

**The Racial camp and the production of the political
citizen:**

**A genealogy of contestation from Indigenous populations
and diasporic women**

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the
award of the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

from

Macquarie University

by

Lara Palombo, BA Hons, M.A. (Women's Studies) Flinders
University

**Department of Media, Music, Communication and Cultural
Studies**

2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Introduction	1
The racial camp and the production of the political citizen: a genealogy of contestations from Indigenous populations and diasporic women.	
Chapter one	26
The arsenal of raciality and the camp in the context of colonial Tasmania	
Chapter two	80
The Flinders Chronicle and the Exercise of Indigenous anti-colonial politics in the Context of the Camp	
Chapter three	101
White Australia's Racial Arsenal and the Biopolitical Construction of the Federated Nation	
Chapter four	144
The turn to the Empire	
Chapter five	181
The Assimilative Order	
Chapter six	218
Political heterogeneities and white sovereignty	
Chapter seven	266
The Political Tide Turns: The Australian Surveillance-Security State and the Biopolitics of Internment	
Conclusion	322
Appendices	333
Reference List	347

Abstract

The racial camp and the production of the political citizen: a genealogy of contestations from Indigenous populations and diasporic women

In this thesis I examine the hypothesis that the racial state reproduces biopolitical mechanisms of segregation, imprisonment and death. The racialised Camp is one of the continuing mechanisms of biopolitical governance that participates in what is constituted as a national necessity to restrict and contain populations and that also opens them to death. The thesis examines the way ‘the political’ as defined by First Nation people and diasporic arrivals operate in relation to the nation-state and the camp. I deploy biopolitical and necropolitical lenses to detail the ways transnational and local racial regimes of governmentality have disciplined the embodiment of those perceived to be politically contesting the establishment of the white (sovereign) citizen. In order to evidence this hypothesis, I focus on concrete instantiations and mutations of the camp in Australia including the foundational colonial camp of Wybelenna in Tasmania and the internment camps of War World One and War World Two.

Moving from pre-Federation to post-Federation, I show how modern population debates informing the White Australian Policy, Protectionist Acts and the Pacific Island Labourers Act and Assimilation are grounded on an onto-epistemology of raciality that governs sexuality and gender and constitutes the population as colonial and scientific problems and as a site of national danger. This sustains the violent ordering, segregation,

elimination and demand for political loyalty to the state.

In the context of producing an analysis of ‘the political’ as it is embodied in cultural texts and practices, I bring into focus the critical role of Indigenous and diaspora responses through productions such as newspapers, petitions, political organizing and differing actions. I examine, the sovereign politics of the early Indigenous newspaper edited by the prisoners of the Wybalenna Camp, ‘*The Flinders Chronicle*’ and of a range of Italian-Australian diasporic newspapers, the ‘*Italo-Australian*’, ‘*il Giornale Italiano*’ and ‘*la Riscossa*’ that were produced in the late 1920s and 1930s.

This is to certify that this work has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution. All work contained within this document is original and my own, unless otherwise acknowledged

Lara Palombo
July 2014

Acknowledgments

This thesis has been a long-term project that has taken me on many journeys and has granted me the privilege of meeting some incredible people. First of all, I wish to thank the women that welcomed me in their homes and shared with me their experiences of War World Two. Your strength will guide me forever. I wish to thank my beautiful children Timo and Gustave who have been part of this project since day one and have been a key inspiration. I want to especially thank my partner Stephen for his continual support, patience and intellectual support. I am indebted to the Italian Government for granting me a travel scholarship to conduct research in Italy and to the Karen Halley Trust from the University of Adelaide for financing my primary research in the Australian National Archives. I am incredibly grateful to all the people that have helped me to produce this project including Vicki Crowley, Margaret Allen, Kylie O'Connell, Maria Giannacopoulus and Holly Randell Moon. I wish to thank Gianfranco Cresciani for providing me with primary information. I am very thankful to Elaine Laforteza and Craig Johnson who have covered for me in my teaching and have provided me with continual intellectual nourishment. I would like to thank Jillian Kramer for all the editorial support and great conversations. I feel really privileged and touched by Jenny Jones for her continual friendship and insightful comments on my drafts. Yet, I am continually inspired by the work conducted by Critical theorists that I've read including Suvendrini Perera, Denise da Silva and my amazing supervisor Joseph Pugliese. There is no doubt that this thesis would not have been possible without the continual help, support and intellectual rigor of Joseph Pugliese.

