmity between Left and Right.” See Hasluck: 183.

<sup>13</sup> quoted in John Hilvert: 45.

<sup>14</sup> Hasluck: 180.

<sup>15</sup> Anne Chisholm, introduction to M. Barnard Eldershaw, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, London: Virago Press, 1983: xii.

or in the performance of essential services, or to induce any person to do or to omit to do anything in breach of his duty as a person so engaged.<sup>16</sup>

These stipulations are so general that it is certainly possible that criticism of the National Security Act could be read as endeavouring to “cause disaffection”. However, p.18 did *not* go to the censor and it is questionable whether the page would have been cut had it done so. In passages in ML ms that have been censored for “prejudicial criticism”, or encouragement of “disloyalty or disaffection”, the statements are usually more specific than the example on p.18, criticising individuals or nations by name. Because of their specificity, the censored passages frequently violated the stipulation under the fourth point of ‘Statements likely to Cause Disaffection’: that no matter may be published that is “likely to prejudice His Majesty’s relations with an Ally or with any Foreign Power with which he is at peace, or likely to offend any such Ally or Foreign Power or any part of His Majesty’s dominions”. Thus, lines such as these were removed: “What did England want but trade? Not the responsibility of backward colonies, not subject peoples unfitted by nature to partake of her glorious liberty” (ML ms p.190, ll.12-14). On the other hand, lines which could be interpreted as “causing disaffection”, but which were couched in figurative terms, were allowed to stand: “The god damn bloody wattle, he wanted to stamp it into the earth, the cold, wet, foreign earth. It had no right to change him, no right to strip him naked” (ML ms p.155, ll.9-10). It is also worth stressing that the majority of the material that was submitted to the censor and duly cut was speculative, or “prognostication” as Harris called it, and not an analysis of past, well-publicised circumstances and events.<sup>17</sup> Those at Georgian House obviously did not feel, for instance, that the criticism of Australia’s and America’s failure to send armed reinforcements to the West Indies before the Japanese invasion (ML ms pp.108-110) constituted “doubtful matter”.

<sup>16</sup> Chief Publicity Censor’s General Directions: (f) and (g).

<sup>17</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944, Marjorie Barnard’s papers, ML MSS 451/4.

The way in which the cut passage on pp.18-21 of ML ms was restored in *TTT*, on p.249, is also problematic. Two pages are missing after this passage in ML ms, so it is probable that either the authors or a Georgian House editor also excised the passage on p.21 of ML ms which deals with hairdressers because the context had been lost. The crossed-out passages have been reinstated by the Virago editors as if the two pages belonged next to one another; apparently the editors did not realise that the intervening two pages were missing. The narrative consequences of this are covered further on.<sup>18</sup>

The majority of passages in ML ms that have been inked-out in black pen, like the example given above, contain subject matter that was possibly, if sometimes ambiguously, in violation of censorship regulations, particularly those that stated prohibitions against evincing disloyalty and prejudicing Allied interests. The nature of these prohibitions is echoed in concerns that Edgar Harris expressed to Barnard and Eldershaw, two weeks after the typescript for the novel had been seen by the government censor. He was responding to a letter that Eldershaw had written, which stated, in part:

I am sorry the last part went to the censor. Of course, I know the censor has to pass upon it, but to send him that part without the context & all that went before to build up its validity is surely to invite his rejection of it.<sup>19</sup>

Harris replied that the portion of the novel that was sent to the censor would be "received sympathetically, and with a knowledge of what goes before, for we prepared a summary of the story":

The opinion expressed by one responsible man was that it was unlikely exception would be taken to any of it, but our opinion is that political quarters are so sensitive to anything that might disturb Allied relationships that objection would be made to that part postulating an international police force composed of American, British and Japanese elements directed to the

<sup>18</sup> Also see Appendix Two for a list of all reshuffled pages in ML ms.

<sup>19</sup> Flora Eldershaw to Edgar Harris, undated [25 March 1944?], Marjorie Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/4.

job of alienating Australia's relations with Russia, and also the suggestion that Russia may make a separate peace with Germany.<sup>20</sup>

Although the censor has indeed crossed through sections relating to the aspects of the novel that Harris describes, there are also segments of the typescript on similar subjects that have been scored through with black pen, both on pages submitted to the censor and on some that he did not see. It is noteworthy that in an earlier letter to Barnard, Harris made it clear that he had doubts about the speculative nature of the material submitted to the censor "*independent of what the censor may say*" [emphasis added].<sup>21</sup> It is possible then, that Harris or one of his employees cut some of the material which Harris had found to be dubious, and that the portion of typescript was then sent to the censor, who made further deletions.

Most of the passages that have been deleted in red ink also have red pencilled marks in the margin beside them, suggesting that the censor made a quick preliminary reading, with a preconceived and definite idea of the type of material that he was looking for, before going through the typescript again. Another possibility is that Harris had marked up the passages that he was worried about and wanted to draw to the censor's attention. Most of the markings appear to indicate subject matter that pertains to Allied relationships, an international police force, or Australia's relations with Russia and Germany. The marginal marks are exclusively beside passages that have been erased with red ink, and there are no red marks beside any of the passages that have been erased with pencils or pens in other colours.

It is known that the censored typescript was returned to Barnard and Eldershaw who, over the next two years, rewrote some material, cut sentences that no

---

<sup>20</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 5 April 1944, Marjorie Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/4.

<sup>21</sup> Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 22 March 1944.

longer made sense, and moved some pages around. The existence of pencil, blue pen, and some of the black pen markings on this section of ML ms could thus be accounted for. As mentioned in the first part of this chapter, it is probable that the typescript that was sent to Georgian House in 1944 was already marked up, so some markings, particularly small changes of punctuation and detail, could have existed on the typescript before it was sent to the censor. The hypotheses put forward here therefore suggest that the colour of the markings on ML ms are crucial to establishing the purpose and the possible dates of deletions. What follows is a detailed examination of pp.111-278 of ML ms, with reference to the colour or colours of the crossings-out of deleted passages, and thus the likely reasons for their removal. As highlighted previously, the reasons given for the cuts in this section of ML ms, and the restoration of cut material in the Virago edition, are also analysed.

The next cut in the typescript following p.18 (which was discussed above) appears on p.111, ll.22-27 in ML ms. Again, the passage is crossed out diagonally in black ink: there is no censor's stamp at the top of the page, and so it may be assumed that it is not the work of the censor. The page that originally followed this one has been renumbered as p.117; there is a second p.112 which was not renumbered and so it was possibly inserted into the narrative at a later date.<sup>22</sup> Thus, in an earlier draft, the cut passage, describing an "upflaring of violence", was directly followed by an account of the pressure of fear in "the great coastal cities". Perhaps then, the passage was cut by Barnard and Eldershaw during the page reshuffling because it was seen as superfluous. Alternatively, Harris or another editor at Georgian House could have felt that the suggestions that Russia could save the Allies, and that Australia was a Japanese target, contravened the guideline that matter which was "likely to prejudice His Majesty's relations with an Ally or with any Foreign Power" was

---

<sup>22</sup> The pages appear to have been renumbered so that a segment about the American soldiers could be inserted into an earlier point in the narrative.

not permitted.<sup>23</sup> However, if this was an infringement it was a minor one, given that Russia was an ally in 1944 and that the Japanese are not mentioned directly in the paragraph. The passage appears in *TTT* on p.308, ll.7-13. While its reinsertion is not as disruptive to narrative continuity as the previous restoration, the subject matter on this page does change from paragraph to paragraph, as the passage is re-established in between a description of Harry and a discussion about the American soldiers in Australian cities.

On p.117 of ML ms (formerly p.112), ll.22 and 23 are crossed out in black ink: "Rabaul was occupied, Port Moresby was raided, Darwin was raided. The public mind adjusted itself to that". The most likely reason for this deletion is simply that the lines are repetitive, as p.93, l.6-7 of ML ms reads: "The Japanese took Rabaul, they raided Port Moresby, they took Timor, they raided Darwin". As these were publicly known events by 1944, this would not have been censorable material. The reinstatement in *TTT* (p.311, ll.13-14) is redundant, since these events have already been described fifteen pages earlier (p.296, ll.11-13 *TTT*).

The next lines that appear crossed out on ML ms are on p.119 and these are reinstated on p.312 in *TTT*. They read: "Its significance seemed clear. Java, still holding out, had been by-passed" (ll.18-19 ML ms, ll.20-21 *TTT*). In the typescript, the word "Java" has been scored out diagonally; the two sentences are also crossed out in black ink. The line appears directly after the description of the Japanese attack on what was presumably Broome: "A pearling town on the nor'west". Possibly, when this sentence was first written, it was uncertain as to whether Java would escape attack; after Java was invaded in March 1942 the detail was historically inaccurate and unnecessary. Its reinstatement in *TTT* thus makes little sense, as the events of war that have been recounted up until

---

<sup>23</sup> Chief Publicity Censor's General Directions: (f), (iv) and (v).

this point in the narrative are more or less factual. The narrative only becomes clearly futuristic at the point at which the censor's stamp appears.

One of the last deletions in ML ms that appears before the censor's stamp, and is restored in *TTT*, appears on p.126, ll.22-25 (p.316, ll.32-36 *TTT*) All markings here are in black pen and, in this instance, it is probable that Barnard deleted the text, as she has also altered the word "said" to "asked" above the corrections, all of which appear to have been done with the same pen. The subject matter is not controversial, and this is almost certainly an editorial deletion of superfluous material. Its relevance in *TTT* is unclear, apart from the fact that it reminds readers of the twentieth century that potential readers in the twenty-fourth century probably won't know what a jigsaw puzzle is — although we are told that on the Tenth Commune crosswords and diablo are popular.

Most of the textual material on pp.130-132 in ML ms did not appear in *TT*. These pages have not been amended by hand in any way, but they do appear to have been inserted into the typescript at a later stage, as they have not been renumbered like the surrounding pages. They directly precede the first pages to bear the censor's stamp; this material has been shifted to a later point in the narrative in *TT* and follows on from a page that does not appear in ML ms. These pages may have been omitted at a late stage of authorial emendation, when a passage about a Japanese plague was being rewritten, or it may have been decided that references to "Britain's impotence", or the overwhelming desire of the Japanese to invade Australia, could prejudice relations with enemies and Allies. Mentioning "the alleged presence or activities of enemy agents in the South-West Pacific Area" was also banned, as was "speculation as to probable or possible enemy or Allied moves".<sup>24</sup> Under the latter stipulation,

<sup>24</sup> Chief Publicity Censor's Special Directions: A.5 'Aliens and Enemy Agents' (a), C.8 'Communiques and Speculation' (b).

justification for cutting many passages in the following pages could be found, as much of the content focuses on an imaginative projection of how the war would progress.

The very first phrase that is crossed out on the pages viewed by the government censor is reinstated in the Virago edition, but is not acknowledged in the 'List of Cuts Restored' page. The line is not crossed out in red ink, but in pencil; the fact that the page bears three different page numbers also suggests the reason that it has been deleted. Four of the five lines on the previous page, p.132 in ML ms, do not appear in *TT*. The last line appears on p.366 in *TT*; it appears earlier, on p.320, in *TTT*. On p.190a, which follows p.132 in ML ms, the crossed out line reads: "Homeward bound for refitting, fell in with a Jap destroyer in waters where she did not expect to find one".<sup>25</sup> On p.366 in *TT*, the corresponding (partial) sentence is "homeward bound for refitting after a tour of service hunting pirates among the islands, fell in with a Jap destroyer in waters where no Jap had any right to be". It is clear then that the first deletion on p.190a in ML ms was made as part of the revision for *TT* and that this page was reshuffled several times, eventually being placed nearly sixty (typescript) pages further on in the narrative.

At the bottom of p.190a, ll.24-26, the first crossing out by the censor appears, distinguishable both because the scorings are neat and in red ink, and because the subject matter contravened censorship regulations. Darby notes that these lines would have been prohibited because they mentioned unkind treatment of prisoners: "The American crew, in high spirits at the prospect of going home, ragged the wretched creatures unmercifully, and authority indulgently shut its

---

<sup>25</sup> The page numbering is confusing here because the typescript contains two sets of pages numbered 190, 191 and 192, as the chart in Appendix One indicates. Further on in this analysis pages with numbers in the 190s are discussed again; this refers to are the second group of pages with these numbers.



eyes.”<sup>26</sup> In fact, this whole passage, about three pages in total, could have been cut because it refers to “the alleged presence or activities of enemy agents in the South-West Pacific Area”. It also refers to figures of enemy casualties and “alleged measures taken against enemy prisoners”, which was forbidden.<sup>27</sup> However, the censor’s deletions here are relatively light. Over the page, on p.191, another sentence has been crossed out by the censor, presumably because it also suggests cruel treatment to prisoners-of-war.

Page 192 bears the marks of several hands. One sentence about “taking no prisoners” has been cut by the censor, probably because references to measures taken against prisoners of war were forbidden, but perhaps also because the phrase implies that the alternative was killing; “Atrocities stories concerning Australians or relating to incidents in the South-West Pacific” were not permissible.<sup>28</sup> Other emendations are made in black ink, including a passage which has been crossed out and rewritten, in Barnard’s hand. *TTT* has the amended version on pages 321-2, ll.39 and 1-8, which is the same as the version on p.368, ll.3-11 of *TT*. It is likely that the lines crossed out in black ink here were deleted by Harris, Barnard or Eldershaw for similar reasons to those discussed above: they anticipated that these lines were censorable. The lines contained references to hostilities between the United Nations and Japan, and between China and the Allies, which perhaps could be seen to prejudice or disadvantage Allied interests. Also crossed out diagonally in black ink on p.192 is the paragraph containing the line deleted by the censor about “taking no prisoners.” It is probable that these marks are editorial and part of the reworking of this section for *TT*, since the subject matter does not appear more

---

<sup>26</sup> Darby: 22.

<sup>27</sup> Chief Publicity Censor’s Special Directions, A.5 ‘Aliens and Enemy Agents’ (a), C.2 ‘Casualties and Casualty Lists’ (e), P.5 ‘Prisoners of War’ (b) respectively.

<sup>28</sup> Chief Publicity Censor’s Special Directions, A.8 ‘Atrocities’.

controversial than other passages which were allowed to stand. In the *TTT* edition this passage is listed as having been cut by the censor.

There are no substantial or red ink cuts on ML ms for another twenty-five pages, although they have been stamped by the censor; however there are several minor crossings out and handwritten changes. On p.142, l.6 in ML ms, for instance, the line: "It was a nightmare of ordered efficiency" is crossed out messily in pencil. The line does not appear in *TT* and it is not reinstated in *TTT*, either because it was recognised as an editorial change or because the Virago editors also used the Georgian House text as a guideline. Several instances suggest that Virago's preparations for the reset section of *TTT* included consultation of *TT* as well as ML ms. An example is the words "internal turmoil", which appear on both *TT* p.363, l.27 and *TTT* p.357, l.29, rather than the words "internal unrest" in ML ms p.186, l.13, indicating that *TT* — and not ML ms — was the guide for *TTT* in this case. In ML ms p.187, l.14, "Such motor cars as were still extant" is changed in Barnard's hand to "as had braved the streets". On the same page in ML ms, l.17, there is an alteration to the structure of a sentence ("the mob chose as its mascot Elsie Todd"), also in Barnard's hand. These handwritten amendments are upheld in both *TT* (p.364-5, ll.38-9, 2) and *TTT* (p.358, l.16, 19)<sup>29</sup>, suggesting that in these instances the Virago editors did differentiate between Barnard's hand and the hand of the censors, and recognised that Barnard had made an editorial correction that was independent of the censorship. Without this recognition, the handwritten amendments could have been disregarded in *TTT*. It would appear that, when preparing to reset this section of the novel, Virago editors had photocopied pages of ML ms and a copy of *TT* beside them, and referred to both. This editorial policy appears somewhat inconsistent, given that for the most part, *TTT* uses ML

---

<sup>29</sup> A similar instance occurs at a later stage in the typescript: the word "weary", on l.20 of p.196 in ML ms has been crossed out — probably for editorial reasons — and is excluded in both editions.

ms as the authoritative text, implying that *TT*, as a censored text, failed to represent its authors' wishes.

On p.160 of ML ms, seven lines have been deleted with neat, black horizontal lines. In a photocopy, these deletions would certainly look like the work of the government censor, since the censor's stamp is in the top right-hand corner and since the material was possibly censorable: it refers to how "Australia was cut off from the world more completely than she had been for a century or more . . . No travellers came, no letters passed, except through the needle eye of officialdom." This is an oblique reference to censorship, and since mentioning censorship was not allowed, it could have been anticipated that this passage would not be passed.<sup>30</sup> This passage is noted incorrectly as the work of the government censor in *TTT* and appears on p.340, ll.7-13. However, an editorial cut, "of her own", necessary because of the deleted reference to "Australia", has been made further down the page in the same black pen, suggesting that either Harris, another Georgian House editor, or Barnard and Eldershaw would have been responsible for all deletions on this page.

The next reference to censorship, on p.163, ll.21-22 of ML ms, has clearly been removed by the censor, as it is crossed out in red ink. Publishing the phrase "as a move in his eternal battle with the censors" would have been a contravention of the prohibition of "the printing, publication, or broadcasting of any statement to the effect that any alteration, addition or omission has been made to any matter by a Publicity Censor." The phrase is clear and unambiguous; as no reference to the existence of censorship was permitted, a censor following these regulations would have little choice but to cut it. The latter part of this point in the directions states that "All references to the exercise of Censorship or to Censorship or Intelligence personnel must be

---

<sup>30</sup> Chief Publicity Censor's Special Directions, C.3 'Censorship, References To.'

submitted", a stipulation which might have influenced Georgian House's decision to submit the novel.

Dramatic alterations to ML ms are evident from p.186 onwards. It is obvious that the censor had a large hand in the deletions, as red ink and the censor's stamp appear consistently on the next twelve pages, but other hands and pens are also visible. In the margin of p.186 of ML ms, for instance, there is a handwritten alteration in Barnard's hand, which appears in both *TT* (p.363, l.26) and *TTT* (p.357, l.28), although in *TTT* it reads as "the East and West" rather than "East and West", as in ML ms and *TT*. While the *TTT* version would gain plot consistency if the line was restored to the original: "Germany broke under the assaults of the Russians" (l.12), this would have gone against Virago's apparent editorial policy of incorporating handwritten amendments. Most corrections on this page are in black pen and diagonal pencil lines cut across the final five lines. Only one line, at the bottom of the page, has been crossed out in red: "here and there in excess of excitement men sabotaged the machines to which they had so long been slaves". This phrase is in clear violation of a direction that prohibits reference "without Censorship endorsement to reports of actual or alleged or attempted sabotage, malicious damage or other similar offences in any defence undertaking, public building or utility".<sup>31</sup> Typically, other, more general, subject matter on this page *could* have been censorable, particularly the description of the assaults on Germany by the Russians, which could be interpreted as "likely to prejudice His Majesty's relations with an Ally or with any Foreign Power with which he is at peace".<sup>32</sup> However, it appears the page was subject to revisions by people other than the censor: at the beginning of a long section that is crossed out in black, the number "186A" has been written, probably to indicate that some new passages, which appear in *TT* but are missing in typescript form, were to be

<sup>31</sup> Chief Publicity Censor's Special Directions, S.1 'Sabotage'.

<sup>32</sup> Chief Publicity Censor's General Directions, (f), (iv).

inserted at this point. Again, a photocopy of this page would not indicate the different colours of the deletions; *TTT* thus implies that all deletions here are the work of the government censor.

On the following page in ML ms, p.187, the top seven lines have been crossed out in black ink. It is likely that they were cut by Barnard and Eldershaw because the context had been lost after cuts had been made on the previous page. The *TTT* notes imply that these deletions were the work of the censor, and the reinstated lines appear on p.358, ll.4-10. One of the deleted lines, "The city was like a brazier and piled high its own fuel", appears in a slightly modified form in *TT* on p.364, ll.31-33 as "The city turned like a great record throwing off sound, or it was like a brazier piled high with its own fuel". The inclusion of this line in the 1947 text also strongly suggests that it was not cut by the censor. In any case, it is difficult to see how these words, describing celebrations at the end of the war, would contravene the censorship regulations.

Page 188 in ML ms again displays the work of several hands. Darby attributes all cuts to the censor<sup>33</sup>, but it is unlikely that this is the case, as the markings are both in black and red, and there are variations in the ways in which the passages have been marked out. A whole paragraph is crossed out in squiggly, diagonal lines, but the paragraph above it has been deleted in red. The page has also been renumbered in the margin as 188A. The first section on the page to be crossed out, with diagonal black lines, was probably removed by Barnard and Eldershaw because it includes the lines, "Authority tried to drive home the lesson 'We are still at war.'" In the *TT* version, the story has been changed to include a victory, so this passage would obviously have had to be deleted for consistency. Two large deletions in red ink on this page and the next are presumably the work of the censor. Both passages probably contained too much

---

<sup>33</sup> Darby: 23.

information and speculation about Allied and enemy relations to be permissible, particularly the references to the victories of Russia, and the statement that communism was sweeping through Germany and that Russia and Germany had become allies. There is also an implicit criticism of British lack of involvement in the Pacific war which would have been forbidden.<sup>34</sup> The crossed-through paragraph that is between the two censored sections was presumably omitted later because the context had been lost. It includes a somewhat prophetic description of Hitler's suicide. As the finer details of the suicide were inaccurate by 1946, when Barnard and Eldershaw were revising, they could have decided to delete it for this reason.<sup>35</sup>

The notes in *TTT* for this page indicate that an entire eight pages of typescript were censored at this point, from the top of p.188 to the bottom of p.195 in ML ms, which corresponds with five pages (358-363) in *TTT*. This is inaccurate, as only some parts of the deleted material on these eight pages has been removed by the censor; the rest was probably cut by Barnard and Eldershaw, because the remaining fragments of text did not make sense. The misconception that all deletions on these pages were the work of the censor would have again occurred if the Virago editors were working from a photocopy; it could also have been seen to be supported by the fact that none of these pages appear in the *TT* edition. The gap that the excisions leave has been filled by several pages of mostly new material (pp.365-9 *TT*). The perception that the cuts of the censor to the novel were "devastating and insidious"<sup>36</sup> has in part been fostered by the belief that

---

<sup>34</sup> All of these details would be banned under the 1944 Chief Publicity Censor's General Directions (f) *Statements likely to Cause Disaffection*, in particular point (iii) "is calculated to influence public opinion (whether in Australia or elsewhere) in a manner likely to be prejudicial to the defence of the Commonwealth or to the efficient prosecution of the war", and (iv) "is likely to prejudice His Majesty's relations with an Ally or with any Foreign Power with which he is at peace, or is likely to offend any such Ally or Foreign Power or any part of His Majesty's dominions."

<sup>35</sup> See Footnote 23 in Section One of this chapter, which gives an approximate date for the post-censorship revisions to the novel.

<sup>36</sup> Jill Roe wrote a year after the Virago edition came out that ". . . it is now clear that the effect [of the censorship] was devastating and insidious." In 'The Historical

the cuts in this section of the manuscript were more extensive than in fact they were. This section of the novel has indeed been heavily marked by the censor, but the extent of editorial alterations and revisions which are also evident makes an endeavour to restore an "original" version of the novel far more problematic than the *TTT* edition indicates. This issue will be raised again in the next section, when the effect of reinstating these eight pages in *TTT* will be examined, particularly in terms of how their inclusion effects difference between the narratives of *TT* and *TTT*.