Introduction

The racial Camp and the production of the political citizen: a genealogy of contestations from Indigenous populations and diasporic women

The central contention of this thesis is that the workings of the racial site of the camp are a norm in Australia. This is part of the racial state reproduction of biopolitical mechanisms of banishment, segregation, imprisonment and death. The racialised camp is one of the continuing mechanisms of biopolitical governance that participates in what is constituted as a national necessity to restrict, contain and eliminate populations and that also opens them to death. The thesis examines the way ‘the political,’ as defined by Indigenous and diasporic subjects, operates in relation to the nation-state and the camp. I deploy biopolitical and necropolitical lenses to detail the ways racial regimes of governmentality have disciplined the embodiment of those perceived to be politically contesting the establishment and security of the white (sovereign) citizen. The camp, then, is part of the matrix and nomos of the self-preservation of white sovereignty that determines the limits of political contestation within a white settler-colonial society. In order to evidence this hypothesis, I focus on concrete instantiations of the camp in Australia including the foundational colonial camp of Wybelenna in Tasmania and the internment camps of War World One and War World Two. I do not consider these to be the only instances of the camp; rather, I see them as

emblematic of the heterogeneous mutations of the camp and its violence. The colonial camp of Wyballena (1833-1847) was established at the end of the Black Wars to counter-act the refusal to cede First Nation Peoples sovereignties and forcefully enforce white colonial sovereignty. This came to operate as an early biopolitical and necropolitical racial site through which Indigenous peoples were banished from their homelands, displaced and imprisoned as racial enemies. As I demonstrate in the course of my thesis, at Wybalenna, under the guises of performing a civilizing mission, the prisoners were treated as (politically) transformable bodies and in effect also as disposable lives that the camp came to largely kill. The internment camp of World War One is a liberal racial technology of violence that transformed the containing of political lives of Wybalenna to territorialize new limits of white imperial sovereignty as governed by war enmity relations. Its establishment participated in the territorialisation of the supremacy of political loyalty to the state and to its allegiance to the British Empire by way of a militarised biopolitical banishment of diasporic bodies ethnicized as disloyal national enemy aliens. This created indefinite detention and exposure to the fearsome conditions of the camp that often resulted in death. The internment camp of War World Two came to operate as a technology of violence that extended and improved upon militarised biopolitical technologies first deployed in World War One to produce mass mobilization of populations and produce a national cleansing of diasporic bodies ethnicized as dangerous to the preservation of white sovereignty. As I argue in my thesis, by World War Two, an intensification of military biopoliticisation took place that came to affect thirty-two

nationalities, including the selective internments of Italian enemy alien civilian women defined as politically disloyal and dangerous to national sovereignty.

I conclude my thesis by staging a textual analysis of selected files on civilian from NSW and Victoria that were largely narrated by police and military authorities. To my knowledge, this thesis stages the first in-depth scholarly analysis of these largely forgotten files. This analysis demonstrates how the militarised biopoliticisation of women's bodies drew upon and transformed pre-defined racial and gendered regimes of knowledge that were already part of the territorialisation of a white settler-colonial society. Assemblages of traces of women's defence indicate a disavowal of their embodiments as political subjects and an enhancement of their collaboration within the social functions of the racial order of the state. But this is not a normative form of defence as levels of open rejection of British authorities and their internment by self-identification as pro-fascist supporters is, as I demonstrate, persistently reported.

In this thesis I track the ways the European based onto-epistemology of raciality operated as a local insular imaginary that shaped, transformed and recombined over time biopolitical forms of colonial and racial governance. This insular imaginary saturated every aspect of life. Moving from pre-Federation to post-Federation, I show how modern population debates informing the *White Australian Policy* (i.e. *Immigration Restriction Act of 1901* (Cwlth), a series of varied state based *Protectionist Acts* and the

Pacific Island Labourers Act 1901 (Qld) and a range of *Amendments to Immigration Restriction Act* (Cwlth) in the 1920s are grounded on a raciality that governs sexuality and gender and constitutes the population as colonial and scientific problems and as a site of national danger. These policies sustained the violent ordering, restrictions, segregation, banishment, elimination and deportation of non-white subjects, mixed inter-racial relations and the new intensive screening of Southern Europeans and careful monitoring of those Italians categorised as from the Southern regions. Drawing from a discursive analysis of the racial territorialisation of Italian migrants, the thesis elaborates on the ways raciality locked Italian diasporic female bodies within a biopolitical economism and heteronormative white order. My analysis shows how these diasporic women on the one hand were all ethnicised as economically viable sources of labour and on the other were racially differentiated and hierarchized in their ability to assimilate and reproduce white children.

In the context of producing an analysis of ‘the political’, I bring into focus the critical role of Indigenous and diasporic responses to white sovereign relations through an analysis of cultural productions such as newspapers, petitions, political organizing and differing actions. I examine the tactical sovereign politics of the early Indigenous newspaper edited by the prisoners of the Wybalenna Camp, *The Flinders Chronicle*, and a range of 1920s and 1930s newspapers including *The Australian Abo Call*, that demanded equal rights for ‘Aboriginal people’ and was closed down by

way of administrative governance. I also examine the *Italo-Australian* and *Il Giornale Italiano* as examples of fascist diasporic newspapers that were calculatively permitted to circulate until World War Two was declared. Their regulation is contrasted to the ways the diasporic anarchist newspaperers of *Il Risveglio*, *La Riscossa* and *L'Avanguardia Libertaria* were categorized as disloyal newspapers and were quickly closed down by the state. I engage closely with the relation between the Australian liberal state and the rise of the Italian Fascist regime and their sharing of an onto-epistemology of raciality that ultimately would be based on their support for violent and white imperial forms of sovereignty and anti-communist policies. The thesis shows how the circulation of these diverse productions, as embodiments of forms of Indigenous, diasporic and transnational politics, was governed by national security mechanisms that immunized the political interests of the white nation-state.

Although the thesis engages with the embodiments of diasporic women in the newspapers, it does not cover in details their activism within the left. This is not myopia on my part, but rather this omission is driven by the actual content of the military files on interned women. Contrary to Italian male experiences of internment that at times indicate a lack of understanding from military authorities on how Fascism differed from communism or anarchism, the primary archival materials concerning the selective internment of women does not indicate a clear focus on communist or anarchist diasporic women. The biopolitical selective nature of women's internments instead largely and repeatedly focused on

authorities' perceptions on their connections with Fascism and other disloyal actions. This invisibility is also linked to the way state authorities had been openly persecuting anarchists and communists thus affecting the open visibility of women operating in these movements. In my discussion of internments I have focused on diasporic Italian-Australian women or civilian internees already living Australia. I have not included the files of Italian women who were staff members of the ships that arrived from Italy when the war was declared or the Prisoners of War who were captured overseas and interned at the Tatura Internment Camp.

In part, this thesis was sparked by my own dealings with the Australian state and legal system. Within less than six months of having arrived in Australia, having just turned 18 and with very little language skills, I found myself in a criminal court after spending one night in a police cell. I was placed on probation and as part of this I was forced to meet a social worker for three years. My memory of the beginning of this nightmare is that of a diasporic Italian-Australian police officer who decided that I was trouble and of being thrown in front of a judge and looking around to a room full of people and not understanding a word of what was being said. This was not just about the language but about not understanding the implications of what was happening to me and with the difficulty of trying to negotiate a space that I had never entered before. Yet, this was a space where I continually felt that everyone thought they already knew my type or me to the point that there was no need to hear what I had to say. In fact, I did not say anything. This moment has never left me as it is imprinted on my

body through an undeniable criminal record that follows me wherever I go. My rough entrance into a national and juridico-legal space that was saturated by meanings that preceded me and did not need to hear my version of events is what provoked me to consider what had happened before my arrival, how diasporic women had been embodied by the state and the law and how they had negotiated a white nation.

As I wrote a Master's thesis on the historical positioning of Italian diasporic women prior to the post-war migration period, it quickly became clear that selective and insular racial imaginaries had silenced narratives of diasporic women's political lives and internments. The limited engagement with racial practices has overall reduced the grasp of how the figures of the Northern and Southern Italian diaspora have shaped women's lives. Joseph Pugliese's (2002) work has opened the fields of whiteness studies and Italian migration studies to the importance of relevance of critiquing the ways a European onto-epistemology of raciality has been transformed and reconfigured in the context of Australian immigration practices. Pugliese's research has specifically re-directed attention on the violent racial technologies that measured and categorized the whiteness of the Southern Italian body. In this context, the important and powerful recounts of women's lives outside the internment camp during World War Two (i.e. Loh, 1980; Triaca, 1985, Kahan-Guidi & Weiss, 1989; Bonutto 1994, Watkins, 1999, Saunders & Daniels 2000; Huntley 2012) have also strongly confirmed the racial heteronormative and gendered violence circulating at the social level and also deployed by state

authorities during the war. These significant recounts of diasporic women's lives however, become significations of 'racial exceptions'. That is the focus is on forms of racial violence that are attached to the events of the war and dislocated from an onto-epistemology of raciality that had already questioned the capacity of Indigenous and diasporic subjects to assimilate into whiteness and had deployed a sovereign necessity of interning bodies in the camp and their ethnicisation as foreign enemies.

These racial embodiments also remain disconnected from the gendered politics of the camp per se. Some assemblages of traces of internments have been made visible in Cresciani's photo of the Fremantle jail with an image of civilian internees Mrs Funazzi and Mrs Ravia (1988); these traces are also becoming more visible in essays by Michael Bosworth (1992) where a very moving oral history by Angela Wayne discusses the effects that her mother's internment had on the children. Other traces like Kay Saunders and Roger Daniels (2000) and Gaetano Rando (2005) have also confirmed that a smaller number of women were interned. Another key historical evidence however, has been introduced more recently by Kate Bagnall's (2008 p.148) in her analysis of a petition signed by fifteen Italian women on 19, April 1942, who had been stationed for week at Stewart Creek Goal on the way to Gaythorne camp in World War Two. Most relevant, however, have also been the article by Angela Diana (1988) '*Italian Women in Australia*' and the Honors thesis by Tonia Mezzini (1992) '*Migration, Identity and Community-Building Fourteen Molfettese women speak*'. Although these texts do not discuss internments per se,

they have brought attention to diasporic women's membership to the Fascio-Femminile or their connection to Fascism in the inter-war years. This membership has greatly affected the representation of women's internment, as there has been a cultural shaming of those caught out as fascist diaspora that were interned during and after the war. Not all women that I interviewed were in fact prepared to discuss their relation to Fascism or diasporic political formations. As also discussed by Mezzini (1992), some women worked to re-define and clarify the meanings of their membership to the Fasci Femminili and overall to political organising by defining their activities as social and philanthropic opportunities during the difficult years governed by Assimilation and the White Australian policy. Fascism, however, has also especially privileged the circulation of male-based counter-histories of internment camps and the continual invisibilizing the internments of women's. It must be noted that this has been also the case in Canada, the United States of America and Britain, where this research is still very much in an emergent state.