The deletions on p.189 in ML ms are nearly all the work of the censor, who has crossed out a paragraph horizontally, and indicated diagonally that the whole paragraph has been cut. The paragraph alludes to a "propaganda machine" and extends the suggestion that Germany has formed an alliance with Russia against England; it is censorable for the same reason as the passages on the previous page: it falls under restrictions on "Statements likely to Cause Disaffection". The bottom of this page shows that the words "News of a peace move" have been partially crossed out with a thick black pen, as if someone began to delete them and then changed their mind.

This line could have been marked for deletion because the next page has been entirely scored through in pencil. This must have been an editorial or authorial decision, firstly because it is not in red pen, but also because the page has been cut too heavily by the censor for the rest to be easily redeemable. Again, most of the censor's cuts on this page are to material which pertains to offending Allies. One cut by the censor on this page is more subtle — and more curious. The sentence "She [Japan] could say with truth that she had no designs on Australia" has had the words "with truth" crossed out. The censor apparently felt that it was acceptable to insinuate that the Japanese did not intend to target Australia,

as long as the sincerity of the Japanese was not insisted upon. Someone has also marked two sentences in blue or black ink: "Look at Germany whiteanted. It will be France next and France is only just across the Channel." This is perhaps because the rest of the paragraph containing these lines had already been struck out by the censor.

Page 191 has been almost entirely scored through by the censor, although a couple of lines, including, "In vain did the enlightened struggle against the miasma of propaganda" — apparently too vague to be considered a reference to censorship — were left unmarked. It is at this point in the story that the turning of Australian public opinion towards the Japanese is described: "Are we going to bear malice for ever because of Pearl Harbour?" is asked, a brave question in early 1944, with Japanese surrender still over a year away. Questions like these, along with assertions such as: "England'd rather see the Japs get us than the coms get hold of France" would also be seen to "evincedisloyalty".<sup>37</sup> At the bottom of this page and on the next a segment criticising capitalism has been deleted in black ink, and thus not by the censor, for reasons unknown.

On page 192, only six and a half lines have been cut by the censor, and not the whole page, as suggested in *TTT*. Several lines have been amended in blue ink and pencil; the censored lines were probably removed because they were seen as disloyal both to Russia, still an Ally in 1944, and to America. Over the page, there is an example in red ink of what is probably the censor's handwriting, since it appears to be a helpful suggestion on how to mend a paragraph after it has been cut. "Propaganda" is supplied as a replacement for an "it" referring back to the deleted "broadcast poison". As Hilvert has commented, the role of

---

<sup>37</sup> Chief Publicity Censor's General Directions (f), (i).



editor and censor sometimes merged for wartime censors as, by 1944, most censors were former journalists:

. . . It seems that journalists were pleased to take jobs as censors because the experience of the Great War suggested that if censorship was needed, it was better for journalists, rather than quasi-military officers, to undertake this delicate task. Censorship bore some resemblance to the discipline of editing. Some censors began to subedit and correct grammar and spelling, to the chagrin of private journalists.<sup>38</sup>

Some subtle subediting appears to have occurred here, and again later in the text, as will be seen. The rest of p.193 has been marked primarily in red. The censored comments on this page, as on many earlier pages, relate to negative remarks about Russia and comments that were probably seen to “evince disloyalty”: “The little people always lose. We’ll live to [sic] ourselves” (II.23-24) is an example. A fragment, “gravity of the mass pulled heavily” (II.15-16) is crossed out in black pen, probably because it is ungrammatical in this context. The four lines following this have been struck through in pencil. It can be speculated that these deletions represented one stage in the revisions made by Barnard and Eldershaw. The lines were probably cut because they discuss an armistice with Japan, a detail that conflicted with the version of events given in *TT*. Later, it must have been decided that, like the preceding five typescript pages and the following two, the uncensored text was too fragmented to be included in a final draft.

On the following four pages in ML ms, nearly all markings are in red. However, small editorial changes are made in black pen: “Nevertheless”, for example, is crossed out on p.195. Most censorship deletions on these pages appear to have been made because the passage refers to dissension amongst the Allies, or because the passage could again be interpreted as “evincing disloyalty”. One particularly clear example of this is on the bottom of p.196, where lines

---

<sup>38</sup> Hilvert: 5.

expressing Barnard's pacifist beliefs have been struck out: "Seek allies among your enemies. Offer them constructive peace without threats or pressure" (ll.25-26). Puzzlingly, however, the immediately preceding line, "Stop fighting and preparing to fight" is allowed to stand (ML ms p.196, ll.24-25, p.370, l.5 *TTT*). Over the page, "Refuse to compete, refuse to fight" has also been censored.<sup>39</sup> References to a left-wing secessionist movement, the possibility of Australian civil war and, on p.196, the formation of a 'non-political police force' comprised of troops from America, Britain and Japan, could all be seen as prohibited speculation and as evincing disloyalty. Descriptions of unemployment and industrial unrest (p.194, ll.2, 3 & 6-7), in addition to being seen to evince disloyalty or disaffection, were also forbidden because they mentioned "threatened industrial dispute".<sup>40</sup> With some irony, some of the new material in *TT* covers similar ground, although it is less specific. For instance, one passage reads: "You know all this as well as I do. The time of unrest, of strikes, and civil violence." Knarf then lists different types of demobilisation and oppression suffered by workers — and exploited by power brokers and financiers — between World War Two and World War Three (pp.365-366, ll.36-41, 2-4 *TT*). The censor did not see this material, and although the National Security Act was still in place when *TT* was published, perhaps the authors and the publishers felt that the details in the passage were too generalised to be of concern.

---

<sup>39</sup> As the title would suggest, Rob Darby's paper: 'Censored . . . and again . . . and again: Marjorie Barnard's struggle to publish pacifist arguments, 1939-47' discusses extensively the many difficulties Barnard experienced in having her strong pacifist beliefs heard. A comparable pacifist argument is expressed on p.187 in the first volume of ML ms. This page was published in 1947, as it was never seen by the censor.

<sup>40</sup> Chief Publicity Censor's Special Directions, S.3 Strikes, which reads, in part, "Press references to any particular strike or threatened strike or to absenteeism anywhere in Australia must be restricted to factual news . . . Anonymous partisan statements or reports are not allowed. Nothing may be published that is calculated to provoke or aggravate an industrial dispute . . .".

The *TT* edition, after the omission of eight pages of ML ms, starts following sections of the typescript text again from the bottom of p.195. Approximately half of p.196 appears on pp.369- 370 of *TT*. Pages 194 and 195 of ML ms are omitted in their entirety from *TT*, but many passages on these pages have not been crossed out, by the censor or in any other hand. In the *TTT* 'Lists of Cuts Restored', however, these pages are listed as having been completely deleted by the censor, which contributes to an obfuscation of the purpose behind the publicity censor's excisions. Although *TTT* suggests otherwise, the censor did not remove broadly critical statements such as: "The government was for compromise, the extreme Right and extreme Left were tugging in opposite directions. The mass of the people had become emotionally unmoored and might turn the scale in either direction" (ML ms p.195, ll.16-19, p.363, ll.23-26 *TTT*). Such statements were too general to be readily interpreted as likely to cause disaffection, or to pertain to any other censorship directions. The mistaken inference that such passages were subject to censorship explains why in *TTT*, as Anne Chisholm comments, "It is hard to follow the workings of the censor's mind; frequently he cleared passages that seem as challenging as those he removed".<sup>41</sup>

A reference to censorship is cut by the censor on the bottom of p.197 and the top of p.198, and there are then no more cuts by any hand until p.205. There are then five pages showing deletions made by the censor. Some complicated editorial decisions have also been made. On p.205, ll.16-21, a paragraph and a half have been crossed out in pencil, and then the pencil has been partially erased; the word 'stet' is in the margin. *TT*, however, doesn't include all of these lines; the last two have been cut from the edition, perhaps because the rest of the paragraph that they are in has been censored. *TTT* indicates that these pencilled-through lines were censored, and reinstates them on p.370, ll.12-

---

<sup>41</sup> Chisholm: xii, xiii.

14. Although the lines describe “strength [ebbing] from the elected government”, and as such could be seen as an expression of disloyalty, they probably escaped censorship because they are directed at the government, rather than the war effort. However, the following two paragraphs, which run over to p.206, were certainly censorable. In describing grim economic conditions in Australia, as the country begins to be bypassed by superior production levels in South America, several points in the censorship directions could have been violated. Such a description could have been seen to “influence public opinion (whether in Australia or elsewhere) in a manner likely to be prejudicial to the defence of the Commonwealth or to the efficient prosecution of the war” or it could be seen as a statement “likely to cause or spread public alarm”.<sup>42</sup> Additionally, publicity censors were very aware of the problems of publicising shortages of goods in the latter years of the war, as archived correspondence between J.B. Cumming, the Acting Director of Rationing, and Edmund Bonney, the Chief Publicity Censor, reveals. Concerns were raised over panic buying and keeping news about shortages of “vital war materials” from the enemy.<sup>43</sup> Point R.2 in the Special Directions thus prohibits mention of rationing or shortages, and a censor would have been sensitive to any mention of a lack of resources, such as that implied in this paragraph in ML ms.

The following censored paragraph, on ML ms p.206, ll.1-17, outlines a continued theme in this section about the divisions between the left and right and the argument that “the war against Russia was the war for the Empire”. It is also suggested here that it is not necessary to go overseas to fight “when we can do it right here” (l.17). Such arguments could be seen to defy general directions against causing disaffection or “prejudicial criticism or complaints”

---

<sup>42</sup> Respectively, Chief Publicity Censor’s General Directions, (f) *Statements Likely to Cause Disaffection*, (iii) and (g) *Unofficial, Sensational or Exaggerated Reports*, (iii).

<sup>43</sup> J.B. Cumming to E.G. Bonney, 8 May 1943; E.G. Bonney to G.T. Chippindall (Director, Dept. of War Organisation of Industry), 19 May 1942, AA B5661/1, item 1942/4083.

and might also be interpreted as advocating the “use of force or violence as a means of advancing or carrying into effect any political cause, measures, policies or proposals”.<sup>44</sup> A sentence below the censored ones has been crossed out in pencil, (ll.18-20), probably edited post-censorship by Barnard and Eldershaw because it relates to the censored material.

Page 207 reveals the work of several hands. “Sydney was the danger point” (l.10) has been pencilled in, in Flora Eldershaw’s hand, and appears in both *TT* (p.377, l.6) and *TTT* (p.371, l.17). As Darby notes, only the identity of the “International Police Force” (“representing the Pacific powers, Britain, the Americas, Japan”) is removed by the censor; this is consistent with censoring earlier in ML ms of descriptions of an alliance between right-wing forces.<sup>45</sup> The other crossed-out lines are in black ink; two lines are also underlined, as if they were marked for deletion but then retained. It is likely that this is another case of pre-emptive censorship by Barnard and Eldershaw, or their publishers: the lines struck through in black ink discuss how the right overtakes the Australian government, possibly a passage that would “evince disloyalty” or disaffection, although not as controversial as similar passages which discuss alliances between warring nations. *TTT* lists all crossed-out lines on this page as having been censored; this is probably because a photocopy of the typescript was referred to, but possibly also because none of these lines appear in *TT*.

The bottom of p.207 and the top of p.208 contain a phrase that was removed by the censor: “round an imperial rat hole”. Saunders remarks that this phrase leads to one of the more amusing reinstatements in *TTT*. A word has been misread, and the sentence appears there as “round an imperial rationale” (p.371, l.36 *TTT*).<sup>46</sup> The original line described ships waiting like “beasts of

<sup>44</sup> Respectively, Chief Publicity Censor’s General Directions, (f), (g) and *National Security (General) Regulations* 41A (a).

<sup>45</sup> Darby: 24.

<sup>46</sup> Saunders: 249

prey”, so perhaps the censor gave in to his editorial instincts and deleted the mixed metaphor for literary reasons. However, it is more likely that the juxtaposition of the words “imperial” and “rat” was seen as disloyal, particularly perhaps the suggestion that Sydney was no more than an imperial rat-hole. A suggestion of “imperial rationales” is definitely less inflammatory, although the notion of boats circling around one creates a very obscure sentence.

On p.208, there are deletions in pencil and in red pen. References to the Japanese, Russians and Americans are deleted in red pen by the censor; the other markings are in pencil. “Nor did the partizans of the Right want to see the destruction of property” (II.7-8) is a pencil deletion — perhaps another example of anticipatory censorship by the authors, or someone at Georgian House, as the allusion to sabotage and malicious damage was possibly censorable, although it is described as a possibility rather than an actual occurrence. The *TTT* edition implies that this cut was the work of the censor; the censorship on this page is inaccurately represented in *TTT* in other ways. Two cuts made by the censor because of their potential to offend Allies — “that Russia and Russian dupes were the last enemies” (I.21), and the words “an American” (I.29) — are not restored in *TTT*. A possible reason for the latter omission is that the words appear in the middle of a paragraph that has been crossed out in pencil with ‘stet’ written beside it. The paragraph appears, without the censored words, in *TT* on p.378, II.6-14. If *TTT* was following the *TT* text at this point, then the censor’s cut may well have been overlooked.

Flora Eldershaw’s handwriting appears again on the top of p.209, as part of her authorial rearrangement of the same sentence. As previously discussed, these instances of her handwriting on ML ms contradict Barnard’s assertions that Eldershaw had little or nothing to do with the novel. A long paragraph below this

is marked and crossed in pencil, black ink and red ink. Lines specifically pertaining to the invasion of Australia by right-wing forces have been censored; others could have been cut post-censorship as editorial amendments. The paragraph does not appear in *TT*, but in *TTT* it is reinstated on pages 372-3, ll.27-39, 1-4, and attributed to the censor, again with some inaccuracy. This page is the last in ML ms to be heavily censored, or edited.

On p.212, there is a straightforward deletion, in red ink, of a reference to censorship; it is restored in *TTT*, p.375, l.1. There is another example on p.213, l.8, of the censor's handwriting, last seen on p.192. Lines 8-9 have been cut by the censor on this page, as they could be seen as disloyal to the Allies as well as Australia; however, it appears that the censor's hand slipped. "We can't go" has been crossed out and then handwritten back in, in red ink. These words appear on page 381 of *TT*, as well as on page 375 of *TTT*. Another censor's cut appears on p.226, ll.10-11, as the "Bolshie" reference would count as a disparaging remark about Australia's Allies; presumably the "dirty Jap" comment was permissible, although the implication of the possibility of invasion by either nation was probably not. A comparable remark provoked the last censor's cut on ML ms on p.270, ll.8-11: "I never did know what side the Russians was on, not really. Aren't they on our side any more?"

Pages 247 and 248 show extensive reworking of the section of narrative that deals with the demise of Gwen. One passage is rewritten in Barnard's hand and then retyped on the next page, which appears to have been inserted at a later date, since the original page has been renumbered 248a.<sup>47</sup> The first seven lines of p.248a have been erased in black ink, but the lines are not reinstated in *TTT*, either because Barnard's writing makes it obvious that the changes are authorial, or because a version following the hand amendments appears on

---

<sup>47</sup> See Appendix Two.

pp.404-405, ll.27-39, 1-4. of *TT*. The same version appears in *TTT* on pp.397, ll.19-33. A few pages later, in the margin of p.250, a couple of sentences have also been added in Barnard's hand and both editions include the amendment (pp.406, ll.32-5 *TT*, pp.399, ll.16-21 *TTT*).

The only other censored material in ML ms that remains unmentioned here is on pp.256, ll.25-28 and 257, ll.1-2 . The first two lines that are crossed out on p.256, 22-4 are made in black ink: the following are in red, and describe the burning of a plant at Port Kembla. This would have been forbidden because it alluded to sabotage. The lines that have been deleted in black ink mention the invading force biding its time and could have been removed because of the possibility that they violated the stipulations against mentioning the presence of enemy aliens or speculating about their movements.<sup>48</sup> All of these lines, deleted by the censor and others, are restored in *TTT*, p.403, ll.22-29.

Thus, in concluding, several observations can be made from the analysis of this section of the Mitchell Library typescript of *Tomorrow*. The first is that it would seem that there was a more intimate working relationship between the censor and the publisher of the novel than has been previously suggested. Since paragraphs are deleted in black pen on pages that the censor did not see, the most likely explanation for the deletions is that Harris, or someone else at the publishing house, engaged in pre-emptive censorship, as they were worried about being served an "order to submit" on all their material. It is also possible that someone at Georgian House had indicated material that the censor might find worthy of attention, given that all marginal marks on this section of ML ms correlate with Harris' self-outlined description of dubious material. Therefore, given that Georgian House provided a synopsis with the typescript section, probably cut some lines voluntarily, and possibly indicated where other

---

<sup>48</sup> Chief Publicity Censor's Special Directions: A.5 'Aliens and Enemy Agents' (a), C.8 'Communiques and Speculation' (b).



cuts might be made, it would appear that the publicity censor had considerable guidance in completing his job.

The second observation is that both the censor and those at Georgian House viewed the novel as they would a newspaper article. As Darby notes, no distinctions are made in the National Security Act and Regulations between factual reports and imaginative fiction, and there is no indication on the censored typescript that any description of Allied relations, for example, might be considered fantastical rather than a realistic and truthful account. However, while it is perhaps not so surprising that the censor treated the typescript as a factual document, the fact that Harris and Georgian House found it necessary to submit a novel to the publicity censor is more perplexing, since no other Australian novel was censored for political reasons during World War Two.<sup>49</sup> Harris felt that, as with a newspaper article, the novel's description of Allied relations could be damaging if they were published. He wrote to Barnard and Eldershaw that "political quarters are so sensitive to anything that might disturb Allied relationships", as if the possible inaccuracies of fiction might have the same power of influence as a public broadsheet.<sup>50</sup> Only a belief in the potency of fiction, and in its ability to affect political life, would have led Harris to believe that he was obliged to submit such material to the censor.

While Harris and Georgian House might have exhibited an over-inflated anxiety in submitting to the censor the material in Barnard Eldershaw's novel, they would not have been alone in practising in-house censorship. Hilvert cites the

---

<sup>49</sup> Other novels could have been candidates for censorship, if they had been submitted. One example is Eleanor Dark's *The Little Company*, first published in Australia in 1945. There are overt references to censorship in the text, such as: "It had entertained him to observe how adroitly (recognising that blind spot of officialdom which fails to realise that there is no such thing as an uncontroversial subject) she had contrived to say at least a good deal of what she wanted to say despite the blanket of censorship." Great Britain: Virago Press, 1985: 91.

<sup>50</sup> See Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard, 5 April 1944, Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/5.

case of the film *Gone With The Wind*, which was shorn by fifteen minutes for Australian film viewers. The censor, however, was responsible for only seven minutes of cuts; the distributor voluntarily disposed of an extra eight minutes, "to demonstrate good faith and to ensure unimpeded presentation of the film in Australia".<sup>51</sup> Peter Davison, who edited the complete works of George Orwell, notes that in-house censorship in publishing houses was also common in Britain in the 1930s and 1940s: "Because of public pressure and the threat of legal action, publishers could not but be cautious."<sup>52</sup> Despite being cautious, Georgian House did not escape legal action for long; in 1948 Robert Close's *Love Me Sailor*, published by Georgian House, was banned on obscenity grounds and the company was fined.<sup>53</sup> Thus anxiety was proved justified, if somewhat displaced, given that Georgian House was vigilant in practising political censorship while overlooking the moral contentiousness of *Love Me Sailor*. As Davison comments in Orwell's case:

Although Orwell objected strongly to such interference with his work, he had no option but to acquiesce if he wished to be published. And, though one might disagree with particular requirements made by his publishers, it is quite unfair not to have sympathy with their predicament. A court case could ruin them and goodbye then to *any* publication except the bland and innocuous. Furthermore, the drafts of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* show Orwell practising self-censorship.<sup>54</sup>

Davison goes on to describe how Orwell changes a reference to love-making that appears in a draft to ellipses in a final version. In this case then, in-house censorship and self-censorship, albeit moral rather than political, became intertwined. This was also the case with *Tomorrow*, at least to some extent. As demonstrated here, Barnard and Eldershaw deleted and revised sections that had

---

<sup>51</sup> Hilvert: 69.

<sup>52</sup> Peter Davison, 'General Introduction To The First Nine Volumes'. In *The Complete Works of George Orwell*, Vol. 1, London: Random House, 1998: xiii.

<sup>53</sup> See John McLaren, 'The Trials of Robert Close and Frank Hardy', in *Writing in Hope and Fear: Literature as Politics in Postwar Australia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996:1-13. Also Leonard Mann in *The Robert Close and Georgian House Case*, Melbourne: The Specialty Press, [1949?].

<sup>54</sup> Davison: xv.

been affected by censorship, so a forced acquiescence in the altering of some of their material did exist. It is difficult to determine whether Barnard and Eldershaw also contributed to the anticipatory censorship of their work; this is unlikely, however, given that Harris' letters indicate that they were informed of the censoring of their typescript after it was a *fait accompli*.<sup>55</sup>

An awareness of the difficulty in finally distinguishing between the alterations made by the authors editorially, the possible alterations made in anticipation of censorship, and the alterations made in response to censorship, renders the last observation given here less than definitive. It is clear that, in their interpretation of the Mitchell Library typescript, the editors of the Virago edition of the novel frequently failed to distinguish between the work of authors, editors and censors. While this study pinpoints the hand — and the intention — of the censor on this typescript, and shows the involvement of Georgian House in the censoring, determining authorial intention in ML ms is ultimately not possible. As the first part of this chapter argued, the typescript has been compiled from different sources, and it is not a copytext for either of the published editions. *TT* is obviously not representative of the authors' wishes, as it does not include material that was cut by the publicity censor. However, as has been seen, *TTT* is equally unsatisfactory, because distinctions between editorial and censorial cuts have not been made.

This analysis also demonstrates that the delineation between authorship, editing and censorship can be extremely indistinct. In the case of *TTT*, the actions of the editors at Georgian House; the Victorian Publicity Censor and the editors at Virago have profoundly affected the content of the extant texts of the novel. It is certain that if Edgar Harris had not voluntarily submitted the *TTT* typescript to

---

<sup>55</sup> The letter from Edgar Harris to Marjorie Barnard that informs the authors that: "We have submitted 132-276 of the second part to the censor for an opinion" is dated 22 March 1944. Barnard's papers, ML MSS 451/5. The censor's stamp on all pages of the typescript is dated 17 March 1944.

the censor, or if the Virago editors had been working with an original and complete version of ML ms, the versions of the novel that exist today would look very different indeed.

## **Three: An Authoritative Edition?**

*"There's no logical place to draw the line. It is like an enormous jigsaw puzzle, I've fitted together a little corner of it, but that has no meaning unless I at least sort out the other pieces and arrange them so as to indicate the completed pattern, however cursorily."*

*Tomorrow: 316*

In 1984, Jill Roe wrote a comprehensive article in *Meanjin* praising the new edition of *Tomorrow*. She conceded that a close comparison of texts would be necessary to assess the full effects of the censorship on *Tomorrow* but wrote that the Virago edition had made it clear that the effect of the censoring had been “devastating and insidious” and that the censor had managed to excise “the novel’s conceptual core with impressive economy”. Roe argued that the end of the war in *TT* was a “tepid affair” compared to the version in *TTT* of “the last-ditch stand led by the revolutionary left, destruction, and the demise of the Australians which occupies the latter part of ‘Afternoon’.”<sup>1</sup> Anne Chisholm’s Introduction in the Virago edition includes some comparable points. Like Roe, she identifies the most substantial and significant cuts to the book as occurring “at the point where Barnard Eldershaw are brilliantly and imaginatively constructing their scenario of dissension and revolution, of an Australia invaded by international forces of the right and torn apart by civil war.”<sup>2</sup> Chisholm also hypothesises that the aim of the censor was to weaken the idea that large numbers of people would follow the Peace Party and refuse to compete and fight.