When I started this research I was drawn to Giorgio Agamben's conceptualisation of the camp in *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Lives* (1998). What mostly interested me was the way the camp was defined in relation to sovereignty. Agamben (1998, p.6) argues that this zone operates as a sovereign space of exception, where law is suspended and where ultimately the 'biopolitical body' is produced. Readdressing Carl Schmitt's definition of the sovereign as the one 'who decides on the state of exception', Agamben concludes that:

In modern biopolitics, [the] sovereign is ... who decides on the value or the non-value of life as such. Life — which, with the declarations of rights, had as such been invested with the principle of sovereignty — now itself becomes the place of a sovereign decision. (1998, p.142)

What Agamben (1998) defines then is the way the camp becomes a permanent fixture of modernity as the ‘*nomos* (law+ violence) or hidden matrix’ of modern state sovereignty. In this sense, I see Agamben’s work connecting with the repeated and multilayered establishments and forcefulness of the camp in Australia as a white sovereign technology of security that is emblematic of sovereign self-preservation. Nevertheless, the level of forcefulness or violence operating within the camp in the context of a white settler-colonial society and imperial territory cannot be separated from raciality. In the camp, as Denise Ferreira da Silva (2007, p. 233) notes, raciality is not a political matter that ‘follow[s] the logic of exclusion’. In my agreement with da Silva, I see raciality as operating as an onto-epistemological productive force that always-already pre-defines the ‘affectability’ of the body that annihilates legal protection. By ‘affectability,’ da Silva signifies subaltern bodies that are constituted as the ‘no bodies’ of the law and that are obliterated from reaching justice can be imprisoned, violated or killed by the state with impunity precisely because they have always-already been racialised:

Beginning with the conception of the body, I read the human body as inscribed by the arsenal of scientific reason, the instruments of productive violence, always-already comprehended by the tools of raciality, namely social scientific signifiers of human (racial and cultural) difference. (2007, p.233)

I read this to mean that for da Silva there are no bodies as ‘simple fact of living’ or ‘bare lives’ as they are always-already distinguished by raciality and its configuration through the racial arsenal. In this context, following

also Mbembe's (2003) work on the necropolitics of the colony, the onto-epistemology of raciality has already grounded the colonial space of Australia as a zone in itself where its selected racialised inhabitants are always vulnerable to the state's use of force and violence. Sovereign power in this sense does not require the state of exception to enact forceful violence. I argue that the constitution of martial law largely serves to create a sovereign dispensation from having to fulfil any obligations or to having to justify its usage of violence, but the prisoners of the camp are already always inscribed by raciality as open and affectable lives. Racial subjection, in the specific historical contexts that I examine, is normalized and predicated on the inevitable death of selected Indigenous lives and on the elimination of ethnicized diasporic bodies through banishment to the camp.

With da Silva, I apply Aileen Moreton-Robinson's (2004b, pp.77-78) conceptualisation of whiteness as an ontological and epistemological *a priori* that is defined by what it does not own and deny: First Nations People's sovereignties. For Moreton-Robinson, this form of whiteness nonetheless also operates as an invisible regime of power that assumes hegemonic sovereign status. Whiteness then becomes an *a priori* that sets up a 'way of knowing and being' and that constitutes an exclusive claims to the position of the truly human so that:

[i]n this way, racial superiority become[s] a part of one's ontology, albeit unconsciously, and informs the white subject's knowledge production...

Thus the universalization and normalization of whiteness as the representation of humanity worked to locate the racialized other in

the liminal space between the human / animal distinction. (2004b, p.77-78)

In an Australian context, then, one can argue that whiteness is part of the productive racial arsenal that violently reiterates and secures the self-preservation of white sovereignty. I see the possessive logic of white 'sovereignty' (Moreton-Robinson 2004a, p.3) exercised by the colonies and the state as productive of what da Silva calls (2007) the 'racial arsenal'. This arsenal also establishes a form of biopower and necropower that works to distinguish and classify and transform political lives, including by obliteration.

Practices of banishment and the establishment of camps and prisons become, in effect, the signifiers of whiteness as a sovereign arsenal of raciality (da Silva, p.118). These practices through the *containment* of Aboriginal people and diasporic lives that are politically contestatory of the state, enact an a priori of 'whiteness' that determines their affectability and possible obliteration. In this context, I also utilize the proposition of an 'insular imaginary' by Suvendrini Perera (2009). By this term, Perera theorizes how Australia is part of a larger process of western territorial ordering and geographical imaginaries. Australia, Perera argues, must be seen as a product of technologies of territorialisation, as well as being constitutive of them; these technologies of territorialisation have worked to envision it as an insular island-nation, a conjunction of 'sea, land, nation and the spaces between' with particular claims to racial-geographical exceptionalism (2009, p.11, p.22). The insularity of the island-nation is constitutive of, as well as being produced by, *terra nullius* and the

consequent establishment of internal and external borders that target racialised and gendered populations, both First Nation people and diasporic lives in differential ways. I draw on Perera's notion of an 'insular imaginary' to argue that this is exerted within the everyday relations that constitute the lives of diasporic women and include (bio)political normative repertoires that are available to the state and are directed at populations. These repertoires are transposed and enacted within the biopolitical militarisation that so clearly inscribes the files of interned women.

Deakin's figuration of the death of the white race in a 1901 speech is considered here through Sarah Ahmed's (2004a) critical work on the cultural politics of emotions. More specifically, my focus is on the way the politics of emotion pertains to the affective attachments circulating in racial discourses. In brief, Ahmed's cultural politics of emotions rejects the emotion/affect distinction used by Deleuze & Guattari (1987) and Massumi (1987; 2002) via Spinoza. This distinction sets up affect as a 'pre-personal intensity' that is more abstract than social emotions. Affect for Massumi cannot be 'fully realized in language, and is always prior to and/or outside of consciousness' (Massumi 1987, p. xvi). In contradistinction to Ahmed's work, the transmission of affect for Massumi is not based on the exchange of affect from thing to body or body to body. This transmission is, rather, based on 'the infolding and unfolding' of intensities between two bodies, which can be virtual or flesh. These intensities resonate apart from intended meaning of context (Massumi 1987, p. 30). For Ahmed, however,

affect is cultural and relational and thus it is at once historical, racial and gendered. This is an effect, as Ahmed states, ‘of the circulation between objects and signs (that is, the accumulation of affective value over time). Some signs increase in affective value as an effect of the movement between signs’ (2004b, p. 120). In other words, these movements are productive and ‘do things,’ including creating affective attachments.

Ahmed’s understanding of affectivity allows me to consider how ‘anxiety’ circulates in white nationalist discourses. This is an emotional effect that is produced by raciality and that also participates in the configuration of an insular affective imaginary. More precisely, as I show in Chapter Three, the intensity of its emotional circulation within Deakin’s speech participates in the affective binding of the white populations to the violent racialised biopolitics of the nation-state. Thus anxiety is shown to be an historical effect of white attachments to the state that is also productively involved in emotionally binding the nation’s white subjects to the state. As Ahmed clarifies, ‘emotions do things, and they align individuals with communities – or bodily space with social space – through the very intensity of their attachments’ (2004b, p. 119).

Before I proceed further, I want to elucidate my understanding of the political as it will be deployed in the course of my thesis. In my thesis, I deploy a conceptualisation of the political that connects it to the establishment of a white sovereign nation-state. The political is understood here as the configuring and securing of a colonial form of sovereignty that

is based on white transnational relations within the British Empire. The political becomes tied to racial biopolitical technologies that are produced by these white sovereign relations. The political, as part of biopolitics, posits the control, surveillance, restriction and elimination of Indigenous and diasporic sovereign-political formations that are seen, as I demonstrate below, as either unassimilable to the white nation or, alternatively, as dangerously subversive of the white political order of the settler-colonial state. The political is, then, shown to be inseparable from an exercise of biopower that normativizes. My project, then, is to mark the historical deployment of a politics of racial violence that is invested in either the restriction and/or elimination of pre-existing and mobile Indigenous and diasporic sovereign-politicals. The thesis draws attention to what da Silva (2007) names as ‘the political symbolic order’ that always and already legitimizes a biopolitics of racial violence as a necessity for the establishment and preservation of white colonial sovereignty.

The political however, is also understood here as generating ‘resistance’. As Foucault argues, ‘there are no relations of power without resistances ... formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised’ (1980, p.170). The thesis engages with the heterogeneous contestations that came to circulate within Indigenous and diasporic politico-cultural networks and newspapers. Through De Certeau (1988), I show how the *The Flinders Island Chronicle*, published in 1836-37, became a tactical (political) site that made counter-claims to colonial imaginaries in the biopolitical camp of Wybelanna. The analysis of *The Australian Abo Call*, edited in Sydney

by Jack Patton in 1938, demonstrates how this newspaper re-imagined an autonomous and anti-colonial Indigenous space and pursued a politics of equality and equal rights for Indigenous people. In the course of the thesis, I also proceed to stage a textual analysis of a range of articles produced in Italian-Australian fascist and anarchist political diasporic newspapers of the 1930s. I do this, again, in order to bring into focus complex relations of political alignment and dissent within diasporic formations in relation to the white settler-colonial state. Through my reading of both Indigenous and diasporic newspapers, the thesis develops a reading of the complex imperial, racial, class and gendered political relations circulating in these newspapers and their response to the racial biopolitics of the sovereign state.