As established in the last section, the Melbourne publicity censor did not explicitly set out to dampen the tale of left-wing revolution in Sydney, or the story of the pacifist Peace Party. Rather, he was merely complying with the Consolidated Censorship Directions and the Chief Publicity Censor’s Special Directions of 1943. It is also clear that most of the substantial narrative differences between *TT* and *TTT* occurred, not because of the censor’s deletions, but because of Barnard Eldershaw’s revisions and the Virago restorations. Moreover, as will be discussed here, the most salient aspects of the revolutionary attempts imagined in *Tomorrow* remained intact after the cuts made by the publicity censor. The description of the last-ditch attempt by Archie Castles and

---

<sup>1</sup> Jill Roe, ‘The Historical Imagination and Its Enemies: M. Barnard Eldershaw’s *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*’, *Meanjin*, 43, 2, 1984: 242-3.

<sup>2</sup> Anne Chisholm, introduction to M. Barnard Eldershaw, *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, London: Virago Press, 1983: xiii.

the Peace Party to achieve an international solution to the war is also virtually the same in both published versions of the book.

It is the case that there are some significant narrative differences between the two editions, both in terms of content and chronology. In *TT*, Harry's death in the raid on Sydney occurs near the end of World War Two. Although it is not explicitly stated that the Japanese are responsible for this bombing, this is implied. The description of the Japanese attack on the north-west mainland (p.316 *TT*) is still intact in this version, so it is clear that it is Japan that is threatening Sydney and that Arch Castles' squadron feels compelled to return to Australia to help defend the east coast (p.318 *TT*). However, in *TTT*, the different chronology of these events more directly links the raid and the culmination of the war with the Japanese. A long section on pp.319-20 describes how "the war in the Pacific went on and on" and that "[n]o one dreamed, for instance, how big a price the Japanese might be willing to pay for the satisfaction of raiding Sydney." As discussed, this section was not seen by the censor but could have been removed by Barnard, Eldershaw or others because some of the content possibly contravened censorship regulations.<sup>3</sup> This section is immediately followed by a description on pp. 320-2 of the incident involving the dissemination of a Chinese plague via some Japanese prisoners of war. The bombing of Sydney and the death of Harry then follows. In *TT* the plague incident occurs much later, after the end of the war with Germany has been celebrated and "[t]he might of the nations swung against Japan . . . the long maturing atomic bomb ripened and fell. Japan was surrounded by a ring of mathematically precise destruction" (pp.363-4 *TT*). In this case the plague is first discovered by the Americans in a pirate ship, one of the "unsundered Japanese ships operating from unknown bases among the Pacific islands and on the China coast" (p.366 *TT*). While both the European war and the Pacific war come to a close it is

---

<sup>3</sup> See p.233 in this chapter.

emphasised that: "War had not ended, it would not end in the lifetime of any man who had known it, it could not end" (p.365 *TT*). Thus the plague is malevolent in a different way. In *TTT*, it is "[a] new power enter[ing] the Pacific war, fighting against both sides" (p.320 *TTT*). The chronological sequence of events links the war in the Pacific with the spreading of the plague by the inhabitants of a captured Japanese destroyer. The bombing raid and Harry's death occur directly after this. In *TT* the Pacific war is over, and the unstoppable pestilence is part of an endless war, evoking a more generalised terror. It is only in *TT* that it is asked: "Was this bacteriological war?" — as if the enemy is nonspecific and everywhere (p.368 *TT*).

The greatest contrast between the two editions occurs on the pages following the descriptions of these events. In *TTT*, Germany is defeated and the Russians capitulate, causing Australian citizens to celebrate, but there is no initial news from England, America or Japan. The core of the censor's deletions focuses on details speculating that Germany would form a separate peace with Russia (p.359 *TTT*), and that a right-wing alliance would then be formed between America, Japan, Canada, South Africa and — less wholeheartedly — England and Australia (p.362 *TTT*). As discussed, these suggestions were censorable on several grounds stipulated in the Publicity Censor's General Directions: they could be seen as likely to cause disaffection, particularly by prejudicing "His Majesty's relations with an Ally or with any Foreign Power with which he is at peace" or by offending "any such Ally or Foreign Power or any part of his Majesty's dominions."<sup>4</sup> In the following pages, the fissures between left and right are both more nuanced and more specific in *TTT*. In *TT* it is stated that "the main split was now horizontal, according to class" and that "[t]he final divisions were into Right and Left" (p.368-9 *TT*). *TTT*, on the other hand, goes into detail about the propaganda that is fed to the English and the Australians to convince them that

---

<sup>4</sup> See p.242 in this chapter.



Japan has become an ally. Nevertheless, this development is perhaps less credible in this version of *Tomorrow*, given that only forty pages earlier a passage such as this one has been included:

The enemy, the Japanese, remained to the Australians a mythical people, as alien as robots, as inexplicable. There was no understanding of them as human beings . . . There was only war between them. It was like a war against monkeys, criminal monkeys. There was no understanding, so it became a purely mechanic war, hatred itself was mechanic. The enemy was an ape with no feeling, only vice. p.319-20 *TTT*

While it is argued in *TTT* that the "miasma of propaganda" urging people to accept peace with Japan is successful because there is a greater fear and hatred of Communism, the passage above renders this somewhat unconvincing. Lines such as these suggest an abrupt about-face:

The Japs were human beings after all. They'd been staunch little allies in the last war. The tales about their frightfulness were only propaganda. (p.360 *TTT*)

Ironically, the expressions of race prejudice are clearer in this later edition of *Tomorrow* because the censor deleted most outright references to Japan and the Japanese. *TT* contains many of the same sentiments, but without the specification. Rather than naming the countries allied with one another, for instance, it is noted that: "[b]oth sides, all sides, accepted alliances as moves in an intricate tactic without moral commitment" (p.369 *TT*).

Both editions of *Tomorrow* describe, in different words, the fatigue and unrest that spreads after the end of war with Germany. In *TTT*, "the scarcities, the queues, the discontents and inconveniences" (p.359 *TTT*) are recounted, and it is emphasised that the Australian and British populations accept the armistice and then the offer of the Peace Party because they are so weary of war that they are prepared to accept anything. In *TT*, the main implication is that the end of the war has terrible consequences and a time of "unrest, of strikes, and civil

violence" follows (p.354 *TT*). The battles between nations are not emphasised; rather, the mentality of "cut-throat competition" and the terror resulting from the war is blamed for the continuing turmoil (p.366 *TT*). The charge by Roe that this version of the war's end is "tepid" is unjustified because the "last-ditch stand by the revolutionary left" is almost completely intact, as these details were not the target of the censor.

Contrary to Chisholm's assertion, the details about pacifism and the Peace Party have also had very few changes made to them by the censor. As noted previously, the words: "Seek allies among your enemies. Offer them constructive peace without threats or pressure" have been removed, but the pacifist message directly above them: "Stop fighting and preparing to fight" is intact (ML ms p.196, ll.24-6). The line "Refuse to compete, refuse to fight" (ML msp.197, l.22) is also cut, as is a reference to censorship (ML ms p.198-9, l.27, ll.1-3), but this is all.

The section in *Tomorrow* that details the final uprising led by Sid Warren is the same in both editions, except for five cuts. One is a reference to censorship (p.375 *TTT*) and the other two involve criticism of the "Japs", "the Yanks" and the "Bolshies" (p.375, 383 *TTT*). These three deletions are each only a sentence long, and they do not change the meaning or the shape of the narrative in any significant way. Page 412 in *TTT* prints a more inflammatory sentence: "I never did know what side the Russian was on, not really. Aren't they on our side any more?" However, this also does not significantly affect the description of the left-wing uprising. The other cut that is restored in *TTT* on p.403 is longer and of greater importance. As noted in the previous section, the first two lines, mentioning the absence of information coming into the city and "the invading force biding its time" are deleted in black ink and so not by the censor, although

they were possibly censorable.<sup>5</sup> Lines that have been scored through in red describe the burning of a plant at Port Kembla, a clear allusion to sabotage. The cut passage also mentions that Melbourne has been declared an “open city”. These restored details help to give a sense of the scope of rebellion against the elected governments in Australia. However, they also intercept a key scene, where Ruth’s faith in Sid, and in the revolution, is badly shaken. Some of the narrative continuum, detailing the horror of destruction, is lost.

As discussed, some inclusions in *TTT* actually obscure the direction of the narrative. The most obvious example of this occurs at the point in which the differences between the two editions begins, on p.249 in both texts. In *TTT* this page has been restored in an ad hoc way. As it would appear that there are some pages missing from the ML ms,<sup>6</sup> the final three paragraphs on this page have little relation to one another: the subject matter jumps from the Finnish War, to a conversation about hairdressers, to thoughts about “reason.”

A small but significant repetitive detail is also omitted on p.415 of *TTT*, right at the end of the reset section, for reasons unknown. The passage describes Ben, pondering his childhood, what the city has meant to him, and what the future holds, both for Ben and for Australia. On *TT* p.423, l. and ML ms p.275, l. , there is a paragraph which reads:

He remembered the night his father had eaten the dinner set aside for him when he was a kid selling papers and his father was out of a job, and how crook his mother had been about it. That was mixed up with the monument too though he'd forgotten how.

The details refer back to pp.127-130 in both *TT* and *TTT*, noteworthy because the existence of the Anzac Memorial is mentioned here for the first time. It is also

---

<sup>5</sup> See p.252 in this chapter.

<sup>6</sup> See p.231 in this chapter.

the first of many instances in which Harry is compared to the stone figure. When Harry dies, Ben recalls this night:

At last he put his head down on the steering wheel and cried, as he hadn't cried since he was a child, since the time his father had eaten his dinner and Ally had gone crook about it and he had run away and his heart had burst right open. (p.343 *TT*, p.348 *TTT*)

Ben's remembrances establish continuities in the text; his eyes are described as being both those of an adult, and of a child, and his hands on the wheel of the truck also recall his father's.<sup>7</sup> This final passage in Knarf's novel emphasises the cyclical and repetitive nature of human history. Thus, the effect of this omission in *TTT* is subtle but significant. It undermines Knarf's assertions about the repetitive power of memory and breaks some of the repetitiveness in the narrative itself.

In concluding, neither *TT* nor *TTT* has a narrative that is entirely consecutive, and contains all the details that are in the extant texts concerning the shifting alliances at the end of World War Two and the collapse of Sydney. *TT* still reads as an angry and defiantly left-wing text: if this was the "ideology" that Edgar Harris was concerned about, then the political slant was published very much intact, despite the submission of the manuscript to the censor. Some of the details pertaining to armistice and allied relations have been obscured in *TT*. In the main, however, the added material in *TTT* offers little that is new and in fact some sections are less clear than in the first edition of the novel.

The question remains as to whether P ms,<sup>8</sup> the most recently uncovered version of *Tomorrow*, which was almost certainly created by Barnard and not by

---

<sup>7</sup> Ian Saunders notes the omission and the significance of the resonance of memory in this section of the novel in 'The Most Difficult Love': Expectation and Gender in Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow* and *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*, *Constructing Gender: Feminism in Literary Studies*, Ed. Hilary Fraser and R.S. White, Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press, 1994: 203, 209.

<sup>8</sup> The recently recovered typescript of *Tomorrow*, probably created in 1957 by Marjorie Barnard, will hereafter be referred to as P ms.

Eldershaw, represents a less corrupted or even superior version of the novel, and whether it would form a more suitable copytext for any future publications. As noted in Chapter Three,<sup>9</sup> P ms is comprised of three volumes that are professionally typed and bound. The page numbering in these volumes differs completely from the censored typescript in the Mitchell Library; the numbers do not restart from page one at the beginning of each volume and, because the text has been double-spaced, there are nearly two thousand pages. The pages are originals, not carbons, although the carbons have also been preserved.<sup>10</sup> The additional 2384 words that appear in the Georgian House edition, but not in ML ms or the Virago edition, have been omitted. All censored passages<sup>11</sup> have been restored. The P ms is clearly not the original copy of carbons in the ML ms because of the different typeface and numbering, and because handwritten changes on the ML ms have been typed up.

It is certain that this version of the novel is based on ML ms, the typescript which includes the section that was censored in 1944 and is now in the Mitchell Library. Given that some errors in ML ms are initially replicated in P ms, and then corrected by hand, it is likely that a professional typist copied directly from the ML ms and that Barnard went through this copy later. All handwritten annotations appear to be in Barnard's hand, in so far as can be determined. As the latter part of Appendix Six outlines, some minor copy-editing appears to have taken place as the typist was typing, as there are a few punctuation and grammatical differences to ML ms.

Appendix Six also cites examples of handwritten emendations on ML ms that have been typed out in P ms,<sup>12</sup> indicating that P ms was created later than ML ms.

---

<sup>9</sup> See Chapter Three, p.129.

<sup>10</sup> Two carbon copies of this typescript were discovered with the original in 1999.

<sup>11</sup> That is, as discussed, all passages that have been horizontally crossed through with a red ink pen, on pages of the typescript that bears the censor's stamp.

<sup>12</sup> See examples in Appendix Six.

While some amendments are slight, others show that significant changes to ML ms were incorporated into the P ms version. An example is the inclusion of the considerable rewriting on p.192 [135], l.12-19 of ML ms.<sup>13</sup> As discussed in the previous section,<sup>14</sup> the lines erased on this page in ML ms are crossed out in black ink, probably by Harris, Barnard or Eldershaw, and they contain references to hostilities between the United Nations and Japan, and between China and the Allies. The rewriting of these lines is in Barnard's hand and all changes appear on p.934 of P ms. Thus, the original typed lines in the ML ms do not appear in either of the published versions of *Tomorrow* and it would seem that Barnard chose not to resurrect them in her final version.

Appendix Six also cites examples demonstrating that P ms was not created using the Virago edition as a guide, which lends support to the earlier argument given here that it is unlikely that P ms could have been created after the *TTT* publication in 1983. As discussed, much of *TTT* is a photo-offset of *TT*. Thus, the 'Morning' section of *Tomorrow* is the same in both *TT* and *TTT*. While it seems probable that *TT* did use this section of ML ms as a copytext,<sup>15</sup> there are small textual variants between the published editions of the novel and ML ms. In these instances, P ms follows ML ms. As Appendix Six cites, for instance, on p.3, l.4-5 in *TT* and *TTT*, it reads: ". . . so that the pattern of hills, dark under a gold dust bloom, was visible." The ML ms reads, alternatively: ". . . was just visible", as does p.1 of P ms. An example later in the narrative occurs on p.1050 of P ms, which does not repeat the mistake on *TTT* p.360, l.39, which occurs in the section of the edition which was reset. It reads: "Thing [sic] as they used to be". P ms, like p.192, l.14 in the 'Afternoon' section of ML ms, reads correctly: "Things as they used to be." In some instances, P ms also corrects slight

---

<sup>13</sup> As noted previously, there are two pages with the number 192 in the 'Afternoon' section of ML ms. The one referred to here is the first one, which was first numbered 150 and then 135.

<sup>14</sup> See pp.236-7 in this chapter.

<sup>15</sup> See p.214 in this chapter and Appendix One.

grammatical errors in ML ms. As noted in Appendix Six, ML ms p.4, l.5 reads: "much better the 10th Commune." This is amended in *TT* and *TTT* to read: "much better than Tenth Commune" (p.5, l.17-18). On p.7 of P ms, a handwritten "than" has been inserted between "better" and "the", so that the phrase finally makes good grammatical sense, although again, it appears that the typist was following ML ms.

P ms also includes some more substantial differences to the published versions of *Tomorrow*. On p.941, the lines that appear on pp.204-5 in the 'Morning' section of ML ms appear. These lines, which as previously discussed were probably censored in-house for obscenity reasons, do not appear in either *TT* or *TTT*. As mentioned, P ms does not include any of the additional words in the Georgian House edition that were not in the ML ms. Thus, the 790 words in the 'Morning' section that appear on pp. 204-6 of both published editions does not appear in P ms.

Most of the passages identified in the previous section of this chapter as having been deleted for editorial and censorial reasons are reinstated in P ms. Even the passage on p.249 in *TT* and *TTT*, criticised here for having little narrative continuity, appears in the same form on p.712 of P ms. However, the lines from "Then they made a cult" to ". . . get on with your story" are underlined in black biro. It can be hypothesised that, on a re-reading, Barnard realised that these lines made little sense; however, the precise purpose behind reinstating this passage cannot be known. As discussed, it would appear that two pages are missing in ML ms at this point, but there are no new pages in P ms.

Most passages that were cut either by the censor or an editor in ML ms are unmarked and intact in P ms. On p.117 of ML ms (formerly p.112), one of the pages before the censor's stamp appears, lines 22 and 23 are crossed out in black

ink. They read: "Rabaul was occupied, Port Moresby was raided, Darwin was raided, The public mind adjusted itself to that." As noted in the previous section, the reinstatement of these lines is redundant, since these events have already been described, but they appear on p. 902 of P ms nonetheless. Other passages that were identified in the previous section of this chapter as having been cut by the censor appear intact in P ms. The first line to be cut by the censor is on ML ms p.190A, ll.1-2: "Homeward bound for refitting, fell in with a Jap destroyer in waters where she did not expect to find one." It appears in full and unmarked on p.929 of P ms. The pages in which these lines are contained, which appear to have been reshuffled, and which appear in a different place in the narrative of *TT*, appear in the same order in P ms as in ML ms. More significantly, the large cuts made by the censor on ML ms pp.188-192 are restored on pp.1043-1049 in P ms.

While most of these reinstatements mean that P ms is very similar to *TTT*, there are some differences. Lines on p.1083 of P ms read: ". . . the grey shapes of a fleet waiting like beasts of prey round an imperial rat *hold*" [emphasis added], not "rat hole" (ML ms p.208, l.1) or "rationale" (*TTT* p.371, l.36). The description of Gwen's final drinking session, which appears on p.397 in *TTT* and pp.404-5 in *TT* has been edited and reworked on pp.1161-2 of P ms. These lines have been cut: "For a long time she thought at random, remembered all sorts of things that had happened to her and that she had temporarily forgotten. She was rather happy in a poetic melancholy way, but sorry for herself." "Everybody owed her everything" has been added. As in ML ms, where versions of this passage appear three times — in handwritten and re-typed forms — in P ms it appears that the creation of these lines was struggled with. Several lines have been crossed out with a blue biro, and then words have been written over the top again, in Barnard's hand.



Another difference to the Virago edition is the inclusion of the sentence: "Her heart had been broken open to love but not fed", which appears on p.1186 of P ms and p.260, ll. 5-6 of ML ms. It does not appear in *TTT*, for reasons unknown. Page 1213 of P ms also includes the sentences in ML ms, p. 275, ll. 1-4, about Ben remembering his father, discussed above as a significant omission in *TTT*.

Overall, P ms gives the impression of a typescript that was constructed in some haste, as most of the uneven narrative that is in ML ms and which remains in *TTT* also occurs here. However, there appear to be fewer grammatical errors and typographical mistakes in this version, compared to the published editions and to the ML ms. With the majority of deletions and handwritten emendations from ML ms incorporated into P ms, it is a much easier text to read. Unlike ML ms, all paper and typesetting are the same, and the page numbering is consecutive, so the whole document was probably created at the same time. As White's letter and Barnard's writing on this typescript attests, P ms was constructed by Barnard, and as the most recent extant text of *Tomorrow* it conclusively represents her final authorial intentions.

Although it has been claimed that *TTT* is the "original", "uncensored" version of *Tomorrow*, the previous section of this chapter has established that this is not the case. These claims cannot be made for P ms either, or that it is a 'restored' version of the novel. P ms has been constructed from ML ms, which has been cobbled together from a number of partial typescripts, probably some time after the death of Flora Eldershaw. Crucially, the existence of P ms further sidelines Eldershaw's contribution to the creation of *Tomorrow*. Eldershaw could not possibly have been consulted about the variants between ML ms and this typescript, as P ms was typed up after her death. Moreover, as it is documented that Eldershaw was involved in "closing the gaps" after the censor's cuts had been made, many of her changes to the ML ms, which formed the source material

for *TT*, have not been incorporated. It can be said that the existence of P ms represents an end-point in Barnard's long struggle to have *Tomorrow* recognised as she wished it to be. Without the approval of one half of the Barnard Eldershaw collaboration, however, Eldershaw's role is inevitably even further eclipsed.

## Conclusion

M. Barnard Eldershaw's *Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow* has been constantly recreated. It has been "a magnificently done" picture of Australian life between the wars; a "pretentiously unpatterned patterning of patterns"; a "trashy tripey novel with a Marxist slant"; a "great" and "neglected" novel and a myriad number of other works. Its reception history has been seen to be almost endlessly variable, influenced by its complex narrative structure, by the diversity of its discourses, and by the number of ideologies it promotes and then discards. *Tomorrow* is an excellent example of Barthes' description of 'text': it has been seen to be irreducibly plural; it is continually in flux, subverting the idea of a stable and solitary 'work'.<sup>1</sup> However, the difference between *Tomorrow* and many other works with varied reception histories is that some of *Tomorrow's* readers physically altered the book that they were reading, so that new textual versions were created. Virago Press, in seeking to restore a censored text, altered the novel to an equal or greater extent than Edgar Hays, or the wartime publicity censor.

Unfortunately, these conclusions do not help us to arrive at a desirable method of presenting an edition of *Tomorrow* for future audiences, an essential task given that the previous published examples have been fragmentary and incomplete. The existence of P ms, the privately owned manuscript of *Tomorrow*, presents several conundrums. Many factors, as have been discussed, support Marjorie Barnard as the author of this version of the novel. If locating an author helps us locate the origin of a text, it is the most reliable of the four extant textual versions of *Tomorrow*. However, in collating what can be considered as a highly unstable history, it remains an inadequate representation of the novel. As the last chapter has established, there is no 'original'

---

<sup>1</sup> Roland Barthes, 'From Work to Text', *Textual Strategies in Post-Structuralist Criticism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1979: 76-7.

version of *Tomorrow*, or one that represents the final intentions of both of the authors. Both the Virago edition and P ms are based on ML ms, which only partially formed the copytext for the first edition of the book. ML ms is such a heavily marked text that its scorings are difficult to decipher — apparently even for the typist of P ms and an elderly Barnard.

It is difficult to retrieve Eldershaw's role in the writing and the editing of *Tomorrow* for many reasons. The long, interrupted — not to mention thwarted — way in which it was written makes it impossible to separate the work of Barnard and Eldershaw, or to determine who had the greater creative or editorial input. In any case, the overlap between the creative and the editorial roles is great, because of the extensive rewriting that the censorship necessitated. It is clear at the very least that Eldershaw was involved in the editing of an early version of the novel, and in some substantial revisions, contrary to Barnard's later claims. P ms, despite having been set up entirely by Barnard, contains some of Eldershaw's work, because editorial changes to ML ms have been incorporated. Thus, traces of the collaboration remain, although they have been muted. The problem of intention remains, and is in fact unresolvable, given that there are no extant texts that conclusively represent the novel as Eldershaw wished.