Through da Silva's work (2007, p. xii-xiii), I also discuss biopolitics as part of an arsenal of raciality that shapes political citizenship. Biopolitical mechanisms are re-defined in Chapter One as being constituted by the analytics of raciality (da Silva 2011, p.46) that grounds 'the self-determined' political subject of the state and the law. In this sense, I see biopolitical mechanisms as postulating the white 'self-determining' subject of law, rights and morals,, that is, in da Silva's terms, the white political citizen. Policies like the *Aboriginal Protectionist Acts*, the *Immigration Restriction Act (Clwth)* and the *Pacific Island Labourers Act (Clwth)* are defined in the thesis as governmental technologies that naturalize white political sovereignty through citizenship. They enable a series of racial caesurae that deny political citizenship to Aboriginal and non-white

diasporic populations who are effectively categorized as the enemies of the state, inferior cultures and/or as semi-humans. These racialised subjects are branded as non-citizens and, in da Silva's (2009, p.212) words, as the 'no-bodies' of law.

As I demonstrate in detail below, the case of the genocidal camp at Wybalenna indicates that political citizenship within the pre-Federation white-settler state was predicated on a raciality that obliterated pre-existing Indigenous politics and sovereignties. Indigenous populations are imprisoned in the camp as 'the enemy,' criminals, as semi-humans living in affectivity, as the mere bodies wholly embedded in nature and as lawless subjects (da Silva 2012, p.47). Moreover, again as I demonstrate in detail throughout the course of the thesis, the modern liberal settler state securitizes diasporic whiteness partly through a demand for political loyalty to state sovereignty. As my analysis of the internments camps evidences, this sovereign demand for political loyalty exposes both Indigenous and diasporic bodies to processes of biopolitical annulment.

The white settler-colonial state is, in the course of my thesis, understood to be part of a modern, liberal democratic tradition that, in the Australian context, effectively effaces the foundational and ongoing violence that, in fact, predicates its very existence. For the settler-colonial state, a system of rights is instrumental to white colonial rule (Patton 2005, p. 287), and this system of rights is, as I demonstrate below, in fact secured through acts of racialised disenfranchisement for targeted racialised subjects. The

white colonial right to property was, for example, founded on and protected by the legal fiction of *Terra Nullius* (see Patton 2005). This racialised right was effectively normativized under the liberal democratic state by the expansion of *the Aboriginal Protectionist Acts* that worked, legally, to continue the process of expropriating and clearing the land of its Indigenous subjects. As this thesis demonstrates, these Acts, as biopolitical technologies, were tied to the material expansion of white sovereign rights. This expansion obliterated the sovereign rights of Indigenous people.

On another point, I am well aware that the usage of the categories ‘Indigenous people’ and ‘Aboriginal people’ is not without its complexities. In this sense, in the thesis I have adopted the terms used by one of my key writer Aileen Moreton-Robinson. In what follows, I offer a synoptic overview of the chapters that constitute this thesis.

Chapter One:

In Chapter One I introduce a discussion of the onto-epistemology of raciality examining how white settler colonialism in Tasmania was grounded on the obliteration of First Nation people’s customary laws, sovereignties and lives. My analysis shows how the deployment of raciality as part of an early form of biopolitical governance unfolds into a white colonial order. This order by the 1820s, intensified its unleashing of racial violence and was legitimised by state approved military interventions that would protect the dispossession and obliteration of First

Nation people in Tasmania and their customary laws and political sovereignties. By 1826, as forms of organized retaliation against white settlers increased, local First Nations people came to be constituted as ‘open enemies’ of the colony and rendered indistinguishable from mortal ‘enemies of the king’. Following this discussion on the introduction of martial law and the Black Wars (1824-31), the chapter moves into an analysis of the colonial camp of Wybalenna (1833-1847). This is defined as a biopolitical and necropolitical technology that is spatialized as a racial zone where displaced Aboriginal populations would be banished and imprisoned as enemies of the colony. In the camp under the guises of being civilized, they were treated as (politically) transformable racial bodies and in effect also disposable or, using da Silva’s term, affectable.

Chapter Two:

Within the discussion of the Wybalenna Camp, I introduce a politico-textual analysis of the newspaper *The Flinders Island Chronicle*. This was produced within the camp and is often referred to as the first Aboriginal newspaper. In this context, I argue that it must be seen as a technology that came to operate as a tactical formation that enacted an anti-colonial politics present within the Wyalong Camp itself.

Chapter Three:

Chapter Three moves into an analysis of the territorialisation of the modern, liberal settler state. I track the ways the European based onto-epistemology of raciality, that produced the deployment of the racial camp,

operates as a local insular imaginary that territorializes the modern nation-state as a security mechanism. This insular imaginary is shaped by, as well as shaping, violent colonial and racial formations through the deployment of defence mechanisms that come to saturate every aspect of life. Moving from pre-Federation to post-Federation Australia, I show how modern population debates, that informed the *Immigration Restriction Act 1901* (Cwlth), federal and state based *Protectionist Acts* and the *Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1901* (Qld), are grounded on national and transnational defence mechanisms that govern race, sexuality and gender. They differentiate and hierarchize local populations as colonial and scientific eugenicists ‘problems’ and as sites of national danger. This sustains the violent ordering, segregation, banishment, ethnic cleansing and elimination of racialised members of the population. My analysis of these racialised biopolitical mechanisms also focuses on the deportation of non-white subjects and the state’s interference in mixed inter-relations and family formation. The chapter maps in detail the ways the settler-colonial nation-state is defined by a form of biopolitical governmentality that is premised on the control, subjugation and assimilation of racialised populations.