P ms does offer the best copytext for a future readers' edition of the novel. A readers' edition is greatly needed, as no satisfactory edition of this kind has ever existed. P ms represents at least one author's intentions and forms a more coherent, inclusive and syntactically correct text than any of its predecessors. However, a desirable scholarly edition of *Tomorrow* would take a fuller historical approach to representing the novel: it would not discard authorial intention, but neither would it be regarded as a primary factor. As established, in the case of *Tomorrow*, the variants are too great, and the contributors too disputed and too many to ever conclusively determine intention. Rather, a critical and eclectic edition that demonstrated a social and cultural history of

the texts — such as has been presented here — is needed. In addition, it is essential that textual variants, misreadings and corruptions are exposed where possible. Only an edition such as this could reveal the complexity of *Tomorrow's* descent into the present day and the struggle that still endures for it to come fully into being.

# APPENDIX ONE

- ML ms p.5
- ML ms p.16
- ML ms p.22
- ML ms p.299

(all ML ms pages are from the 'Morning' section)

- *TT* p.6
- *TT* p.19
- *TT* p.22

**Note:**

- The corrections made in typing on ML ms p.16, l.3 and p.22, l.12.
- Barnard's handwriting on ML ms p.5 and Eldershaw's on ML ms p.22.
- Changes on ML ms p.5 have been incorporated on *TT* p.6. Also compare handwritten amendments on ML ms p.22 with *TT* p.19 and ML ms p.229, l.23 with *TT* p.222, l.31.

The years of the migration were good; the country was in good heart and so were the men. They were the descendants of a peculiar people called the Pioneers and only two or three generations <sup>earlier</sup> ~~before~~, their forbears had gone out into the wilderness, for they had come down here from the coast and the city, and, driving out the First People and cutting down the bush, had made a life for themselves. It had been hard and many had perished but others had prospered, grown wise, tough and rich. They hadn't been afraid of the country and its irregular rhythms. The sons thought they could do it again, or rather they wouldn't believe that they were the great grandsons, the grandsons and even the sons of Pioneers, so close couldn't. They left their foundered, mortgaged runs, where they had been was the end to the beginning. History melted down the years between and the feeling the long war like a drought, and set off in a sort of cheerful *followed a forlorn hope because one with their successive forebears and desperation.* If they lost a lot they got rid of a lot too. What had *been also called the Pioneers.* been done once they could do again, but this time it was different. There was not only no way back but there were no resources behind them. For a year or two it was not so bad, while the few things they had brought with them lasted and the seasons were good. Then the situation began to tell on them in earnest. At first they shored their sheep but there was no market for the wool. It decayed and stank and burned in bark sheds. A little of it they made shift to spin into yarn for their own use. Several risked a journey to a southern port with a drayload or two but it proved too dangerous and unprofitable. They could dispose of the wool readily and secretly but there was little or nothing they could get in exchange. It was useless to keep the flocks, save a few small ones to provide meat, yarn, leather and tallow. They let them go, it was better than confiscation. The sheep wandered over the fenceless pastures. They lambed and wandered on. Their fleeces grew and blinded them, the burden of wool dragged them down till every morning there were some that could

them; that he took on his shoulders decisions which should be communal.

The colossus ~~was seated, hands on knees~~ sat, looking straight before him, his stone arms resting on his stone knees, a soldier after battle, accoutred, his battle dress a rough swaddling on his tired limbs, an infantryman in a slouch hat, hard, lean, far-sighted, one who had covered great distances, a man worn down to bedrock, an immortal ghost in stone.

Knarf stood looking up at it, eliminating Ord's grumblings from his attention as something accustomed and meaningless. He was at once irrationally convinced that this stone figure had survived holocaust and

~~time~~ <sup>time</sup> ~~life~~, not by chance, but because of some inherent quality in itself.

The stone was charged with life. Just as its substance was harder and more enduring than the flesh of men whose likeness it held, so too the spirit that had been in him, dogged, enduring, obstinate, unyielding, was transmitted unchanged into stone. It endured because it embodied endurance. This was the thing itself, the surviving principle of man, grasped by the sculptor and set down in stone. As the stone preserved the life it copied, so the tension of the artist's imagination preserved the stone. This brooding, unheroic figure was immortal man. Knarf had one of those moments when his mind made what seemed to him a direct contact with reality, dead knowledge came to life in him, a world co-ordinated about this focal point. The thing that was illuminated in his mind was a truism, something that his mind had never doubted and his imagination had never before accepted. The men of the lost world, four centuries sunk in time, were as fully matured in their humanity as any man living, cut from the same living, continuous tree of life; only their circumstances had been different. Trapped in a failing world they had still



it was the Golden Age, Knarf told himself pedantically . There has  
 never before in the whole history of man been anything like this,  
 peace and plenty. The river was once the last <sup>refuge from</sup> frontier against the  
 desert. <sup>In the worst times</sup> The desert <sup>reached</sup> ~~crossed~~ the river, <sup>in it,</sup> running long red fingers into  
 the good lands, its dusty breath carried blight for hundreds of miles.  
 The river itself was silted up, the excoriating dust ground the face  
 of the hills. Rabbits and wallabies, driven by the desert into the  
 cultivated lands, devoured everything before them. Men went out to  
 massacre them because both could not survive in the denuded land.  
 They killed and killed but hunger was stronger than fear in the crea-  
 tures, and despair than will in men. <sup>for over a century</sup> All through the ~~twentieth~~ <sup>first</sup>  
 century the land had lain dead, virtually deserted, <sup>but</sup> towards the end  
 of the twenty-second century, because it had been left alone, it began  
 very slowly to rejuvenate itself. It had taken more than a hundred  
 years of conscious effort, of replanting, of vast engineering schemes  
<sup>tapped the snows of the Alps and brought water</sup> that ~~brought the surplus water of the North Coast~~ into the dredged  
 and deepened channels of the old rivers, to rehabilitate it completely.  
 Knarf told himself the story, bricking in the hollow spaces of his  
 mind with it. Would the desert ever come again, was the possibility  
 of it still there, giving the brilliant scene its phantasmal quality?  
 Had it the sharp-edged beauty of something threatened? Or was that  
 a suggestion of the restless imagination? Nothing is lost, nothing  
 ends. I don't know that, I only feel it. Didn't the desert pass  
 like a sponge over the land, wiping out all that had gone before,  
 so that this <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ a new beginning? This place has never been sta-

idiosyncrasies.... We have, of course, to take the medical chart into consideration also.... Believe me your son is best where he is, best for himself and for society.... t thousands of young people pass through our hands every year, the rules must be rigidly applied and only scientific considerations can be admitted.... All work is equally useful and honourable. He will have another chance later."

Later was too late. It was an anxious time for mothers when their children set out in the world, everything depended on favour or chance.

Lin didn't believe in scientific measurement. Patronage was something she did understand. She didn't suppose it was right but it worked. It had to work for Ren, nothing mattered so long as he got his chance. Her will, woody and acrid, infused her mind with obstinacy. Oran could have hands like rats, and legs like a goat for the matter of that, he was influential and his coming here must be turned to advantage for Ren. Knarf should be paying him more attention. But Knarf was preoccupied, taciturn. He could be so different, charming and brilliant, if only he would exert himself. But he never did when there was any advantage in it. He was the most infuriating man in the world. Lin looked from her husband to her son, from her son to her husband, and wondered, with bitter curiosity, what she really felt about them. For years she had told herself that she loved Knarf, and sometimes even now, when she saw him suddenly - his grave sensitive face, his unexpected friendly smile, his gentle reassuring hands, - her heart turned to water. <sup>she loved for him</sup> But it had been a blind alley, leading neither to joy nor to tragedy, only to a dull beating imprisoned pain. They never came close to one another, in their lives, or in Ren. Then she had told herself that she hated him, but that led nowhere either, was just as impotent. Now she didn't

or their bullocks and they had gone on. No one pursued them, but their needs drove them further and further out. As they reached poorer country they needed more and more of it for their sheep. They could not stick together, they had to scatter. It was every man, or every family, for himself. The years of the migration were good, the country was in good heart and so were the men. They were the descendants of a peculiar people called the Pioneers and, only two or three generations earlier, their forbears had gone out into the wilderness, had come down here from the coast and the city, and, driving out the First People and cutting down the bush, had made a life for themselves. It had been hard and many had perished but others had prospered, grown wise, tough, and rich. They hadn't been afraid of the country and its irregular rhythms. The sons thought they could do it again, or rather they wouldn't believe that they couldn't. They were the great-grandsons, the grandsons, and even the sons of Pioneers, so close was the end to the beginning. History melted down the years between and these followers of a forlorn hope became one with their successful forbears, and were also called "The Pioneers." They left their foundered, mortgaged runs, where they had been feeling the long wars like a drought, and set off in a sort of cheerful desperation. If they lost a lot they got rid of a lot too. What had been done once they could do again—but this time it was different. There was not only no way back but there were no resources behind them. For a year or two it was not so bad, while the few things they had brought with them lasted and the seasons were good. Then the situation began to tell on them in earnest. At first they shored their sheep but there was no market for the wool. It decayed and stank and burned in bark sheds. A little of it they made shift to spin into yarn for their own use. Several risked a journey to a southern port with a drayload or two, but it proved too dangerous and unprofitable. They could dispose of the wool readily and secretly but there was little or nothing they could get in exchange. It was useless to keep the flocks save a few small ones to provide meat, yarn, leather, and tallow. They let them go, it was better than confiscation. The sheep wandered over the fenceless pastures. They lambed and wandered on. Their fleeces grew and blinded them, the burden of wool dragged them down till every morning there were some that could not rise and must starve where they lay. Summer and drought pressed hard on them. The waterholes dried up. The sheep died in hundreds and then thousands. Dumb and

helpless  
keeping  
survival.  
them. E  
starved a  
laden wi

The n  
a motley  
hungry,  
the shee  
Pioneers  
learned  
nothing  
but tha  
somethi  
use. Th  
as the I  
no festi  
somethi  
breeding

They  
to bring  
new wo  
majority  
a few  
beside t

That  
legend.  
it for  
real. H  
was oft  
made :  
reason,  
produc  
trick h  
neutral  
plain  
clothes  
already

st finished was  
 oted there and  
 ad been begun  
 sses can finish.  
 he poetry that  
 f his maturity,  
 nts upon cold  
 enough energy  
 with his living  
 The shock of  
 beginning it.

e must go out  
 pped mind to  
 k was finished  
 shared. Today  
 about it but  
 been salvaged  
 st, had come,  
 a help. Knarf  
 finished into  
 , a rising day,

east only, but  
 od beneath a  
 the primitive  
 eloping under  
 see everything  
 it was shape,  
 ving back into  
 a to south as  
 e rain reserve.  
 ts of trees in  
 had a wave  
 stretched the  
 lark frame of  
 us fruit-trees  
 f of vegetable  
 lay. Farther  
 ss of intense

green. It was the focus of the whole scene, and yet it was a relief to look away, to comfort the eyes with the tranquil hills. They appeared empty but for the roads with their double line of trees and the clots of greenery that marked the presence of a house here and there. They were pasture land. The countryside was, of course, much more thickly settled than it had been, since the hundredfold improvement of the pasture, the larger flocks on smaller areas, and scientific culture generally had concentrated the population. The wool, with the better pastures, had deteriorated, it was said, but that was the sort of old man's tale that usually got about.

If we looked back at today instead of living in it, we would say it was the Golden Age, Knarf told himself pedantically. There has never before in the whole history of man been anything like this, peace and plenty. The river was once the last refuge from the desert. In the worst times the desert reached the river itself, running long red fingers into the good lands, its dusty breath carried blight for hundreds of miles. The river itself was half silted up, the excoriating dust ground the faces of the hills. Rabbits, driven by the desert into the cultivated lands, devoured everything before them. Men went out to massacre them because both could not survive in the denuded land. They killed and killed but hunger was stronger than fear in the creatures, and despair than will in men. For over a century the land had lain dead, virtually deserted, but towards the end of the twenty-second century, because it had been left alone, it began very slowly to rejuvenate itself. It had taken more than a hundred years of conscious effort of replanting, of vast engineering schemes that tapped the snows of the Alps and brought water into the dredged and deepened channels of the old rivers, to rehabilitate it completely. Knarf told himself the story, bricking in the hollow spaces of his mind with it. Would the desert ever come again, was the possibility of it still there, giving the brilliant scene its phantasmal quality? Had it the sharp-edged beauty of something threatened? Or was that only a suggestion of the restless imagination? Nothing is lost, nothing ends. I don't know that, I only feel it. Didn't the desert pass like a sponge over the land, wiping out all that had gone before? So that this is a new beginning? This place has never been standardised either because it is too new and cannot catch up to the older places—or because it cannot forget that it was once a frontier. Frontier people are different. A part of life has gone

as cadets straight away. If you protested, you were rebuked for seeking favours where none was given. If you still persisted, you might in the end get an interview with the Director of Vocations, and he would have your son's test card brought to you out of the files, so that you might satisfy yourself that he had been scientifically graded to his work, but all you would see would be a string of figures, quite incomprehensible. The official stylus would point, "You see there is a deficiency here. . . . Certain temperamental idiosyncrasies. . . . We have, of course, to take the medical chart into consideration also. . . . Believe me your son is best where he is, best for himself and for society . . . thousands of young people pass through our hands every year, the rules must be rigidly applied and only scientific considerations can be admitted. . . . All work is equally useful and honourable. He will have another chance later."

Later was too late. It was an anxious time for mothers when children set out in the world, everything depended on favour or chance. Lin didn't believe in scientific measurement. Patronage was something she did understand. She didn't suppose it was right but it worked. It had to work for Ren, nothing mattered so long as he got his chance. Her will, woody and acrid, infused her mind with obstinacy. Oran could have hands like rats, and legs like a goat for the matter of that; he was influential and his coming here must be turned to advantage for Ren. Knarf should be paying him more attention. But Knarf was preoccupied, taciturn. He could be so different, charming and brilliant, if only he would exert himself. But he never did when there was any advantage in it. He was the most infuriating man in the world. Lin looked from her husband to her son, from her son to her husband, and wondered, with bitter curiosity, what she really felt about them. For years she had told herself that she loved Knarf, and sometimes even now, when she saw him suddenly—his grave sensitive face, his unexpected friendly smile, his gentle reassuring hands—her heart turned to water. But her love for him had been a blind alley, leading neither to joy nor to tragedy, only to a dull beating imprisoned pain. They never came close to one another, in their lives or in Ren. Then she had told herself that she hated him, but that led nowhere either, was just as impotent. Now she didn't know. As for Ren, if she didn't love her son, she had nothing at all. Love was battling for the loved one, and not caring what happened to anyone else. No good battling for Knarf, he didn't

want any help to Oran about nervousness and would do some man would not unless he were

Avik was with his last two conditions and distribution of world national states the two moves

"Thank you,

"No," said I

"What do you

"Liberty." T

"The boy's r

They have new

"They can't

are only impos-

Ren, speaking

The quiet n

a state of satir

nothing but re

can utilise. Lik

It drags us de

living. Where

there is trouble

Illil said, an

"Circumstance

ruling class is i

reality it becom

effect upon its

and a source o

Ren beat lig

"The power

can be diluted

The machines

all that is bein

## APPENDIX TWO

- ML ms p.6  
(from the 'Aubade' section)  
- *TT* p.433

### Note:

- Punctuation on ML ms p.6, l.15-17 and *TT* p.433, l.3-4.
- The changes from ML ms p.6, l.27 to *TT* p.433, l.13.



have our lunch with us and eat it anywhere, sitting under a gumtree. I'd go to sleep for an hour on father's cloak. What with so much sun and air and getting jogged up and down and an enormous lunch, I couldn't keep awake. I'd drop off listening to Murrumbidgee - that was the old mare, ~~name of the river, you know,~~ Ord called her that and it was he who gave her to us, - cropping the grass beside us. Father never told about my going to sleep because I was rather big then for a midday nap".

"Your father is a very distinguished man." Illil said it in a detached sort of way as if fathers were objects of common interest.

"Yes," Ren agreed, "but I don't know him very well".

Any one else might have laughed but Illil only nodded. "It's often like that, being related to people makes you self conscious. You're like him, you know."

"To look at?"

"Yes, and inside too, I should think."

"I can't write or anything like that. I do in my mind but as soon as I pick up a pen I feel dumb and wooden all over."

"I expect that's only an inhibition. But what I feel about you is that you're like your father but that whatever it is - genius, I suppose it's called - that comes to a head in his writing, is dissolved through you. Genius in solution." She turned and looked at him without slackening pace. She spoke so frankly and with such effulgent maturity that Ren was not at all embarrassed, only delighted.

"Do you really think so?" was all he could say in a pleased tone.

"I wouldn't say so if I didn't think so. I thought you were fine, that way you stood up to Vern to-day."

"To look at?"

"Yes, and inside too, I should think."

"I can't write or anything like that, I do in my mind, but as soon as I pick up a pen I feel dumb and wooden all over."

"I expect that's only an inhibition. But what I feel about you is that you're like your father, but that whatever it is—genius, I suppose it's called—that comes to a head in his writing, is dissolved through you. Genius in solution." She turned and looked at him without slackening pace. She spoke so frankly and with such effulgent maturity that Ren was not at all embarrassed, only delighted.

"Do you really think so?" was all he could say in a pleased tone.

"I wouldn't say so if I didn't think so. I thought you were fine, the way you stood up to Oran today."

"Did you? Did you really, Illil? Sfax thought I'd made a fool of myself."

"I wouldn't worry about that. We won't have Sfax with us long."

"What do you mean?"

"He's ready to retreat. Didn't you notice? There's a look in the eye, you come to recognise it after a time."

"But I've known Sfax all my life, he wouldn't do anything like that. He's so clever, I expect he has just outstripped us all and sees things a bit differently."

"He's clever enough in his own way, a real smarty, but he hasn't any stomach for sacrifice. Don't look so glum, it isn't important. We've used him, that's all. He thinks he's used us. That's the joke."

"I don't understand."

"It would be plain enough if you didn't know him so well. He's only interested in the votometer, we're only the excuse for demonstrating it. He's useful to us. So far we're quits. But he might be dangerous."

Ren muttered unhappily that he didn't believe it.

"You'll have to be tougher than that. You're very romantic, you know." The gay friendly smile was back in her eyes, the hard creature of a moment ago gone. The thought just flicked across Ren's mind: "Does she think I'm a child?"

"That's what Sfax said."

Illil was coughing and Ren would have liked to walk more slowly but she would not. Her mood had changed again. She was no longer



## APPENDIX THREE

Chart showing renumbering and reordering of pages in the Mitchell Library typescript.

ORIGINAL PAGE NUMBER	RENUMBERED TO:	OTHER NOTES
111	remains the same	Paragraph crossed out at bottom of page.
112	"	Possibly inserted at a later stage - only 17 lines of text. Pages 112 -116 are in different paper to rest of section.
121	113	Was numbered in hand as 114, then the "4" was crossed out.
122	114	
123	115	
116	remains the same	Only five lines of text - the "6" is underlined.
112	117	
113?	118	
114	119	
115	120	
116	121	
117	122	
118	123	
119	124	
125	remains the same	Possibly inserted at a later stage - only 13 lines of text.
143	126	
144	127	
145	128	
146	129	
130	remains the same	Page 130-2 were possibly inserted at a later stage. They have not been hand-edited and a large portion of the text does not appear in Georgian House.
131	"	The first page with the censor's stamp.
132	"	
148	<del>133</del> -190A	
149	<del>134</del> -191	
150	<del>135</del> -192	
136	remains the same	Pages 136 and 137 were possibly inserted at a later stage.
137	"	
126	138	
127	139	

ORIGINAL PAGE NUMBER	RENUMBERED TO:	OTHER NOTES
128	140	
129	141	
130	142	
131	143	
144	remains the same	Possibly inserted at a later stage.
133	145	
134	146	
135	147	
136	148	
137	149	
138	150	
139	151	
140	152	
141	153	
154	remains the same	
152	154a	
153	154b	
154	154c	
155	remains the same	From this point onwards, the page numbers are consecutive, until:
181a	remains the same	Possibly inserted at a later stage.
218	218-19	An earlier page 219 has been removed.
248a	remains the same	Possibly inserted at a later stage.

## APPENDIX FOUR

- Two copies of p.249 from *Tomorrow and Tomorrow*. Melbourne: Georgian House, 1947.

**Note:**

- The different headers.

It was something, Harry thought, to get a little bit of your world tied up.

The Russo-Finnish war was dragged like a red herring across the international situation. The ideological confusion was worse confounded. "Aggression, barefaced aggression," cried the Right. "Self-defence," declared the Left; "look at Leningrad up near the border, exposed to attack. Russia must protect herself." "Finland's a democracy, we are fighting for democracy, so her cause is ours," asserted the Right. "Oh yeah," said the Left, "What price Mannerheim?" "Idealism," said the Right. "Realism," said the Left. Allied help did not reach Finland any more than it had reached Poland. In Germany the question was even more barbed. It was a matter of choosing between a quasi ally and a potential ally. Germany acquiesced in the defeat of Finland, albeit with pious regrets, confident that the rage and humiliation generated in Finland would make of her a jumping-off place, a beaten iron head, for a German attack on Russia. In the meantime, thousands of men, Finns and Russians, died on the Karelian Isthmus and in the swamps of Lake Ladoga, in the thick forests and on the snowy plains. Alive, these men had not differed greatly from one another, they were men and brave, they were conscripts; dead, they did not differ at all.

It was a hot Sunday in January 1940. The street lay gasping. The bandsman downstairs was practising a tiddley bit, over and over, on his trumpet. It sounded incredibly desolate, and like a fish out of water. Ally lay on her bed reading. Harry, Wanda, and Ben had dispersed immediately dinner was over on their own occasions. Ruth was restless. The dinner dishes were still stacked in a greasy pile on the sink. It was Wanda's turn to wash up, but she had gone out, and for once Ruth didn't intend to do it. She couldn't make up her mind about the afternoon. The house was insufferable, all the greasy emptiness in the world seemed stacked up in it. There was nothing to stop her from going out, but if she got dressed and went out it would only underline the fact that she had nowhere special to go and no one to go with. An insuperable sense of disappointment was on her, like a headache or a malaise. There was a boy at the office who wanted to take her out, and Tony Nelson would have liked the chance, but they wouldn't do. She was a year older than Tony anyway. Lonely and uncertain, she put a veneer of awkward aloofness over her

*Georgian House  
Edition, 1947*

It was something, Harry thought, to get a little bit of your world tied up.

The Russo-Finnish war was dragged like a red herring across the international situation. The ideological confusion was worse confounded. "Aggression, barefaced aggression," cried the Right. "Self-defence," declared the Left; "look at Leningrad up near the border, exposed to attack. Russia must protect herself." "Finland's a democracy, we are fighting for democracy, so her cause is ours," asserted the Right. "Oh yeah," said the Left, "What price Mannerheim?" "Idealism," said the Right. "Realism," said the Left. Allied help did not reach Finland any more than it had reached Poland. In Germany the question was even more barbed. It was a matter of choosing between a quasi ally and a potential ally. Germany acquiesced in the defeat of Finland, albeit with pious regrets, confident that the rage and humiliation generated in Finland would make of her a jumping-off place, a beaten iron head, for a German attack on Russia. In the meantime, thousands of men, Finns and Russians, died on the Karelian Isthmus and in the swamps of Lake Ladoga, in the thick forests and on the snowy plains. Alive, these men had not differed greatly from one another, they were men and brave, they were conscripts; dead, they did not differ at all.

It was a hot Sunday in January 1940. The street lay gasping. The bandsman downstairs was practising a tiddley bit, over and over, on his trumpet. It sounded incredibly desolate, and like a fish out of water. Ally lay on her bed reading. Harry, Wanda, and Ben had dispersed immediately dinner was over on their own occasions. Ruth was restless. The dinner dishes were still stacked in a greasy pile on the sink. It was Wanda's turn to wash up, but she had gone out, and for once Ruth didn't intend to do it. She couldn't make up her mind about the afternoon. The house was insufferable, all the greasy emptiness in the world seemed stacked up in it. There was nothing to stop her from going out, but if she got dressed and went out it would only underline the fact that she had nowhere special to go and no one to go with. An insuperable sense of disappointment was on her, like a headache or a malaise. There was a boy at the office who wanted to take her out, and Tony Nelson would have liked the chance, but they wouldn't do. She was a year older than Tony anyway. Lonely and uncertain, she put a veneer of awkward aloofness over her

*Georgian House edition, 1947*

## **APPENDIX FIVE**

- Consolidated Censorship Directions, Issued 30th April 1943: Absolute Prohibitions by Law, Chief Publicity Censor's General Directions and Chief Publicity Censor's Special Directions.

# CONSOLIDATED CENSORSHIP DIRECTIONS.

*Issued on 30th April, 1943.*

In pursuance of the powers conferred upon me by the Press and Broadcasting Censorship Order dated the fourteenth day of January, 1943, I, EDMUND GARNET BONNEY, Chief Publicity Censor, hereby issue the following Directions to each editor, printer and publisher of newspapers and other publications in Australia and to each owner or other person in charge of wireless transmitting apparatus in Australia.

## PRESS AND BROADCASTING CENSORSHIP DIRECTIONS.

1. These Directions may be cited as the Consolidated Censorship Directions and may from time to time be supplemented, amended, or cancelled by Temporary Censorship Directions.
2. The Consolidated Censorship Instructions issued on 17th July, 1942, and all other Censorship Instructions in force before 1st April, 1943, are hereby cancelled.
3. The objects of these Directions are to ensure that the enemy is not assisted by the publication or broadcasting of any matter that contravenes the requirements of security and that nothing is published or broadcast that is likely to prejudice the defence of the Commonwealth or the efficient prosecution of the war.

## ABSOLUTE PROHIBITIONS BY LAW.

4. Attention is directed to the following ABSOLUTE PROHIBITIONS contained in the National Security (General) Regulations and the Press and Broadcasting Censorship Order:—

### *National Security (General) Regulation 17—*

"17.—(1.) Subject to these Regulations, a person shall not, in any manner likely to prejudice the defence of the Commonwealth or the efficient prosecution of the war—

- (a) obtain;
- (b) record, communicate to any other person, or publish; or
- (c) have in his possession any document containing, or other record whatsoever of, any information being, or purporting to be, information with respect to—
  - (i) the number, description, armament, equipment, disposition, movement or condition of any of the forces, vessels or aircraft of the King or the Commonwealth;
  - (ii) any operations or projected operations of any of those forces, vessels or aircraft;
  - (iii) any measures for the defence or fortification of any place on behalf of the King or the Commonwealth;
  - (iv) the number, description or location of any prisoner of war;
  - (v) munitions of war; or
  - (vi) any other matter whatsoever information as to which would or might be directly or indirectly useful to the enemy.

"(2.) A person shall not make any false statement, or spread a false report, whether orally or otherwise, or do any act, or have any article in his possession, likely to be prejudicial to the defence of the Commonwealth or the efficient prosecution of the war, or likely to cause disaffection to His Majesty or public alarm or despondency or to interfere with the operations of any of the Forces of the King or the Commonwealth or the Forces of any foreign power allied or associated with His Majesty in any war in which His Majesty is engaged."

### *National Security (General) Regulation 19 (1.) (c)—*

"19.—(1.) Subject to any exemptions for which provision is made by order of the Minister, a person shall not, except under the authority of a written permit granted by or on behalf of the Minister—

- (c) make, or have in his possession, any photograph, sketch, plan or other representation—
  - (i) of a prohibited place, or of any part of or object in a prohibited place;
  - (ii) of, or of any part of or object in, any area specified by order of the Minister, being an area in relation to which the restriction of photography appears to the Minister to be expedient in the interests of the defence of the Commonwealth; or
  - (iii) of a place, person, thing or occurrence of any description specified in any order made by the Minister, or of any part of such place, person, thing or occurrence."

### *National Security (General) Regulations 41 (1.), 41A and 41B—*

"41.—(1.) A person shall not—

- (a) endeavour to cause disaffection among any persons engaged (whether in Australia or elsewhere) in the service of the King or the Commonwealth, or in the performance of essential services, or to induce any person to do or to omit to do anything in breach of his duty as a person so engaged; or
- (b) with intent to contravene, or to aid, abet, counsel or procure a contravention of, paragraph (a) of this sub-regulation, have in his possession or under his control any document of such a nature that the dissemination of copies thereof among any such persons would constitute such a contravention."

"41A. A person shall not by speech or writing advocate, encourage or suggest—

- (a) the use of force or violence as a means of advancing or carrying into effect any political cause, measures, policies or proposals; or
- (b) the use of sabotage or the destruction of or injury to property.

"41B. A person shall not—

- (a) print, publish, distribute, circulate or, without lawful excuse (proof whereof shall lie upon him), have in his possession, any book, periodical, pamphlet, 'dodger', circular, hand bill, card or newspaper; or
- (b) broadcast by means of wireless telegraphy any message or other communication, containing any matter advocating, encouraging or suggesting—
  - (c) the use of force or violence as a means of advancing or carrying into effect any political cause, measures, policies or proposals; or
  - (d) the use of sabotage or the destruction of or injury to property."



*National Security (General) Regulation 42 (1.) and (4.) (a)—*

" 42.—(1.) A person shall not—

- (a) endeavour, whether orally or otherwise, to influence public opinion (whether in Australia or elsewhere) in a manner likely to be prejudicial to the defence of the Commonwealth or the efficient prosecution of the war; or
- (b) do any act, or have any article in his possession, with a view to making, or facilitating the making of, any such endeavour.

" (4.) In this regulation—

- (a) the expression " public opinion " includes the opinion of any section of the public.

**Press and Broadcasting Censorship Order.**

*Persons to comply with directions of Publicity Censor—*

" Paragraph 11.—A person shall not print or publish in Australia, or lodge for transmission for printing or publication outside Australia—

- (a) any matter which he is required by or under this Order to submit to a Publicity Censor, unless it has been submitted to a Publicity Censor and has been passed for publication or transmission (either with or without alteration) by that Censor;
- (b) any matter the printing or publication of which has been forbidden by a Publicity Censor or refuse or fail to comply with any direction given to him by a Publicity Censor in relation to any such matter;
- (c) any statement to the effect, or from which it can be inferred, that any alteration, addition or omission has been made by, or under the direction of a Publicity Censor;
- (d) any matter in such a way as to show that any alteration, addition or omission has been made by, or under the direction of, a Publicity Censor; or
- (e) any statement to the effect that publication of any matter has been forbidden by a Publicity Censor."

" Paragraph 16.—The owner or person in charge of a wireless transmitting apparatus shall not broadcast or authorize or permit the broadcasting of any matter specified in paragraph 11 of this Order."

**CHIEF PUBLICITY CENSOR'S GENERAL DIRECTIONS.**

NOTE.—All directions where applicable, whether General or Special, contained in this consolidation apply not only to all newspapers and broadcasting stations, but also to all publicity media such as periodicals, association journals, company reports, matter issued to advocate a cause, &c. They further apply to all advertising, photographs and pictures, cinematograph films and all other matter that is not strictly a private communication between two persons.

*(a) Submission of Doubtful Matter—*

Editors and broadcasters are obliged to reject material that is obviously inconsistent with Censorship requirements, and doubtful matter must, in all cases, be submitted to a Publicity Censor. Copy, galley proofs or broadcasting scripts must be submitted *in duplicate with headings*.

*(b) Re-submissions after One Month—*

Matter submitted to a Publicity Censor may be published or broadcast within one month after being passed for publication or broadcasting, but not thereafter unless it has been re-submitted and again passed. This applies particularly to photographs and pictures.

*(c) Published Matter contravening Censorship Requirements—*

Matter contravening Censorship requirements or conflicting with the essential principles of Security, which has been published or broadcast, must not be republished or broadcast without prior submission to and approval by a Publicity Censor. Matter which has been published or broadcast in breach of Censorship, is not thereby released for use by other persons.

*(d) Publicity Censorship and Service Authorities—*

The Fighting Services or other authorities to which matter may be referred for advice are not Publicity Censorship authorities, and the fact that their approval or disapproval has been given to any material in no way signifies that Censorship has either passed or rejected such material. No material that has been submitted, or is required to be submitted, to Censorship may be published, nor has it been prohibited, unless it bears the stamp of a Publicity Censor to that effect.

*(e) Official Statements Censorable—*

Statements purporting to be official, made by recognized official sources, shall not be accepted as having been passed by, or as being immune from, Censorship, except where express provision is made in these Directions for exceptions in the case of official statements by Ministers of State or by Allied General Headquarters. In all cases where official statements, other than those excepted, may contravene Censorship requirements they should be submitted to a Publicity Censor.

*(f) Statements likely to Cause Disaffection, &c.—*

No statement, cartoon, illustration or photograph, or other matter may be published or broadcast which—

- (i) Evinces disloyalty, or is likely to encourage disloyalty or to cause disaffection;
- (ii) is likely to discourage enlistment in the fighting forces or in any auxiliary service;
- (iii) is calculated to influence public opinion (whether in Australia or elsewhere) in a manner likely to be prejudicial to the defence of the Commonwealth or to the efficient prosecution of the war;
- (iv) is likely to prejudice His Majesty's relations with an Ally or with any Foreign Power with which he is at peace, or is likely to offend any such Ally or Foreign Power or any part of His Majesty's dominions; or
- (v) is likely to be, or is capable of being, used to enemy advantage, or to the prejudice or disadvantage of British or Allied interests.

*(g) Prejudicial Criticism or Complaints—*

- (i) Criticism of or complaints concerning any of the Services or any war instrumentality may first be referred for verification of facts and for comment to the Service or instrumentality concerned, but must be submitted to a Publicity Censor before publication. Legitimate criticism will not be suppressed.
- (ii) Statements of servicemen or ex-servicemen alleging bad or unfair treatment in Australia or elsewhere must be submitted before publication.
- (iii) Criticism of Service leaders in their official capacities must also be submitted.

*(h) Unofficial, Sensational or Exaggerated Reports—*

Publicity agencies must not misrepresent the military situation by publishing or broadcasting—

- (i) Rumours, and unconfirmed or unauthorized reports of victories or defeats;
- (ii) Headlines or titles exaggerating successes or failures of any kind;
- (iii) Any statement likely to cause or spread public alarm.

# CHIEF PUBLICITY CENSOR'S SPECIAL DIRECTIONS.

---

## A.1. AIR RAIDS OR OTHER ATTACKS ON AUSTRALIAN TERRITORY.

Special instructions will be issued as soon as possible after an alert is sounded or an attack made by the enemy on any Australian city, district, or area. Pending official relaxation Rule C.8 (a) "Communiques", will apply. All material referring to an alert or an attack must be submitted to Censorship before publication.

## A.2. AIRCRAFT—OPERATIONS AND PERSONNEL.

1. Publication of the following is prohibited except for official releases from Allied Head-quarters or as may be provided in Censorship Directions :—

- (a) Ferrying of aircraft to or from Australia ;
- (b) Embarkation, disembarkation, route, mode of travel, or other movements, to or from or within Australia, of R.A.A.F. or Allied Service or Civil aircraft or personnel. (This applies also to suspension, diversion, or resumption of civil air services) ;
- (c) Refuelling particulars or movements of bulk fuel, stores, supplies and the like ;
- (d) Any reference to new or experimental types of British, American, or Australian aircraft, including wooden planes made in Australia, whether completed or in course of production ;
- (e) Number, description, armament, equipment, performance or condition of any Allied aircraft except those specifically released from time to time, used or intended to be used in operations in the South-West Pacific ; or the bases from which such aircraft are operating or may operate ;
- (f) Precise location or number of R.A.A.F. or Allied aerodromes or training establishments, the number of trainees, the time occupied in any phase of training, the attainment of any particular state of training or methods of training including paratroop training ;
- (g) Strength, establishment, location or operational organizations of R.A.A.F. or Allied Air Forces, or any unit thereof ;
- (h) Measures for defence of Air establishments or operational methods employed or to be employed by Service aircraft ;
- (i) Manufacture of gliders in Australia or their proposed use in the South-west Pacific area.

2. *No reference is to be made or implied with respect to any Allied Air Force personnel—that he is an Intelligence, Radio, Armament, or other special officer, or has special qualifications in these or like matters.*

## A.3. AIR ACCIDENTS.

No mention is permissible of any Service air accident in the South-west Pacific area until the official version has been given by the Department of Air. No photographs of such accidents may be published. Evidence given at inquests into Service accidents must be submitted to Censorship. All material relating to accidents involving civil planes must also be submitted.

## A.4. AIRMEN'S VISION.

No unauthorized mention is permissible regarding research by R.A.A.F. to remedy black-out of pilot's vision.

### A.5. ALIENS AND ENEMY AGENTS.

Information relating to the following matters may not be published without Censorship endorsement :—

- (a) Alleged presence or activities of enemy agents in the South-west Pacific area ;
- (b) The arrest or detention of, or other Military action, dealing with enemy aliens or alleged traitors ;
- (c) Plans or proceedings of Aliens' Classification Committee or any similar body.

### A.6. ARMY INFORMATION.

1. Publication of the following is prohibited :—

- (a) Letterpress or photographs which indicate the numbers, location, armament and equipment of troops who are guarding military establishments and other places ;
- (b) Movements of troops connected with the manning of defence works, fortifications, and the furnishing of guards in places of defence importance ;
- (c) The location or movements of troops or units, or their departure or return from overseas unless officially released ;
- (d) Particulars or pictures of any measures for the defence or fortification of any place or area ;
- (e) Reports of searches and raids for a Military purpose, except with Censorship consent ;
- (f) All reference to radio signal stations ;
- (g) Information as to the operation and condition of other means of telecommunication ;
- (h) All references to protective measures taken by the Services through the provision of armed guards ;
- (i) References to the Australian signal system, signal equipment, or organization of the Australian Corps of Signals, except such approved references to signals as are necessary for recruiting purposes ;
- (j) Unauthorized references to operational methods or tactics used by Allied or enemy Forces ;
- (k) Number of existing armoured units or possible expansion thereof ;
- (l) Except with Censorship consent the numerical or other designation of military establishments or of military units, their location, commanders, principal officers, strength, composition, armament, organization, morale, discipline, state of training, experience, or other information that may indicate the fighting value of any particular unit ;

2. Publication of information or speculation on the following subjects is forbidden unless permitted by Censorship or made the subject of official announcement :—

- (a) Any measures of Military assistance to Australia by friendly Powers or by Australia to them ;
- (b) Any diversion of road or rail traffic occasioned by the use of means of communication for Military purposes, or as the result of enemy action ;
- (c) Any specific measures planned or adopted for beach or coastal defence ;
- (d) The location or extent of any prohibited areas ;
- (e) The practice by Australian or Allied Forces of any technique of training new to Australia ;
- (f) The composition of Forces, changes in boundaries of Military districts, locations of head-quarters of armies, corps or divisions, or arrangements for their supply ;
- (g) The objects and work of and other information regarding, any technical or special unit of the Australian or Allied Forces ;
- (h) The names of officers who have, or are supposed to have received appointments in the Australian Forces.
- (i) Trials of army equipment, whether already in service or not.

### A.7. A.I.F., C.M.F., AND ALLIED UNITS.

The identity of A.I.F., C.M.F. or Allied units, whether in Australia or abroad, must not be disclosed by publication of their identifying numbers, except with Censorship consent. Such terms as : " An infantry battalion ", " A Queensland artillery regiment ", " A Field Hospital ", &c., may be used.

Identifying colour patches in photographs of Service personnel should be re-touched out before publication, unless Censorship considers that the identity of the units concerned is already known to the enemy.

Special attention should be paid to items in social, sporting and other sectional columns. See also C.7.

### A.8. ATROCITIES.

Atrocity stories concerning Australians or relating to incidents in the South-west Pacific area may not be published unless officially released under the name of a Commonwealth Minister, the Chief of Staff of the Service concerned, or by General Head-quarters.

### A.9. A.R.P. AND CAMOUFLAGE.

There must be no reference to—

- (a) Precise locations of A.R.P. control centres or particulars of secret code signals ;
- (b) Any alleged shortage of major equipment for air raid precautions, including fire-fighting equipment ;
- (c) Civil respirators (in pictures or letterpress) except with Censorship consent ;
- (d) *Camouflage of any kind.*—This restriction includes the demolition, removal or alteration in appearance of any well-known landmark, or any other measures that may be proposed or undertaken to render out of date the enemy's knowledge of the appearance of our defences from the air. References to camouflage research also prohibited, as is mention of dummy landing grounds and similar structures designed to deceive the enemy.

### A.10. AIR SERVICES—OVERSEAS.

No unofficial reference is permissible to the route, port of arrival or departure, or other information concerning any overseas air service, including air freight service, in being or contemplated.

### A.11. ALLIED WORKS COUNCIL.

The following limitations must be observed in publicity concerning any Allied Works Council activity :—

- (a) *Location.*—No more exact definition than say, " a northern area of Australia " ;
- (b) *Materials.*—Reference in general terms only to quantities of common construction material ; no reference to uncommon material ;
- (c) *Cost.*—No reference to amount of money expended on a project, except in very general terms, such as " several hundred thousand pounds ", or except as allowed by Censorship.
- (d) *Transport.*—No reference to methods of transporting workmen or material to a works site ;
- (e) *Administration.*—No defining of Works Council administrative areas ;
- (f) *Camouflage.*—No reference permitted ;
- (g) *Descriptive.*—No reference to specific land marks by which a works area could be positively identified. Only most general statement of the purpose of the installation. (" Defence project " would be a proper term for defence works of any nature whatever) ;
- (h) *Labour Strength.*—No reference to the number of men engaged on a particular work or in a particular area without Censorship's consent.
- (i) *Communications.*—No reference is permissible to the use of radio-telephone for communicating between Allied Works Council camps.

NOTE.—The above Security restrictions do not forbid reasonable references to the magnitude and importance of works carried out by the Allied Works Council. Aggregate expenditure and employment figures for the Commonwealth as a whole, or a particular State, are permissible concerning work already completed, but all such material must be submitted to Censorship before publication.

### A.12. ADVISORY WAR COUNCIL.

Reports of proceedings of the Advisory War Council must be limited to official statements issued by Party Leaders for publication.

## BUSHFIRES.

See F.1. Fires.

### B.1. B.B.C. BROADCASTS.

Notwithstanding any specific instructions to the contrary, the broadcast of a news item by B.B.C. automatically releases that item for publication and broadcasting in Australia.

### B.2. BROADCASTING STATIONS.

All radio stations and broadcasting stations must observe the Broadcasting Censorship Standing Orders for the time being in force.

### B.3. BUILDINGS—RACECOURSES, ETC.

Except for official announcements by the responsible Minister, there is to be no reference without Censorship consent to the location, function or Military establishment of buildings, racecourses, public or private utilities or other services, structures or areas which are to be or have been constructed, taken over or adapted for war purposes.

### B.4. BOMB DISPOSAL METHODS.

There must be no disclosure and no photographs of any of the following :—

- (1) Precise location of bombs ;
- (2) Size of bombs ;
- (3) Depth of penetration of bombs ;
- (4) Difficulty or lack of difficulty in recovering unexploded bombs ;
- (5) Time allowed to elapse before recovery is attempted ;
- (6) Nature of fuse (electrical, mechanical, chemical, &c.), used ;
- (7) Time and method of removal of fuses ;
- (8) Use or existence of booby traps in fuses or in other parts of unexploded bombs ;
- (9) Time elapsing before delayed action bombs explode ;
- (10) Methods other than digging used to recover unexploded bombs ;
- (11) Methods used in handling unexploded bombs ;
- (12) Demolition of unexploded bombs in situ ;
- (13) Degrees of efficiency of bomb disposal technique in use ;
- (14) Any indication of the nature of special apparatus in use or about to be used.

### B.5. BROADCASTS OF OPERATIONS.

No information relating to operations or to the Defence Forces generally on matters affecting Military Security may be broadcast without prior reference to Censorship. This is to apply whether or not such information has already been published in the Press.

### B.6. BLACK-TRACKERS.

It is permissible to refer to the work of black-trackers in tracing missing airmen within the continental limits of Australia, but no reference may be made to the employment of Australian natives on similar work in adjacent islands.

## CAMOUFLAGE.

*See* A.9. A.R.P. and Camouflage.

### C.1. CABLES—UNITED KINGDOM PRESS.

Voluntary Censorship, as applied by Press to news received from Internal sources in Australia, will also apply to Press cable and Beam messages from overseas. Editors should, therefore, submit doubtful messages from United Kingdom or elsewhere.

### C.2. CASUALTIES AND CASUALTY LISTS.

(a) No casualty may be announced before publication in an official casualty list, unless such announcement is authorized, in writing, by the next of kin, and does not identify the ship, unit or exact area in which the person was serving.

(b) Biographies of soldiers, sailors and airmen mentioned in casualty lists may be published, but the unit in which a casualty was serving must not be disclosed. The locality where the casualty occurred may be mentioned in general terms only, such as "the Middle East," the "South-west Pacific area." The prohibition against disclosure of units extends to obituary notices in advertising columns of newspapers, but not to Probate notices.

(c) Broadcasting of casualty lists is prohibited, but subsequent to issue broadcast reference may be made to individuals whose records or deeds warrant special mention.

(d) Summaries of casualties for particular Services, Units, Battles, Dates, Theatres of War, or specified localities should not be published, unless the subject of official release and passed by Censorship.

(e) No figures relating to Enemy Casualties in any hostilities in the South-west Pacific Area may be published unless authorized by General Head-quarters.

(f) Reports of Civil accidents in which Australian Service Personnel (not on duty) are concerned must be submitted to Censorship.

### C.3. CENSORSHIP, REFERENCES TO.

The Press and Broadcasting Censorship Order made under National Security Regulations prohibits the printing, publication, or broadcasting of any statement to the effect that any alteration, addition or omission has been made to any matter by a Publicity Censor, or that publication of any matter has been forbidden. All references to the exercise of Censorship or to Censorship or Intelligence personnel must be submitted.

### C.4. CENSORSHIP UNIFORMITY.

When an Editor submits an item for Censorship, the item must, as a matter of course, be withheld from interstate correspondents and affiliates until the Censor's decision is given. Affiliated papers should be notified when items have been submitted to and passed by the State Censor. The item may be transmitted by interstate correspondents only in the form in which it was passed by the State Censor. This rule applies equally to Broadcasting Stations.

### C.5. CODES OR CYPHERS.

(a) No mention or speculation is allowed as to the capture or compromise of any British or Allied code or cypher by the enemy or of our capture or compromise of any of the enemy's.

(b) No publicity should be given to the training of A.W.A.S. or other women in cypher work. Official service recruiting advertisements alone excepted.