Chapter Four:

In this chapter, I demonstrate how as Australia entered World War One the sovereign assertion of political loyalty to the British Armed Forces re-signified the onto-epistemology of white sovereignty. Political loyalty to a white British imperial order demanded the reconfiguration of the national limits of whiteness that had been based on close British-German relations.

In World War One this order is reconfigured by violently creating a militarised state that is at war with British enemies, performing military actions in the South Pacific, containing the right to kill by enlisting selected British citizens and British allies and restricting the recruitments of Aboriginal people. My analysis of war technologies demonstrates how large ranges of biopolitical mechanisms were posited as necessary to securitize state sovereignty. This was perceived to be at risk from internal and external enemies, through such legislative measures as: the *Aliens Restriction Order 1914* (Cwlth), *War Precautions Act-Aliens Registration Regulation 1916* (Cwlth), *Unlawful Association Act 1917* (Cwlth), *Amendment to Naturalization Act 1917* (Cwlth), and *Disloyalty Regulation 1918* (Cwlth). The establishment of the internment camp, then, becomes part of range of military biopolitical racial and gendered technologies of violence that categorized, banished and incarcerated ‘alien enemies’. These technologies ethnicized and gendered especially German nationals irrespective of their citizenship or birth status. The camp exposed all internees to indefinite detention and to those appalling conditions that often resulted in death. This chapter, analyses the surveillance of enemy alien women and the internment of a British born woman who had married a German national. In concluding this chapter maps how multiple technologies of war were internalised within existing systems of law and as part of the social containment of First Nation people and diasporic lives.

Chapter Five:

In this chapter I analyse the ways immigration practices placed more emphasis in the 1920s on defending white sovereignty by preventing and eliminating the possibility of unassimilable political formations. In this case, the state placed emphasis on governmental technologies that could contain, measure and monitor the assimilation of those racially categorized as Southern European and Southern Italian bodies. Quota systems, total prohibition, deportation, multiple restrictions and stringent medical examinations were deployed as examples of immigration biopolitical technologies that would predict and identify unassimilable, non-white bodies and their related cultural/political practices. In this analysis, I engage with the Ferry Report Inquiry of 1925 that wrote the racial and gender hierarchizing of Northern and Southern Italians female bodies within formations of whiteness, labour relations, heteronormativity, racial reproduction, marriage and assimilability. The analysis moves to elaborate on the ways raciality has reconfigured and gendered Italian female diasporic bodies. Specifically, the analysis focuses on the way in which a European-based onto-epistemology, that has been already grounded on a biopolitical racial caesura between women from the Italy's northern and southern regions, worked to reproduce a series of other hierarchical differences based on class, moral, religious, sexual and political grounds. As diasporic female bodies, I discuss how they are biopoliticised economically as sources of labor within a heteronormative, gendered white order. My analysis shows how diasporic women were gendered by the raciality of the nation-state that differentiated and hierarchized their ability to assimilate and reproduce white children.

Chapter Six:

In the context of producing an analysis of ‘the political,’ in this chapter I bring into focus the critical role of Indigenous and diasporic politics. I examine, the newspaper *The Australian Abo Call* of 1938 that was edited by Jack Patten. This paper created an autonomous space for news that was relevant to First Nations peoples and demanded citizens’ rights. Viewed as a threat to the settler-colonial state because of its politically contestatory articles, this paper was closed down by way of administrative governances set out in the *Newspaper Act 1898 (NSW)*. The textual analysis of the two newspapers the *Italo-Australian* and *Il Giornale Italiano* argues that they operated until the outbreak of World War Two and must be seen as part of transnational and diasporic Italian-Australian Fascist propaganda. The analysis of the anarchist newspapers *Il Risveglio*, *La Riscossa* and *L’Avanguardia Libertaria*, evidences the existence of a diasporic anti-fascist politics that attacked both the Fascist regime and the Australian state’s tacit support of Fascist politics. The papers were categorized as disloyal and closed down by the censorship forces of the Australian state. In my analysis, I draw attention to the manner in which the Australian liberal state and the emergent Italian fascist regime both advocated forms of white supremacy; their shared investment in the biopolitics of whiteness led to Australia’s initial support for the Italian Fascist state’s colonial ventures and its violent crackdown on communist organizations. The thesis shows how these diverse Indigenous and diasporic newspapers were governed by national security mechanisms that immunized the political

interests of the white nation-state. These mechanisms led to eventual closure of the *Australian Abo-Call* and the *Il Risveglio*, *La Riscossa* and *L'Avanguardia Libertaria*, whilst they simultaneously allowed the circulation of the two Fascist newspapers. The shutdown of the Italo-Australian Fascist newspapers would, significantly, only occur when World War Two is declared.