### C.6. COMMUNICATIONS—SUSPENSION OF.

No mention of suspension of postal, telegraphic, telephonic or cable communications except for official statements. No reference is permitted to R.A.A.F. signalling methods by wireless telegraph or otherwise or to interruption of these communications.

### C.7. COMMANDS.

Unless officially released for publication there shall be no reference to---

- (1) Changes or speculations about changes in Allied Commands in the South-west Pacific area ;
- (2) Known or possible location or movements of any senior officer engaged in operational activities or associated with any operational or combat unit of the Australian or Allied Forces.

(A " senior " officer is, in the Navy above the rank of Lieutenant ; in the Army, above the rank of Captain ; and in the Air Force, above the rank of Group Captain.)

### C.8. COMMUNIQUES AND SPECULATION.

(a) No mention may be made of enemy or Allied operations in the South-west Pacific Area which have not been announced in an Allied Head-quarters communique. Discussions of operations announced in communiques will be confined to the factual limits of the communiques. No discrediting of the reliability of communiques will be permitted.

(b) Unauthorized speculation as to probable enemy or Allied moves is forbidden by a War Cabinet ruling. Such speculation includes discussion of the probability or possibility of enemy or Allied offensives in the South-west Pacific Area.

### C.9. CROWDS AND ASSEMBLIES.

Except with Censorship's consent, there may be no advance broadcast or Press publicity concerning proposed large gatherings of Service personnel in public buildings, sports grounds, city streets, or elsewhere.

### C.10. CHEMICALS.

There must be no reference, without Censorship consent, to supplies, or the import or export of chemicals for Defence purposes in Australia, or for the manufacture of munitions, nor must there be reference to the use of any new chemical for similar purposes or to the use, or proposed use, of chemicals in war operations in the South-west Pacific Area.

### C.11. COURT-MARTIAL PROCEEDINGS.

In reports of court-martial proceedings in Lines of Communication Areas, there must be no reference to the constitution or location of the court, the names of counsel or witnesses, the numbers of units, or the location of camps or stations, or any matter affecting military security.

### D.1. DISTURBANCES OR DISAFFECTION.

References to disaffection or indiscipline among members of Australian or Allied Forces or to riots or disturbances in which they take part must be submitted to Censorship. Publication is prohibited of anything likely to prejudice the training, discipline or administration of the Forces or to affect adversely Allied relations. In reports of disturbances involving more than one nationality references to Service personnel should not distinguish the Service or nationalities concerned.

### D.2. DARWIN CENSORSHIP.

All news items or articles from Darwin, except those endorsed "Passa", or passed by Publicity Censor, Adelaide, must be submitted. Correspondents should be instructed by their editors to mark articles forwarded by any route other than by telegraph to Adelaide in such a way as to ensure handling by Publicity Censorship in the capital city from which they radiate to affiliated papers.

### D.3. DISTILLERIES (POWER ALCOHOL).

Location of existing or contemplated power alcohol distilleries must not be revealed.

### D.4. DIPLOMATIC APPOINTMENTS.

No unauthorized statement is permitted regarding the supposed identity of any diplomatic representative who may be appointed by Australia to another country or by another country to Australia.

### E.1. ENEMY CLAIMS.

(a) Enemy claims received by cable or B.B.C. broadcast of Allied losses in any specified action or series of actions or in any theatres of war in which Australians are operating, may be published *as received*. They must be printed in such a manner as to leave no doubt that the reports are of enemy origin.

(b) Enemy radio claims "picked up" by a newspaper or broadcasting station in Australia must in every instance be submitted to Censorship.

(c) In no circumstances may reference be made to Japanese radio announcements regarding Australian Service personnel whom they claim to be holding as prisoners of war.

### E.2. ESCAPE STORIES.

Stories relating to escapes from Japanese-occupied territory, including New Guinea, New Britain, Timor or other island areas, must be submitted to and passed by Censorship before publication. In no circumstances should any mention be made of the method or means of escape, the type of transport used or the route followed, unless such particulars have been released by Allied Head-quarters. The same restrictions apply to reports of evacuations from island areas to the Australian mainland. Such reports,



### **E.3. EQUIPMENT—CONDITION OF.**

Specific allegations about any particular shortage of equipment or armament of the fighting forces may not be published without the consent of Censorship ; official statements excepted.

### **E.4. EVACUATIONS WITHIN AUSTRALIA.**

No unauthorized references to—

- (a) The evacuation of civilians from Australian cities or to the policy of evacuating civilians ;
- (b) Names of towns or districts to which women or children may be evacuated ;
- (c) Plans for evacuating banks in an emergency.

### **F.1. FIRES.**

Reference to specific localities in which bush fires occur, or detailed information about other fires, would be particularly dangerous with the enemy close at hand, and should be avoided, at least until the fires have been extinguished. There may be no broadcasting of bush fire warnings without Censorship consent.

### **F.2. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS.**

The passing of a newspaper article or radio script for publication or transmission overseas does not necessarily mean that such articles or scripts are suitable for publication in Australia. Censorship approval must be obtained in every instance before such material can be used here.

### **F.3. FOOD.**

(a) Without Censorship endorsement, there must be no reference to any research in connexion with foodstuffs for use for defence or service purposes.

(b) Any report which alleges that inferior or bad food is being supplied to members of the fighting forces or that sickness has resulted among such members from bad food must be submitted to Censorship.

**I.1. IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.**

(a) Except for official releases, no reference is permitted to import or to export of munitions, implements of war, articles, supplies, or equipment for use of members of the fighting forces, or machinery or metals of any description, including gold.

*See also* M.5 (Mining and Minerals) and W.3 (Wool Stocks and Shipments).

**I.2. INVENTIONS.**

Any description or pictorial or photographic representation of any novel kind of fighting machine for use on land, sea or in the air, or any other inventions for use in warfare, is prohibited, unless it has been passed by Censorship.

Imaginative articles purporting to forecast the emergence of new forms of warfare are prohibited.

**I.3. INTERNEES.**

All material, including letters from correspondents, relating to internees, former internees internment camps, &c., in Australia, must be submitted to Censorship.

**INTERVIEWS WITH SERVICE PERSONNEL.**

*See* S.7. Service Personnel.

**L.1. LEAFLETS (PROPAGANDA).**

Propaganda leaflets used in the South-west Pacific Area, whether distributed by the enemy or ourselves, must not be quoted or reproduced without authority.

**LETTERS FROM SERVICE PERSONNEL.**

*See* S.7. Service Personnel.

**M.1. MUNITIONS.**

1. Publication of the following is prohibited :—

- (a) Photographs which show munitions factories, annexes or contractors' workshops as a whole ;
- (b) Material that gives the location of, or descriptions of work carried on in, munitions factories, annexes or contractors' workshops, except in official releases or advertisements passed by Censorship ;
- (c) Any indication of the sources of electric power, steam, water, or essential services for munitions establishments ;
- (d) Any indication of the exact nature or quantity of munitions produced or to be produced in any particular establishment.

2. The locations of the following or changes in their location may not be indicated without permission of the Ministry for Munitions :—

- (a) Munition factories, annexes or contractors' workshops, in particular machine-tool factories and bomb-filling and shell-filling centres ;
- (b) New or projected power houses or power "boosting plants" ;
- (c) Optical instrument factories ;
- (d) New or projected petrol refineries and fuel oil depots ;
- (e) Aircraft part factories ;
- (f) Marine mine manufacturing centres ;
- (g) Ammunition, explosive, fuel, armament and supply stores or dumps or the like ;
- (h) Radio location instrument factories.

3. There must be no reference, except for official releases by the Minister for or Department of Munitions, to :—

- (a) New types of munitions, munitions production, armaments, guns, tanks, transport vehicles, &c., existing or projected ;
- (b) The production of machine tools for munitions ;
- (c) Any of the main armament, except the two-pounder gun, of the Australian Cruiser Tank. There must be no reference to more powerful armament, to its performance figures or to its armour. No photographs of its interior are allowed.

4. Firms engaged in war work must make no mention of that fact when advertising for labour.

**M.2. MANPOWER.**

Unless approved by the responsible Minister or the Chief of the General Staff, publication is prohibited of figures analysing, grouping or classifying the man-power available for the Australian Armed Forces or for war purposes.

**M.3. MISSING SERVICE PERSONNEL.**

Advertisements and other notices concerning missing service personnel must not give their exact unit identity. The Arm of the Service to which a Service man belongs may be given only in general terms, such as Infantry, Engineers, Ordnance, &c. It is permissible to quote the missing man's army number, rank and name.

**M.4. METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT.**

No reference may be made to the introduction or possible introduction in the South-west Pacific Area of the system of Radio sonde or any similar system for obtaining meteorological information.

**M.5. MINING AND MINERALS.**

1. Except for official releases by the Commonwealth Statistician or unless permitted by Censorship, there may not be published concerning any mineral in relation to any Australian Territory any statistics of—

- (a) Exports and imports ;
- (b) Production during the preceding twelve months or any part thereof ;
- (c) Quantities transported or delivered during such period ;
- (d) Estimates of future production ;
- (e) Stocks ;
- (f) Labour engaged or other data from which degree of change in production may be deduced.

2. No discoveries of new deposits or developments of new sources of supply may be mentioned without Censorship consent.

3. Publication of periodical production of individual mines may be submitted to Censorship and will be passed if special reasons are shown. Such figures may not be combined, however, and published as totals of State or Commonwealth production.

4. This Direction does not apply to gold or coal, except that it is not permissible to publish statistics of exports or imports of these minerals during the preceding twelve months or part thereof.

### N.1. NAVAL INFORMATION.

1. There is no restriction on the publication of overseas reports of Naval actions, or reports of the dispositions of ships which have already been passed by the Censorship Authorities in the United Kingdom or other British Dominions, or in Allied countries.

2. In general, photographs of types of ships mentioned in copy passed for publication are allowed, providing such photographs do not reveal details of their construction or armament. All new photographs of ships must, however, be submitted to Censorship. Photographs incorporated in "Jane's Fighting Ships", may be taken as a guide of the types of photographs which are permissible.

3. Except for official releases, publication of the following matters is prohibited :—

- (a) Any reference, direct or indirect, to the location, disposition, or projected movements of—  
 Allied Naval vessels of any description ;  
 Hospital ships. (See H.1) ;  
 British, Allied, or Neutral merchant ships (including coastal vessels and oil tankers) ;  
 Enemy Naval vessels of any description ;  
 Enemy merchant ships ;
- (b) Reports of concentrations of war or merchant vessels in a specified locality ;
- (c) The movements of Naval personnel or the appointments of Naval officers ;
- (d) Security measures taken to exercise surveillance over potential enemy vessels, or to restrain prospective enemy persons ;
- (e) Any information regarding Naval munitions, materials, establishments, technical apparatus or equipment, the arming or fitting out of vessels, or the construction or erection of Naval buildings and dockyards, including graving and floating docks ;
- (f) Reports of, or survivors' stories of, encounters between merchant vessels and enemy raiders, submarines or aircraft ;
- (g) Loss of or damage to war vessels or merchant ships, whether as the result of enemy action or accident ;
- (h) Information about Naval convoys and escorts or about Transports associated with the conveyance of Australian, New Zealand or Allied troops proceeding to or from Australia, or operating anywhere within the South-west Pacific Area ;
- (i) Any reference to official sailing directions or orders referring to trade routes which have been issued by the Admiralty or the Navy Office.

### O.1. OFFICIALS TRAVELLING ABROAD .

Except as officially released, there may be no reference to the actual or probable date of departure, route, means of transport, or progress of any Minister or Government Official travelling to America or elsewhere overseas until after his arrival.

**P.1. PARLIAMENT—SECRET SESSION.**

No reference to proceedings at Secret Sessions of Parliament.

**P.2. PETROL.**

No disclosure permitted regarding petrol stocks in Australia.

**P.3. PHOTOGRAPHS AND FILMS.**

Overseas photographs and films and all other photographs of which editors are doubtful, must be submitted, with their captions and headings, to Censorship. Newspapers in States other than New South Wales may publish without submission to Censorship pictures received by them from the United States Office of War Information.

**P.4. POWER, LIGHT, ETC., FAILURE OF.**

Reports of failure of supplies of electric power, light, gas, or water must be submitted to Censorship.

**P.5. PRISONERS OF WAR.**

1. Except with Censorship's consent, there may be no reference to—
  - (a) The actual or contemplated employment of prisoners of war in connexion with any Service work or other project in Australia ;
  - (b) Alleged measures taken against enemy prisoners, or any reference to or photographs of enemy persons the effect of which might be to provoke reprisals against our own personnel in enemy hands ;
  - (c) The capture or interrogation of or other particulars concerning enemy prisoners-of-war, without the consent of General Head-quarters. This prohibition includes statements made by them, their names, units or other intelligence derived from them, or any mention of captured enemy documents or letters, diaries, photographs, &c., found in their possession ;
  - (d) Persons engaged in interrogating enemy prisoners-of-war, or in translating captured enemy documents. *In no circumstances must it be disclosed that American-born Japanese (NISEI) are engaged on this work. No reference may be made to NISEI in service in this area ;*
  - (e) Mutinies, escapes or other happenings at prisoner of war camps, or to escaped prisoners, except for Ministerial statements.
  
2. No photographs may be published—
  - (a) Of prisoners of war inside the confines of a prisoner-of-war camp, or while engaged outside as members of a working party ;
  - (b) Of Japanese prisoners-of-war unless approved by General Head-quarters.
  
3. Members of the public may not be invited to correspond with named Australian prisoners-of-war in enemy countries. " Pen " friendships are prohibited.
  
4. No reference is permissible to broadcasts by, or concerning, Australian prisoners-of-war from Batavia or other enemy controlled broadcasting station.
  
5. Without the consent of Censorship, there may be no reference to Australian or Allied Service personnel or to civilians taken prisoner, or allegedly taken prisoner, by the enemy.
  
6. No reference is permitted to any actual or contemplated exchange of prisoners of war or any movement of prisoners for such purpose unless officially announced in Australia or cabled from overseas.

### P.6. PRISONERS' LETTERS.

Letters or extracts from letters, written by Australian or Allied prisoners-of-war in enemy hands, may be published only after submission to Censorship.

### P.7. "PEN FRIEND" CORRESPONDENCE.

Nothing may be published or broadcast inviting readers or listeners to engage in "Pen Friend" correspondence. This includes advertisements and invitations in letters to or from members of the armed forces or prisoners-of-war, and it applies to correspondence both within Australia and overseas.

### P.8. PORTS AND WHARVES.

All references to wharf or other port facilities, built, being built or contemplated, to navigational conditions in any port in Australia, to the expansion of or alteration to such wharves or other facilities, or to work in connexion with the navigational conditions of any port, must be submitted to Censorship.

### R.1. RADIO LOCATION.

(a) Publication is prohibited of any material dealing with Radio Location unless first endorsed by Censorship. Official recruiting announcements are excepted. The exact location of air observers' posts may not be disclosed.

(b) There may be no reference of any kind to RADAR, a method of radio location of aeroplanes. Use of the term Radar is strictly forbidden.

### R.2. RATIONING OR SHORTAGES.

There may be no unauthorized reference to—

(a) Shortages or possible shortages of essential, non-perishable, and hoardable foodstuffs, clothing, household goods, or other commodities;

(b) The fact that any particular non-perishable article or commodity is about to be rationed.

Reference is permissible to shortages of non-essential articles such as sports clothes, but there must be no reference to shortages of essential articles which might incite panic buying. Shortages in remote areas, due to faulty distribution, may be mentioned, as may be shortages of perishable goods; but there must be no hint of an expected shorter supply of an item already rationed and which can be hoarded, such as tea, cotton, &c.

### R.3. ROADS OF STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE.

(a) References to the use of roads for Military purposes must be in very general terms. They must not disclose, directly or by inference, the movement of troops or supplies in any specified period or area.

(b) Articles, news items or photographs concerning roads of strategic importance must not refer to the carrying capacity or state of repair of any road; to the construction or state of repair of bridges, detours or by-passes; or to permanent or temporary weaknesses or deficiencies or to measures to remedy them.

(c) New military roads must not be mentioned, unless and until their completion has been officially announced. All publicity material must then be submitted to Censorship before publication.

**RAILWAYS AND ROLLING STOCK.**

*See T.1. Transport.*

**STATISTICS.**

*See I.1. (Imports and Exports), M. 5 (Mining and Minerals), and W.3 (Wool Stocks and Shipments).*

**SHIPPING.**

*See N.1. (Naval Information).*

**S.1. SABOTAGE.**

Except for official statements, no reference is allowed without Censorship endorsement to reports of actual or alleged or attempted sabotage, malicious damage or other similar offences in any Defence undertaking, public building or utility.

**S.2. SHIPBUILDING AND LAUNCHINGS.**

- (a) Only general references are permitted to the building or launching in Australia of naval or merchant vessels. All shipbuilding items and photographs must be submitted to Censorship.
- (b) Subject to the consent of Censorship, a ship's name, type, and tonnage may be given.
- (c) There must be no reference to the following, except in official releases:—
  - (i) The number of ships of any specified type launched or contemplated, or any other specific details of our shipbuilding programme;
  - (ii) The armament or speed of any naval vessel;
  - (iii) The speed of any merchant vessel or the trade for which it is intended or is being used;
  - (iv) The construction of lighters, barges or other types of small craft;
  - (v) The expansion or number of slipways at a particular yard, or new slipways, docks, or other facilities either built, being built or contemplated, for repairs to or maintenance of shipping in Australia, or to the expansion of such places already operating in Australia;
- (d) Mention of the place where ships are being built must be no more specific than, e.g., "a New South Wales dockyard".

**S.3. STRIKES.**

(a) Press references to any particular strike or threatened strike or to absenteeism anywhere in Australia must be restricted to factual news, and to statements issued for publication under the name of an official representative of either party to the dispute, or by a Minister. Anonymous partisan statements or reports are not allowed. Nothing may be published that is calculated to provoke or aggravate an industrial dispute, or delay the settlement of a dispute or hinder negotiations for a settlement.

(b) As a general rule "spot" news of strikes in shipping, munitions and coal industries should not be broadcast or cabled overseas. Factual, considered, objective and sober reviews of the industrial position may be broadcast or cabled after Censorship scrutiny and endorsement.



#### S.4. SUNSPOTS.

No broadcasting is permitted of statements or forecasts relating to the effect of ionospheric activity (sunspots) on radio communications or to research connected therewith. Speculation as to forthcoming ionospheric disturbances or research thereon is forbidden, but references to past phenomena (e.g., Aurora Australis) may be published after reference to Censorship, provided no mention is made of any interference with communications.

#### S.5. STOCK MOVEMENTS.

References to plans for moving or movements of stock from Coastal areas must not mention probable or actual routes or destination, or disclose figures or other details likely to encourage an enemy attack in any particular locality.

#### S.6. SECURITY SERVICE.

Press references to Security Service must be restricted to statements issued for publication by the responsible Minister under his own name. There must be no amplification of such statements, and no broadcasting without Censorship's consent. The activities of Commonwealth Security Police or other Security Service Officers may not be mentioned without official sanction.

#### S.7. SERVICE PERSONNEL—PUBLIC STATEMENTS.

By decision of the War Cabinet, made on the recommendation of the Advisory War Council :

“ Members of the Services are not to make statements in the Press, in public speeches or in broadcasts.”

The following restrictions therefore apply :—

- (a) Excepting official statements, no publication or broadcasting is permissible of any statements by any member of any fighting service which expresses any opinion regarding military policy, strategy, or leadership, or which discloses any other matter affecting Australian or Allied forces. This applies to all service personnel, irrespective of unit or rank, and whether or not their identity is disclosed ;
- (b) The publication of statements by, interviews with, or letters from, members of the fighting forces giving personal experiences is permissible, but only after submission to Censorship.

#### T.1. TRANSPORT.

There must be no reference without Censorship's consent to—

- (a) Congestion at any railway centre, port, wharf or warehouse area ;
- (b) Disorganization of road, rail, sea or air transport ;
- (c) Damage to any permanent way, bridge or other part of the transport system ;
- (d) The fact that traffic is unusually heavy on any strategic line or road and no figures or other information must be used which might indicate the amount of traffic for war purposes passing at any time over any road or railway ;
- (e) The purchase, construction, disposal, quantity, shortage, depreciation or condition of locomotives or rolling stock of any Australian railway ;
- (f) The condition, construction, proposed construction, or other information relating to strategic railway lines, bridges or strategic roads.

## TANKS.

See M.1. (Munitions)—Paragraph 3.

### W.1. WEATHER NEWS.

(a) *Forecasts.*—No weather forecast, or anything from which the prevailing state of the weather in a particular area may be inferred, may be published.

(b) *Floods.*—Press reports regarding floods, anticipated or in progress, must be limited to necessary warnings that specified localities are in imminent danger, and such warnings must be submitted to Censorship. Articles describing conditions in particular areas affected by floods, and giving details of damage to local facilities in particular localities affected by flood waters, must not be published until Censorship consent has been obtained.

(c) *Rainfall.*—Press items must be limited to the fact that rain has fallen during the previous week in areas where its value is significant to the public and to primary producers. Particulars of precise amounts of rainfall must be confined to the permissible weekly figures issued by the weather bureau.

(d) *Dust Storms, Cloud Bursts, Cyclones, Heat Waves, Unusually Cold Weather or other Special Weather Phenomena.*—Particulars of these must not be published until 48 hours after the time of occurrence. This especially applies to descriptive articles disclosing the area of the disturbance or its effects.

(e) *Temperatures.*—These may be published 24 hours after the time of observation.

(f) *Conditions of Pastures—Stock and Crops—Market Reports, &c.*—Publication of information of this kind is permissible, except in areas of immediate strategic importance.

(g) *Photographs.*—Photographs that disclose information of probable military value, or show instances of drought, storm, flood or other damage caused by weather or other disturbances in specific areas must be submitted to Censorship.

(h) *Broadcasts.*—Broadcasts of meteorological information or other information mentioned in this Direction, including forecasts of weather, are forbidden except for river heights and weekly rainfall figures released by weather bureaus, and, with Censorship permission, approved flood and bush fire warnings.

### W.2. WATER STORAGE.

Except with Censorship's consent, no information may be published regarding the state of water storage in particular localities or restricted areas, or concerning the construction or condition of water storage works.

### W.3. WOOL STOCKS AND SHIPMENTS.

Except for official releases by the Central Wool Committee, no figures must be published relating to the shipment of wool overseas or to stocks of Australian wool held in Australia or elsewhere, nor may any unofficial indication be given of the probable destination of wool shipments from Australia.

### W.4. WAR CORRESPONDENTS.

No reference may be made to any war correspondent having engaged in combatant activity in the South-west Pacific Area.

### W.5. WHYALLA PIPELINE.

Unless officially disclosed and passed by Censorship no further publicity may be given to the Whyalla pipeline.

# APPENDIX SIX

- Comparisons between ML ms and Pms

## APPENDIX SIX

These details were recorded during two brief examinations of P ms, which is privately owned. Due to limited time available for accessing this typescript, page numbers have not been recorded. It can be seen that handwritten amendments to ML ms were incorporated in P ms, and that small errors in ML ms have often been corrected on P ms. The details are given here collectively, though not exhaustively, because they demonstrate that P ms was created using ML ms as a guide, and that neither of the published editions (*TT* and *TTT*) were used as copytexts. It can also be seen that passages that were cut by the censor, as well as passages that were probably removed for editorial reasons, have been reinstated in P ms. The comparisons between P ms and *TTT* reveal that some minor copy-editing has taken place as the typist was typing; all of the amendments cited in this section are typed and not handwritten.

Comparisons between ML ms and P ms:

a. The 'Aubade' and 'Morning' Sections<sup>1</sup>

1. ML ms p.2, l.6: features handwritten hyphens and a comma. These punctuation changes are upheld on P ms p.3.
2. ML ms p.3, l.12: features a handwritten change from "which" to "that". Change upheld P ms p.6.
3. ML ms p.4, l.5: reads, "much better the 10th Commune." On P ms p.7, a handwritten "than" has been inserted between "better" and "the". ML ms p.4, l.13: reads, "not make terms thrust out." On P ms p.8, a handwritten "were" has been inserted between "terms" and "thrust".
4. ML ms p.5, l.3: "before" has been changed to a handwritten "earlier". Change upheld P ms p.9.
5. ML ms p.5, l.9-13: All handwriting incorporated P ms p.10.
6. ML ms p.7, l.3: "He" has been changed to a handwritten "Knarf". Change upheld P ms p.14.
7. ML ms p.14A, l.10: "suddenly" crossed out by hand. Change upheld P ms p.30.
8. ML ms p.15, l.16: "just" has been changed to a handwritten "first". Change upheld P ms p.33.
9. ML ms p.17, l.5: "guarding" has been changed in handwriting to "It guarded". Change upheld P ms p.36.

---

<sup>1</sup> As covered in Chapter Five (see footnote 12 on p.210), it is necessary to make distinctions between the 'Aubade'; 'Morning'; 'Symposium'; 'Afternoon' and the 'Nocturne' sections of the ML ms. This is because the page numbering is not continuous. 'Aubade', 'Morning', 'Symposium' are numbered from 1 to 316. 'Afternoon' is numbered from 1 to 276, with two un-numbered pages at the end. In addition, because of the page reshuffling, there are two lots of pages with the numbers 190, 191 and 192. 'Aubade' is numbered from 1 to 34. In the P ms, the numbering is continuous.

10. ML ms p.17, l.10: "them" has been crossed out by hand and replaced by the handwritten "the stone men". Change upheld P ms p.36.

11. ML ms p.205, ll.22-4: "Like the man who spent years learning to bend backwards and put his head between his legs just so he could piss in his own face." Incorporated P ms p.941. Omitted *TT* and *TTT*, p.152. ML ms, p.206, l.1: "There was fucking but not love. Fucking wasn't enough." Incorporated P ms p.941.

12. ML ms p.280, l.7: three pages missing that appear in *TT* and *TTT* p.204, l.10 - p.206, l.11. These pages are also missing in P ms.

b. The 'Afternoon' Section

13. ML ms p.111, ll.21-27: "It seemed as if . . . inevitable as the spring." Crossed out diagonally in black ink. Appears in full and unmarked in P ms pp.892-3, except that last line has been changed to "accepted as inevitably" in blue biro, Barnard's hand.

14. ML ms p.187, l.14: "were still extant" erased, "had braved the streets" added in Barnard's hand. Change upheld P ms p.1049.

12. ML ms p.126, l.20: "asked" has been changed in handwriting to "said". Change upheld P ms pp.918-9. ML ms p.126, ll.21-25: "Do you know . . . diabolio" erased in black pen. P ms p.919 intact and unmarked.

13. ML ms p.139: Two handwritten lines are inserted at the top of the page: "It wasn't real, they didn't believe it, they thought it was another stunt. They were angry and tried to push it away." Insertion incorporated P ms p.941.

14. ML ms p.142, ll.6-7: "It was a nightmare of ordered efficiency" crossed out. Omitted in P ms p.948. Also omitted *TT* p.329 and *TTT* p.326.

15. ML ms p.190A, l.24: "Japanese". On P ms p.931, word appears as "Jap".

16. ML ms p.192 [was 135], ll.12-19: All changes incorporated P ms p.934.

17. ML ms, p.191, after first line: Separation marks have been added. Incorporated P ms p.1049.

18. ML ms p.192, l.19: "Peace was now inevitable" erased in blue ink. Incorporated P ms p.1052 as "Peace was ~~new~~ inevitable."

19. ML ms p.193, l.1: "propaganda" inserted in what is probably the censor's handwriting.<sup>2</sup> Change upheld P ms p.1053.

20. ML ms p.197, l.5: "was only a reinforcement". Corrected P ms p.1061: "was only a reinforcement". "Were" is given as a handwritten correction in Barnard's hand.

21. ML ms p.199, l.16: "knowing it now as nothing but a spectacle," handwritten insertion after "along them,". Change upheld P ms p.1066.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter Five, p.244.

22. ML ms pp.207-9: All crossings-out and deletions restored, P ms pp.1082-8.

23. ML ms p.212, l.10: "The censor in a panic shut down on it." Erased in red ink, restored P ms p.1092.

24. ML ms p.226, ll.10-11: "No dirty Jap or Bolshie . . . own hands" Erased in red ink, restored P ms p.1118.

Comparisons between P ms and *TTT* (1983 Virago edition of *Tomorrow*):

a. The 'Aubade' and 'Morning' Sections<sup>3</sup>

1. *TTT* p.3, l.5: "was visible". Appears as: "was just visible" P ms p.1.

2. *TTT* p.3, l.20: "new wonder". Appears as: "a new wonder" P ms p.2.

3. *TTT* p.5, l.18: "Tenth Commune;" Appears as: "Tenth Commune." P ms p.4.

4. *TTT* p.5, l.22: "written in the dust,". Appears as: "written in the dust;" P ms p.8.

b. The 'Afternoon' Section

5. *TTT* p.320, l.21: "it was his eye". Appears as: "it was his eyes" P ms p.929.  
*TTT* p.320, l.22: "was suspicious". Appears as: "were suspicious" P ms p.929.  
*TTT* p. 320, l.26: "the crew". Appears as: "her crew" P ms p.930, ML ms p.190A, l.13.

6. *TTT* p.357, l.24: "But love, sacred nor profane." Appears as: "But love, neither sacred nor profane." P ms p.1040. *TTT* p.357, l.28: " internal turmoil."<sup>4</sup> Appears as: "internal unrest" P ms p.1040, ML ms p.186, l.13.

7. *TTT* p.358, l.20: "fantastic fickle". Appears as: "fantastic and fickle" P ms p.1042, ML ms p.187, l.18. *TTT* p.358, l.35: "celebration". Appears as "celebrations" P ms p.1043, ML ms p.188, l.6, *TT* p.365, l.20-21.

8. *TTT* p.360, l.39: "Thing as they used to be". Appears as: "Things" etc. P ms p.1050, ML ms p.191, l.14.

9. *TTT* p.361, l.30-1: "The powers were now jockeying". Appears as: "Peace was ~~now~~ inevitable but the powers were now jockeying" P ms p.1052. ML ms p.192, l.19: "Peace was now inevitable but" crossed out and amended to "The powers were now jockeying" etc.

---

<sup>3</sup> As discussed in Chapter Five, p.218, the 'Aubade' and 'Morning' sections of *TT* and *TTT* are the same, because this section of *TTT* is a photo-offset of *TT*.

<sup>4</sup> The phrase also appears as "internal turmoil" *TT* p.363, l.26 despite the fact that this section of *TTT* has been reset using ML ms as a guide.

# Primary Sources

## Primary Texts (unpublished):

Mitchell Library typescript of Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow, two volumes, *circa* 1945.  
ML MS 451 CY 2485.

Uncatalogued typescript of Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow, three bound volumes, *circa* 1956. Privately owned.

## Manuscript Collections:

Papers of Marjorie Barnard. Mitchell Library, Sydney. ML MSS 451, 2809, 4869.

Uncollected Papers of Marjorie Barnard. Privately owned.

Papers of Flora Eldershaw. Mitchell Library, Sydney. ML MSS 5601.

Papers of Eleanor Dark. National Library, Canberra. NLA MSS 4998.

Papers of Miles Franklin. Mitchell Library, Sydney. ML MSS 364.

Papers of Drusilla Modjeska. National Library, Canberra. NLA MSS 8320.

Papers of Benjamin W. Huebsch. Library of Congress, Washington. MSS 50013.

The Palmer papers, National Library, Canberra. NLA MSS 1174.

Meanjin Archives, Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne.

Consolidated Censorship Directions 1943, National Archives of Australia. AA B5661/1,item 1942/4083.

## Unpublished Work by Marjorie Barnard:

'The Case for the Future', 1940. Marjorie Barnard's Uncollected Papers. Privately Owned.

'The Gulf Stream' (novel). Marjorie Barnard's Papers, ML MSS 451 (carbon). Marjorie Barnard's Uncollected Papers (original). Privately Owned.

## Primary Texts (published):

Eldershaw, M. Barnard. Tomorrow and Tomorrow. Melbourne: Georgian House, 1947.

----- Tomorrow and Tomorrow. London: Phoenix House, 1948.

----- Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow. Introd. Anne Chisholm. London. Virago Press, 1983.

----- Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow. Introd. Anne Chisholm. New York: Dial Press, 1983.

## Published extracts of Tomorrow and Tomorrow:

Australasian Book News and Literary Journal 2.5. November 1947: 231-234.

'An Ancient Continent' (from Aubade). Australian Heritage. Ed. Clem Christes Melbourne: Longmans, Green, 1949: 211-226.

'Aubade'. Australian Science Fiction. Ed. and Introd. Van Ikin. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1982: 146-154.

'Aubade'. She's Fantastical. Ed. Lucy Sussex, Judith Raphael Buckrich. Melbourne: Sybylla Feminist Press, 1995: 77-91.

**Other published works by M. Barnard Eldershaw:**

A House Is Built. London: Harrap, 1929.

Green Memory. London: Harrap, 1931.

The Glasshouse. London: Harrap, 1936.

Plaque With Laurel. London: Harrap, 1937.

Phillip of Australia: An Account of the Settlement of Sydney Cove 1788-92. London: Harrap, 1938.

Essays in Australian Fiction. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1938.

The Life and Times of Captain John Piper. Sydney: Limited Editions Society, 1939.

'Liberty and Violence', 1939. Plaque With Laurel, Essays Reviews & Correspondence. Ed. and Introd. Maryanne Dever. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1995: 251-7.

My Australia. London: Jarrolds, 1939; Rev Ed. 1951.

Plaque With Laurel: Essays, Reviews & Correspondence. Ed. and Introd. Maryanne Dever. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1995.

But Not For Love: Stories of Marjorie Barnard and M. Barnard Eldershaw. Ed. and Introd. Robert Darby. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1988.

**Published Work Edited by Flora Eldershaw:**

Australian Writers Annual. Sydney: Fellowship of Australian Writers, 1936.

The Peaceful Army: A Memorial to the Pioneer Women of Australia. Sydney: Australia's 150th Anniversary Celebrations Council, Women's Executive Committee and Advisory Council, 1938. Second Edition, Ed. and Introd. Dale Spender, Ringwood: Penguin, 1988: xi.

**Published History, Fiction and Criticism by Marjorie Barnard:**

The Ivory Gate. Melbourne: Champion, 1920.

Macquarie's World. B. Waite for Australian Limited Editions Society, 1941.

'Our Literature'. Australian Writers Speak. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1943: 97-105.

The Persimmon Tree and Other Stories. Sydney: Clarendon Publishing, 1947. Rev. ed. London: Virago Press, 1985.

'The Four Novels of Patrick White'. Meanjin 15.2. Winter 1956: 156-170.



A History of Australia. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1962; Rev. ed. 1963

Miles Franklin. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967.

'How 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow' Came To Be Written'. Meanjin 3. Spring 1970: 328-30.

'The Gentle Art of Collaboration'. Ink No. 2. Sydney: Society of Women Writers, 1977: 126-8.

Miles Franklin: The Story of a Famous Australian. Introd. Jill Roe. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1988.

## Secondary Sources

### Theses:

Albinski, Nan Bowman. 'The Well-Ordered Paradise: Utopian Fiction By British, American and Australian Women.' Ph.D Thesis. Monash University, N.S.W. 1985. (Published without Australian section as Women's Utopias In British and American Fiction. London: Routledge, 1988).

Darby, Robert. 'While Freedom Lives: Political Preoccupations in the Writing of Marjorie Barnard and Frank Dalby Davison, 1935-1947'. Ph.D. thesis. Australian Defence Force Academy, NSW, 1980.

Dever, Maryanne. 'Subject to Authority: A Study of M. Barnard Eldershaw'. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Sydney, 1993.

Molloy, Bruce. 'Some Political Aspects of the Australian Novel, 1930-59'. MA Thesis. University of Queensland, 1974.

### Sources Relating Specifically to Marjorie Barnard, Flora Eldershaw, M.Barnard Eldershaw and Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow:

Bennett, Bruce. 'Local Loyalties and Modernist Impulses: 1930-1950'. Australian Short Fiction: A History. Bruce Bennett. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2002: 101-144.

Buckridge, Patrick. "'Greatness" and Australian Literature in the 1930s and 1940s: Novels by Dark and Barnard Eldershaw'. Australian Literary Studies 17.1. May 1995: 29-37.

-----, 'Intellectual Authority and Critical Traditions in Australian Literature.' 1945-1975. Intellectual Movement and Australian Society. Ed. James Walter and Brian Head. Melbourne: Oxford University Press. 1988: 188-213.

Burns, Robert. 'Flux and Fixity: M. Barnard Eldershaw's Tomorrow & Tomorrow.' Meanjin 29. 1970: 320-27.

- Cadzow, Jane. 'The World of Literature Catches Up With Tomorrow'. Weekend Australian. 19-20 November, 1983: 6.
- Carter, David. 'Documenting and Criticising Society.' Penguin New Literary History of Australia. Eds. Bruce Bennett and Laurie Hergenhan. Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1988: 370-389.
- . "Current History Looks Apocalyptic": Barnard Eldershaw, Utopia and the Literary Intellectual, 1930s-1940s.' Australian Literary Studies 14.2, 1989: 174-87.
- Davison, Frank Dalby. 'Tomorrow and Tomorrow'. Meanjin 6.1. Summer 1947: 249-50.
- Darby, Robert. 'An Unfinished and Unpublished Story By Marjorie Barnard: Textual Note.' Notes & Furphies. No.21, 1988: 2-6.
- . 'Censored. . . and again. . . and again: Marjorie Barnard's Struggle to Publish Pacifist Arguments, 1939 '47'. Unpublished paper for The History of the Book in Australia Conference. RMIT. 21-22 November, 1997.
- . 'Reflective Imagery in the Fiction of M. Barnard Eldershaw'. Southerly 61.3. 2001: 146-159.
- . 'Dampening the Incendiary Ardour: The Roots of Marjorie Barnard's 'Dry Spell'.' Quadrant 46.6. June 2002: 62-8.
- Dever, Maryanne. 'The Case for Flora Eldershaw'. Hecate 15. 2. 1989: 38-48.
- . "No time is Opportune for a Protest": Aspects of the Political Activities of Marjorie Barnard and Flora Eldershaw'. Hecate 17.2. 1991: 9-21.
- . "'Conventional Women of Ability": M. Barnard Eldershaw and the Question of Women's Cultural Authority.' Wallflowers and Witches: Women and Culture in Australia 1910-1945. Ed. Maryanne Dever. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994: 133-146.
- . "'No Mine and Thine But Ours': Finding 'M. Barnard Eldershaw'.' Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature 14.1. Spring 1995: 65-75.
- Dutton, Geoffrey. 'Out of Print: Prominent Australians Name the Australian books They Would Like To See Republished'. The Bulletin. 13 October, 1981: 92.
- Green, H.M. 'Australian Literature 1947.' Southerly 9.4. 1948: 58-9.
- . 'The Novel'. A History of Australian Literature, Vol II 1923-1950. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1961: 1096-1104.
- H.J.H. 'Facets of Freedom'. Australian Observer. 18 October, 1947: 208.
- J.C.H. 'Symbolic Fallacy'. Bulletin. 16 June 1954: 2.
- Jefferis, Barbara. 'The Censorship of Yesterday Hid A Great Tomorrow'. Weekend Australian. 10-11 September 1983: 14.
- Jordan, Deborah. 'Nettie Palmer As Critic'. Gender, Politics and Fiction: Twentieth Century Australian Women's Novels. Ed. Carole Ferrier. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1985: 59-84.

- Joseph, Beate. 'Utopia, Dystopia and Then Australia'. Centre for Research in the New Literatures in English Reviews Journal. December, 1984: 59-63.
- Kelly, Sharon Brett. 'New Publication on 88th Birthday: Double Honour for Celebrated Coast Author.' Gosford Star. 4 September 1985: page number unknown.
- Mair, Ian. 'MBE's Tomorrow and Tomorrow'. Fellowship. April 1948: page number unknown.
- Mant, Gilbert. 'What Shall Tomorrow Be?'. Australasian Book News and Library Journal 2.5. November 1947: 227-228.
- McQueen, Humphrey. 'Memory and Imagination'. Social Alternatives 8.3. 1989: 20-22.
- '. Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow'. Island Magazine 32. Spring 1987: 3-12.
- Miller, John Donald Bruce. 'A Footnote on Tomorrow'. Meanjin 7.2. 1948: 125-7.
- Modjeska, Drusilla. 'Review of Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow'. For 'Books and Writing', Australian Broadcasting Commission. Broadcast 14 September 1983.
- O'Leary, Shaun. 'Fall Of The City Of Sydney', Sydney Morning Herald, 13 September, 1947: 13.
- Partridge, P.H. 'The Shape of Things to Come'. Meanjin 6.4. Summer, 1947: 251-2.
- Palmer, Aileen. Unpublished review of Tomorrow and Tomorrow. Marjorie Barnard's papers. ML MSS 2809.
- Palmer, Nettie. 'Our Author's Page: Flora Eldershaw.' Walkabout. 1 October 1950.
- Palmer, Nettie. 'Council of Adult Education. Discussion Group Book Notes. 1952, NLA MS 1174/25/86.
- Roderick, Colin. 'This Battered Caravanserai'. Southerly 9.4. 1948: 222-4.
- Roe, Jill. 'The Historical Imagination and Its Enemies: M. Barnard Eldershaw's Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow'. Meanjin 43.2. June, 1984: 241-52.
- Rorabacher, Louise E. Marjorie Barnard and M. Barnard Eldershaw. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973.
- Rousseau, Yvonne. 'Classical View of Wartime'. The Age Saturday Extra. 27 August 1983: 10.
- Saunders, Ian. 'The Texts of Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow: Author, Agent, History'. In Southern Review: Literary and Interdisciplinary Essays 26.2. July 1993: 239-261.
- '. 'The Most Difficult Love': Expectation and Gender in Barnard Eldershaw's Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow'. In Constructing Gender: Feminism in Literary Studies. ed. Hilary Fraser and R.S. White. Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press. 1994: 199-221.
- Spender, Dale. 'Nettie's Network'. Writing A New World: Two Centuries of Australian Women Writers. Dale Spender. London: Pandora Press, 1988: 261-265.
- Steele, Colin. 'Prophetic Classic Restored'. Canberra Times. 22 October 1983: 16.
- Sullivan, W.G. 'Humanism and Some Recent Australian Writing'. Melbourne University Magazine. 1948: 36-42.
- Unknown author. 'Fish and Chips'. Bulletin. 15 October, 1947: 2.

Unknown author. Review of Tomorrow and Tomorrow (English edition). Sunday Times (London). February 27, 1949.

Unknown author. 'Past Imperfect'. Times Literary Supplement, 12 March 1949: 165.

Unknown author. 'Hail Tomorrow'. Southerly, 11.1.1950: 58.

#### **Interviews with Marjorie Barnard:**

Elizabeth Riddell. 'Interview with Marjorie Barnard' (film). 17 April 1975. Prod. and Dir. Keith Salvat, Keisal Films.

Baker, Candida. 'Interview with Marjorie Barnard'. Yacker 2: Australian Writers Talk About Their Work. Pan Books: Sydney, 1987: 39: 28-41.

Bosi, Cossetta. 'Writer Beats Censor After 40 Year Wait'. Flora Eldershaw's papers. ML MSS 5601.

de Berg, Hazel. 'Conversation with Marjorie Barnard' (sound recording). 12 December 1966.

Brown, Di. 'Feminist Publishing in Australia: Commercial and Cultural Practices.' Overland 153. Summer 1998: 8-13.

Callaghan, Paul. 'Marjorie - the Last of a Select Literary School.'. Publication and date unknown. Barnard's uncollected papers.

Fairbairn, Zoe. 'Interview with Marjorie Barnard, May 1983'. Writing Lives: Conversations Between Women Writers. Ed. Mary Chamberlain. London: Virago, 1988: 37-44.

Giuffre, Giulia. 'Interview With Marjorie Barnard'. A Writing Life: Interviews with Australian Women Writers. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1990: 131-148.

Keesing, Nancy. 'Everything is Not Enough: An Interview With Marjorie Barnard. Overland 67. 1977: 49-53.

McInerney, Sally. 'Recognition for a Writer Who Wanted to Change Things Despite the Censor'. Sydney Morning Herald. 19 November, 1983: 43.

Molloy, Bruce. 'Unpublished Interview With Marjorie Barnard.' 26 July 1973. Appendix to Bruce Molloy, 'Some Political Aspects of the Australian Novel, 1930-59', MA Thesis, University of Queensland, 1974. ML MSS 2809 Add on.

Williamson, Kristin. 'The Remarkable Marjorie Barnard'. National Times. 25 August, 1983. 32.

#### **Obituaries:**

##### **Flora Eldershaw:**

Barnard, Marjorie. 'Tributes to Flora Eldershaw'. Meanjin 15.4. Summer 1956: 391-2.

Fitzhenry, W. E. Bulletin 77.3999. 3 October 1956: 10.

Moore, T. Inglis. 'Tributes to Flora Eldershaw'. Meanjin 15.4 Summer 1956: 392-3.

- Palmer, Aileen. 'In Memory: Flora Eldershaw'. Southerly 17.4. 1956: 234.
- Palmer, Vance. 'Tributes to Flora Eldershaw'. Meanjin 15.4. Summer 1956: 390-1.
- Prichard, Katharine Susannah. 'Tributes to Flora Eldershaw'. Meanjin 15.4. Summer 1956: 393.
- , 'A Unique Collaboration: Tribute to Flora Eldershaw'. Westerly 1. 1957: 35-6.

### **Marjorie Barnard:**

- Phillips, Valmai. 'Obituary - Marjorie Faith Barnard (1898-1987)' Newsletter of the Royal Australian Historical Society & Affiliated Societies XL.4. 1987.
- Usher, Ron. 'Writer and Bird Lover Marjorie Barnard Dies'. Publication and date unknown. Barnard's uncollected papers.
- 'Marjorie Barnard, Much Honoured Novelist and Historian, Dies Aged 89.' Sydney Morning Herald. Saturday, May 9 1987:6.
- Quadrant 31.7. July 1987 :9.
- Womanspeak 5. 1987: 25.
- SGHSOGU (Sydney Girls High School Old Girls Union?) News Sheet 108. September 1987.

## **General References:**

### **Articles:**

- Albinski, Nan Bowman. 'A Survey of Australian Utopian and Dystopian Fiction'. Australian Literary Studies 13.1. May 1987: 15-28.
- , 'Visions of the Nineties'. Journal of Australian Studies 20. May 1987: 12-22.
- Bartlett, Norman. 'Meliorating Modernism: Australia and the Humanist Tradition.' Meanjin Quarterly 33.4. Summer 1974: 350-358.
- Barthes, Roland. 'From Work to Text'. Textual Strategies in Post-Structuralist Criticism. New York: Cornell University Press, 1979: 73-81.
- Benjamin, Walter. 'The Author As Producer.' Address at the Institute for the Study of Fascism. Paris, 27 April 1934. Rpt; Reflections, Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings. Ed. Peter Demetz. New York: Schocken Books, 1986: 220-238.
- Brown, Diane. 'Feminist Publishing: Reinventing a Reading Culture', Australian Women's Book Review. 9.2-3. Spring 1997: 15.
- Buckley, Vincent. 'Utopianism and Vitalism in Australian Literature'. Quadrant 3.2. March, 1959: 39-51.

- Carter, David. 'Modernity and Belatedness in Australian Cultural Discourse.' Southerly. 54.4. Summer 1994-5: 6-18.
- 'Re-Viewing Communism: *Communist Review* (Sydney), 1934-1966: A Checklist of Literary Material.' Australian Literary Studies 12. 1985: 93-105.
- Curthoys, Ann. 'Australian Feminism Since 1970.' Australian Women: Contemporary Feminist Thought. Ed Norma Grieve, Ailsa Burns. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994: 14-28.
- Croft, Julian. 'Responses to Modernism 1915-1965.' Penguin New Literary History of Australia. Eds. Bruce Bennett and Laurie Hergenhan. Ringwood,
- Darby, Robert. 'The Censor as Literary Critic'. Westerly. December 1986: 32.
- Davison, Peter. 'General Introduction To The First Nine Volumes'. The Complete Works of George Orwell. Vol. 1. Ed. Peter Davison. London: Random House, 1998: vii-xxxviii.
- Eco, Umberto. 'Travels In Hyperreality'. In Travels In Hyperreality: Essays. Trans. William Weaver. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 1986: 3-58.
- Fish, Stanley. 'Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics'. New Literary History 2, 1970: 121-161.
- '. 'Is There A Text In This Class?'. The Stanley Fish Reader. Ed. H. Aram Veesser. Massachusetts; Oxford; Blackwell, 1999: 38-54.
- Foucault, Michel. 'What Is An Author?' Trans. Donald F. Bouchard, Sherry Simon. Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. New York: Cornell University Press, 1977: 124-27.
- Higgins, Bertram. 'Mordecaius (to Guido Baracchi)'. Quadrant. Vol. 15, no. 6. November-December 1971: 5-10. (poetry)
- Ikin, Van. 'Dreams, Visions, Utopias'. The Penguin New Literary History of Australia. Eds. Bruce Bennett and Laurie Hergenhan. Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1988: 253-266.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach'. The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett. Wolfgang Iser. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1974: 274-5.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory'. New Literary History 2, 1970: 7-37.
- Jameson, Frederic. 'Progress Versus Utopia; or, Can We Imagine The Future?' In Science Fiction Studies, 27. July 1982: 152.
- Jones, Jackie. 'Publishing Feminist Criticism: Academic Book Publishing and the Construction and Circulation of Feminist Knowledges'. Critical Survey 4.2. 1992: 174-82.

- Keene, Judith. 'Aileen Palmer's Coming of Age'. Crossing Boundaries: Feminisms and the Critique of Knowledges. Ed. Barbara Caine, E.A. Grosz, Marie de Lepervanche, North Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1988: 180-192.
- Knight, Stephen. 'Textual Variants: Textual Variance.' Southern Review 16. 1983: 44-54.
- Kumar, Krishan. 'Science and Utopia; H.G. Wells and A Modern Utopia'. Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1987: 168-223.
- '. 'Science and Anti-Utopia: Aldous Huxley and Brave New World. ibid: 224-287.
- Mailloux, Steven. 'Learning to Read: Interpretation and Reader-Response Criticism'. Studies in the Literary Imagination 12.1. 1979: 93-108.
- Mazzolini, Donatella. 'The City and the Imaginary'. Trans. John Koumantarakis. New Formations: A Journal of Culture/Theory/Politics 11. Summer 1990: 90-103.
- McGann, Jerome. 'What Is Critical Editing?'. TEXT: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship 5. 1991: 15-29.
- Palmer, Vance. 'Battle'. Meanjin 8. 1942: 5-6.
- Pizer, Donald. 'Self-censorship and textual editing'. Textual Criticism and Literary Interpretation. Ed. Jerome J. McGann. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985: 147-161.
- Rabinowitz, Peter. 'Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences.' Critical Inquiry 4. 1977: 121-41.
- Roff, Sue. 'Virago Press Offers Stunning List of Australian Viragos'. Antipodes 1:1 1987: 58-9.
- Ross, Lloyd. 'Literature and Society'. Meanjin 6.4. Summer 1947: 227-30.
- Rouvillois, Frederic. 'Utopia and Totalitarianism'. In Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000: 316-331.
- Sargisson, Lucy. 'Contemporary Feminist Utopianism: Practising Utopia on Utopia'. Literature and the Political Imagination. Eds John Horton, Andrea T. Baumeister. London: Routledge, 1996: 238-55.
- Sartre, John Paul. 'We Write For Our Own Time'. Meanjin 6.4. Summer 1947: 222-6, 272.
- Shaer, Roland. 'Utopia and Twentieth Century Avant-gardes.' In Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000: 278-297.
- Shillingsburg, Peter. 'The Autonomous Author, the Sociology of Texts, and the Polemics of Textual Criticism.' Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory. Ed. Philip Cohen. Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 1991: 22-43.
- Small, Ian. 'The editor as annotator as ideal reader.' The Theory and Practice of Text-Editing: Essays in Honour of James T. Boulton. Ed. Ian Small, Marcus Walsh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991: 186-207.
- Suvin, Darko. 'Defining the Literary Genre of Utopia: Some Historical Semantics, Some Genealogy, a Proposal, and a Plea.' Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics

- and History of a Literary Genre. Darko Suvin. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979: 37-62.
- Smith, Bernard. 'The Fascist Mentality in Australian Art and Criticism'. Communist Review. June 1946: 182.
- Tanselle, George Thomas. 'The Editorial Problem of Final Editorial Intention'. Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing. George Thomas Tanselle. Charlottesville: Published for the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia by the University Press of Virginia, 1990: 28-37.
- Thomson, Helen. 'Australasian Utopias 1880-1900'. Australian Victorian Studies Association Conference Papers. 1982: 30-42.
- Waring, Wendy. 'Publishers, Fiction and Feminism: Riding the Second Wave.' Reader: Essays in Reader Oriented Theory, Criticism and Pedagogy. 1996 Spring-Fall: 35-36, 94-107.
- Wilkinson, Antonia. 'Virago Press and the Alteration of Publishing Culture'. The Culture of Publishing. [www.brookes.ac.uk/schools/apm/publishing/culture](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/schools/apm/publishing/culture).
- Williams, Raymond. 'Utopia and Science Fiction' in Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays. London: Verso Editions and NLB, 1980: 196-212.

**Other Published Works:**

- Anderson, Janet et. al., eds. Art and Reality: John Anderson on Literature and Aesthetics. Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 1982.
- Albinski, Nan Bowman. Women's Utopias In British and American Fiction. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Armstrong, Judith. The Christesen Romance. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1981.
- Bakhtin, M.M. The Dialogic Imagination. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson, Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Baker, A.J. Australian Realism: The Systematic Philosophy of John Anderson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Bammer, Angelika. Partial Visions: Feminism and Utopianism in the 1970s. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Barber, Benjamin R., McGrath, Michael J. Gargas. The Artist and Political Vision. New Jersey: Transaction, 1982.
- Barthes, Roland. The Pleasure of the Text. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc., 1975.
- , S/Z. Trans. R. Miller. Cape: London 1975 (1970).
- , Image-Music-Text. New York: Fontana, 1977.
- Baudrillard, Jean. Trans. Chris Turner. The Illusion of the End. Oxford: Polity Press, 1994.
- , Simulcra and Simulation. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.



- Bellamy, Edward. Looking Backward: 2000 -1887. Boston: Ticknor and Company, 1887.
- Benjamin, Marina. Living at the End of the World . London: Picador, 1988.
- Bennett, Bruce, ed. Cross Currents: Magazines and Newspapers in Australian Literature. Melbourne, Longman Cheshire, 1981.
- Bentley, Mary Moore. A Woman of Mars, or, Australia's Enfranchised Woman. Sydney: Edwards Dunlop, 1901.
- Bernal, John Desmond. The World, the Flesh and the Devil: An Enquiry into the Future of the Three Enemies of the Rational Soul second ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969.
- Bloch Ernst. The Utopian Function of Art and Literature: Selected Essays. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1988.
- . The Principle of Hope, Three Volumes. Trans. Neville Plaice, Stephen Plaice, Paul Knight. Blackwell: London, 1986.
- Borchardt, Dietrich, Wallace Kirsop. The Book in Australia: Essays Towards a Cultural and Social History. Melbourne: Australian Reference Publications, 1988.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. Labyrinths. English translation. London: Penguin Books, 1970.
- Burke, Sean. The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.
- Brady, Veronica. Can These Bones Live?. Sydney: The Federation Press, 1996.
- Brooks, Barbara, Clark, Judith. Eleanor Dark: A Writer's Life. Sydney: Macmillan, 1998.
- Buckridge, Patrick. The Scandalous Penton: A Biography of Brian Penton. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994.
- Cadman, Eileen, Gail Chester and Agnes Pivot. Rolling Our Own: Women as Printers, Publishers and Distributors. London: Minority Press Group, 1981.
- Calvino, Italo. If On Winter's Night A Traveller. English translation. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981.
- Capp, Fiona. Writers Defiled: Security Surveillance of Australian Authors and Intellectuals 1920-1960. Ringwood: McPhee Gribble, 1993.
- Carey, John, ed. The Faber Book of Utopias. London: Faber and Faber, 1999.
- Cohen, Philip, ed. Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory. Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 1991.
- Coleman, Peter. Obscenity, Blasphemy, Sediton: The Rise and Fall of Literary Censorship in Australia. Sydney: Duffy and Snellgrove, 2000; rpt. 1962.
- Collins, Paul, ed. The MUP Encyclopaedia of Australian Science Fiction and Fantasy. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1998.
- Connor, Steven. Theory and Cultural Value. Oxford, UK: Cambridge, USA: Blackwell, 1992.

- Cusack, Dymphna. Jungfrau. Introd. Florence James. Ringwood: Penguin, 1989; rpt. The Bulletin, 1936.
- Daniel, Helen, ed. Millennium: Time Pieces by Australian Writers. Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1991.
- Dark, Eleanor. Prelude to Christopher. Adelaide: Rigby, 1934.
- The Little Company. Introd. Drusilla Modjeska. London: Virago, 1986; rpt. Sydney: Collins: 1945.
- Davis, Lennard J. Resisting Novels: Ideology and Fiction. London: Methuen, 1987.
- de Man, Paul. Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Dever, Maryanne, ed. Wallflowers and Witches: Women and Culture in Australia 1910-1945. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1994.
- Docker, John. Australian Cultural Elites: Intellectual Traditions in Sydney and Melbourne. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1974.
- The Nervous Nineties: Australian Cultural Life in the 1890s. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Dunmore, John, Utopias and Imaginary Voyages to Australasia: A Lecture Delivered at the National Library of Australia, 2 September 1987. Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1988.
- Dutton, Geoffrey. Snow on the Saltbush: The Australian Literary Experience. Ringwood, Viking, 1984.
- Ede, Lisa, Andrea Lunsford. Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990.
- Eggert, Paul, ed. Editing in Australia. Canberra: English Dept, University College ADFA, 1990. Occasional Paper No. 17. Distributed by NSW University Press, Kensington. Revised versions of papers given at a conference at University College in April, 1989.
- Engels, Frederick. Socialism: Utopian and Scientific (eighth impression). Trans. Edward Aveling. London: Allen & Unwin, 1936.
- Ferrier, Carole, ed. Gender, Politics and Fiction: Twentieth Century Australian Women's Novels. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1985.
- ed. As Good As a Yarn With You: Letters Between Miles Franklin, Katharine Susannah Prichard, Jean Devanny, Marjorie Barnard, Flora Eldershaw and Eleanor Dark. Oakleigh: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Jean Devanny: Romantic Revolutionary. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1999.
- Fish, Stanley Eugene. The Stanley Fish Reader. Ed. Arran Vesser. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1999.

- Freund, Elizabeth. The Return of the Reader: Reader-Response Criticism. New York: Methuen, 1987.
- Frow, John. Marxism and Literary History. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Gaskell, Phillip. From Writer to Reader: Studies in Editorial Method. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Goldmann, Lucien. Towards a Sociology of the Novel. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Tavistock, 1975.
- Goodwin, Barbara, Keith Taylor. The Politics of Utopia: A Study in Theory and Practice. London: Hutchinson & Co, 1982.
- Gorky, Maxim et. al. Soviet Writer's Congress 1934: The Debate on Socialist Realism and Modernism in the Soviet Union, Maxim Gorky et al., London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977.
- Gottesman, Ronald, and Scott Bennett, eds. Art and Error: Modern Textual Editing. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1970.
- Green, H.M. A History of Australian Literature Vol 11 1923-1950. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1961.
- Greetham, D.C. Textual Scholarship: An Introduction. New York: Garland, 1992.
- Harcourt, J.M. Upsurge: A Novel. Introd. Richard A. Nile. Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 1986; rpt. London: John Long, 1934.
- Harvey, A.D. Literature into History. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988.
- Hasluck, Paul. The Government and the People: 1939-41. Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 1952.
- Herbert, Xavier. Capricornia. Sydney: Publicist Publishing, 1938.
- Hetherington, Kevin. The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and social ordering. London; New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Hewett, Dorothy. Wild Card: An Autobiography 1923-1958; Rev. ed. Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Hilvert, John. Blue Pencil Warriors: Censorship and Propaganda in World War 2. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1984.
- Holmes, Katie. Spaces in Her Day: Australian Women's Diaries 1920s -1930s. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1995.
- Holquist, Michael. Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Holton, Robert. Jarring witnesses: Modern Fiction and the Representation Of History, New York; London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994.
- Howe, Irving. Politics and the Novel. London: Steven & Sons, 1961.
- Huxley, Aldous. Brave New World. London: Grafton Books, 1986; rpt. London: Chatto & Windus, 1932.

- . Ends and Means: An Enquiry into the Nature of Ideals and into the Methods employed for their Realization. London: Chatto & Windus: 1937.
- Ikin, Van. Australian Science Fiction. Ed. and Introd. Van Ikin. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1982.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. Towards An Aesthetic of Reception. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Introd. Paul de Man. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
- Jencks, Charles, ed. The Postmodern Reader. London: Academy Editions, 1992.
- Kamenka, Eugene, ed. Utopias: Papers from the annual symposium of the Australian Academy of the Humanities. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Kenan-Rimmon, Shlomith. Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics. New York; London: Methuen, 1983.
- Kermode, Frank. History and Value. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Kumar, Krishan, Stephen Bann, eds. Utopias and The Millennium. London: Reaktion Books, 1993.
- Kumar, Krishan. Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
- Kumar, Krishan. Utopianism. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1991.
- Lane, William. The Working Man's Paradise: An Australian Labour Novel. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1980; rpt. Sydney: Edwards & Dunlop, 1892.
- . 'White or Yellow?: A Story of the Race-War of A.D. 1908.' The Boomerang. 18 February - 5 May 1888.
- Laski, Harold Joseph. Where Do We Go From Here? An Essay In Interpretation. London: Penguin Books: 1941.
- . Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time. London: Allen and Unwin, 1946.
- . Communism. New York: H. Holt & Co; London: Williams and Norgate, 1927.
- . An Introduction to Politics. London: Allen & Unwin, 1934.
- Lasky, Melvin J. Utopia and Revolution. London: Macmillan, 1976.
- Lawson, Henry. 'Little World Left Behind'. Henry Lawson: The Master Story-teller: Commentaries on His Prose Writings. Ed. Colin Roderick. London; Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1985: 371-74.
- Lee, Jenny, Philip Mead, Gerald Murnane, eds. The Temperament of Generations: Fifty Years of Writing in Meanjin. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1990.
- Le Guin, Ursula. The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia. Frogmore: Panther, 1975. Rpt. New York, 1975.
- Lemon, M.C. The Discipline of History and the History of Thought. Routledge, London, 1995.
- Levenson, Michael, ed. The Cambridge Companion to Modernism. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Levitas, Ruth. The Concept of Utopia. Hempstead: Phillip Allen, 1990.

- Lyons, Martyn, John Arnold, eds. A History of the Book in Australia 1891-1945: A National Culture in a Colonised Market. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2001.
- Macartney, Frederick Thomas Bennett, Edmund Morris Miller. Australian Literature: A Bibliography to 1930, Extended to 1950, Revised Edition. Ed. F.T. Macartney, Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1956.
- Macherey, Pierre. A Theory of Literary Production. Trans. Geoffrey Wall. London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- MacIntyre, Stuart. The Reds: The Communist Party of Australia From Origins to Illegality. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1998.
- Mailloux, Steven. Interpretive Conventions: The Reader in the Study of American Fiction. New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Mailloux, Steven. Reception Histories: Rhetoric, Pragmatism, and American Cultural Politics. New York: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Mann, Leonard. The Go-Getter. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1942.
- Marcuse, Herbert. Five Lectures: Psychoanalysis, Politics and Utopia. Trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro and Shierry M. Weber. London: Penguin, 1970.
- Marinetti, Filippo Tommaso. Marinetti: Selected Writings. Ed. and Introd. R.W. Flint. Trans. R.W. Flint, Arthur A. Coppotelli. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1972.
- McGann, Jerome J. A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- ed. Textual Criticism and Literary Interpretation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- . The Beauty of Inflections: Literary Investigations in Historical Method and Theory. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- . The Textual Condition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- McKenzie, Donald Francis. Bibliography and The Sociology of Texts. London: British Library, 1980.
- McLaren, John. Writing in Hope and Fear: Literature as Politics in Postwar Australia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- McQueen, Humphrey, Social Sketches of Australia 2nd Edition. Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1991.
- Modjeska, Drusilla. Exiles At Home: Australian Women Writers 1925-1945. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1981.
- Morris, William. News from Nowhere or An Epoch of Rest: Being Some Chapters From a Utopian Romance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Moylan, Tom. Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination. London: Methuen, 1986.

- Mumford, Lewis. The City in History: The Origins, Its Transformations and Its Prospects. Pelican Books, 1961.
- Onega, Susana Jaen, ed. Telling Histories: Narrativising History, Historicising Literature. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995.
- Orwell, George. Nineteen Eighty Four. Introd. and Annot. Bernard Crick. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Parker, David. Ethics, Theory and the Novel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Parker, Hershel. Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons: Literary Authority in American Fiction. Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1984.
- Parrinder, Patrick. Science Fiction: Its Criticism and Teaching. London: Methuen, 1980.
- Penton, Brian. Censored: being a true account of a notable fight your right to read and know, with some comment upon the plague of censorship in general. Sydney: Shakespeare Head Press, 1947.
- Phillips, Arthur Angell. The Australian Tradition: Studies in a Colonial Culture. Melbourne: F.W. Cheshire, 1958.
- Piercy, Marge. Woman On The Edge Of Time. London: Women's Press, 1979. Rpt. New York, 1976.
- Pollak, Michael. Sense and Censorship: Commentaries on Censorship Violence in Australia. Sydney: Reed Books, 1990.
- Prichard, Katharine Susannah. Intimate Strangers. London: Jonathan Cape, 1937.
- Reid, Ian. Fiction and the Great Depression: Australia and New Zealand 1930-1950. Melbourne: Edward Arnold Australia, 1979.
- Ricouer, Paul. Lectures on Ideology and Utopia. Ed. George Taylor, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Ruppert, Peter. Reader In a Strange Land: The Activity of Reading Literary Utopias. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- Said, Edward. Culture and Imperialism. London: Vintage, 1993.
- Serle, Geoffrey. From Deserts the Prophets Come: The Creative Spirit in Australia 1788-1792. Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1973.
- Sheridan, Susan. Along the Faultlines: Sex, Race and Nation in Australian Women's Writing 1880s-1930s. Allen and Unwin, 1995.
- Sim, Stuart, ed. The Icon Critical Dictionary of Postmodern Thought. Cambridge: Icon Books, 1998.
- Smith, Vivian, ed. Letters of Vance and Nettie Palmer 1915 -1963. National Library of Australia, Canberra, 1977.
- Smith, Vivian, ed. Nettie Palmer: Her Private Journal Fourteen Years, Poems, Reviews and Literary Essays. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1988.

- Spence, Catherine Helen. Handfasted. Ed. and Introd. Helen Thomson. Ringwood: Penguin, 1984.
- Spender, Lynne. Intruder on the Rights of Men, Women's Unpublished Heritage. London; Boston: Pandora Press, 1983.
- Stead, Christina. Seven Poor Men of Sydney. London: Peter Davies, 1934.
- . The Man Who Loved Children. London: Peter Davies, 1941.
- . For Love Alone. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1966; rpt. London, 1945.
- Stephensen, Percy Reginald. The Foundations of Culture in Australia: An Essay towards National Self Respect. W.J. Miles, 1936.
- Strahan, Lynne. Just City and the Mirrors: Meanjin Quarterly and the Intellectual Front 1940-1965. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Suleimann, Susan, Inge Crosman. The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Suvin, Darko. Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing. Virginia: University of Virginia, 1990.
- Tennant, Kylie. The Battlers. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1941.
- Thomas, Donald. A Long Time Burning: The History of Literary Censorship in England. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Throssell, Ric. Wild Weeds and Windflowers: The Life and Letters of Katharine Susannah Prichard. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1975.
- Tompkins, Jane P., ed. Reader Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism. London; Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Tregenza, John. Australian Little Magazines 1923-1954: Their Role in Forming and Reflecting Literary Trends. Adelaide: Libraries Board of South Australia, 1964.
- Ward, Russel. A Nation For A Continent: The History of Australia 1901 - 1975. Heinemann, Victoria, 1975.
- Webby, Elizabeth, ed. The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Wells, H.G. The Science Fiction: Vol 2, The Invisible Man, When The Sleeper Wakes, The Shape of Things To Come. London: Orion, 1996.
- Wilde, William H., Joy Hooton, Barry Andrews, eds. The Oxford Companion to Australian Literature 2nd ed. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1994 (1985).
- Wilding, Michael. The Paraguay Experiment. Ringwood: Penguin Books, 1985.
- Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society: 1780 -1950. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

- Williams, John F. The Quarantined Culture: Australian Reactions to Modernism 1913-1939. Melbourne; New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Wood, George Arnold. The Discovery of Australia. Rev. J.C. Beaglehole. Foreward. O.H.K. Spate. Melbourne: Macmillan Australia, 1969.
- Woolf, Virginia. Mrs Dalloway. Virginia Woolf: Three Great Novels. London: Penguin Books, 1992; rpt. London: Hogarth Press, 1925.
- Zaymyatin Yevgeny. We. Trans. B.G. Guemey. Introd. and bibl. note. M. Glenny. London: Jonathan Cape, 1970.
- , A Soviet Heretic: Essays. Trans and Ed. M. Ginsburg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Australian Writers Speak: Literature and Life in Australia. A series of talks arranged by the Fellowship of Australian Writers for the Australian Broadcasting Commission. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1943.
- Georgian House: The First Two Years, 1944-45. Melbourne: Specialty Press, 1945.
- Virago Press: New Books and Complete List August 1985 to February 1986. London: Virago Press, 1985.