Chapter Seven:

This final chapter conducts an analysis of files created by the Commonwealth Investigation Branches (CIB), as part of a range of national security mechanisms that were used by the Australian state to monitor or close down politically left or 'subversive' newspapers. Following my analysis of these files, the chapter moves to discuss War World Two and the militarised biopolitical mechanisms that were largely deployed by police and military authorities. This analysis demonstrates how the militarised biopoliticisation of female diasporic bodies drew upon and transformed those pre-defined racial and gendered regimes of knowledge that were already part of the territorialisation of a white settler society. My critical assemblage of the traces of the women's defence, as found in military files, indicates a disavowal of their embodiments as political subjects and an enhancement of their collaboration within the social functions of the racial order of the white Australian state. I argue that what the interned diasporic women evidence is not a normative form of defence as they can be seen to voice levels of open rejection of the hegemonic values espoused by the Australian state's authorities. In this

context, I draw attention to their complex articulation of political agency as, in their files, these women often mark their internment by self-identifying as pro-Fascist supporters.

I conclude my thesis with a brief overview of the genealogical continuities and mutations of the racial camp as demonstrated by the *Northern Territory National Emergency Response (Cwth)* and mandatory detention centres. I finalize the discussion by drawing attention to the largely unresolved issues that still pertain to Australia's unjust practices of racialised internment by focusing on recent federal and state motions seeking acknowledgement for past wrong doing.

Chapter One

The Arsenal of Raciality and the Camp in the Context of Colonial Tasmania

In the context of both pre- and post-Federation Australia, regimes of colonial governmentality were deployed to transform Indigenous sovereignties and new diasporic formations. These regimes were based on a white colonial attempt to administer a modern form of biopower that would conduct the transformation of Indigenous and diasporic political lives. Tasmania, was envisaged as a unitary colonial governmental formation informed by a biopolitics that was based on what da Silva terms the ‘analytics of raciality’. This effectively hierarchized, rendered ‘affectable’ and ‘obliterable’ local Indigenous nations and the anti-colonial politics perceived to be operating within the settled districts. In this setting, the historical surveillance of Indigenous populations and their cultural productions becomes a signifier of a form of colonial governmentality that hierarchised political relations and always assumed that they were open to transformation, as an ‘assimilable’ or ‘obliterable’ politics. Indigenous people are assumed to be, as da Silva (2007) argues, ‘affectable’ and open to transformation, that is, they are re-imagined as without their own guiding ‘internalities’ or principles of sovereign-juridicality. In other words, they are positioned as lawless.

This violent colonial logic that attempts to obliterate Indigenous sovereignties, is analysed not simply as a historical formation, but rather as a phenomena located within nineteenth-century scientific projects of knowledge. These projects produced the 'racial' as that which 'refigures, as it reconstitutes, the whole field of modern representation' and becomes the governing relation that institutes the juridical, economic and moral ground. This is what da Silva refers to as the 'global'. The racial, as I argue via da Silva's (2007, p. xiii) writing, effectively institutes the global (the colonial juridical, economic, moral) as an onto-epistemological context. This is perceived as 'a productive and violent gesture necessary to sustain the post-Enlightenment version of the Subject as the sole determined thing'. For da Silva (2007, p. xiii), 'racial difference as a human attribute' comes to be a key notion of raciality, which constitutes the idea that in each global region, universal reason (law of nature) produces human beings with different attributes. Significantly, the (self) determination of unique attributes requires the elimination of 'others'. Racial difference then reigns in the colony and:

Establishes mentally (morally and intellectually) distinct kinds of human beings, namely, the self-determined subject and its outer-determined others, the ones whose minds are subjected to their natural (in the scientific sense) conditions. Precisely this statement, I argue, informs the core argument of the sociology of race relations, that is, the causes of the subordination of the others of Europe in their physical and mental characteristics and postulates that the solution to racial subjection requires the elimination of racial difference. (da Silva 2007, p. xiii)

The arsenal of scientific knowledge – raciality – re-configures the 'truth of man' in the Australian context as based on the self-determination of European colonisers and the necessary racial subjugation and attempted elimination of First Nation people.

In Tasmania, my key site of focus in this chapter, sovereign Indigenous nations and communities are onto-epistemologically constituted by racial technologies of governmentality as a threat and ‘enemies’ of the colony. One of the outcomes of this governmentality is that their law-keeping practices are approximated to the category of criminality rather than being assigned to political sovereignty/ies. When organised forms of retaliation against white settlers visibly increased, a necropolitical form of sovereignty produced an onto-epistemological racial perception of the Indigenous people as an enemy, a criminal and a rioter, living in externality and open to the affectability of nature and its ruling by reason, that is, again in da Silva’s (2007) terms, as open to death.

What also emerges from the analytics of raciality is a biopolitics (but also necropolitics) that for Michel Foucault (2003) is directed at the sovereign management and ordering of life and death. For Roberto Esposito (2008, p. 46), however, this modern biopower that configures life, or as he states that works through the two modalities of ‘negat[ing] life or enhanc[ing] its development or violates it and excludes it’, is mediated by the concept or mechanism of ‘immunity’. Immunity as a biopolitical mechanism does not simply work to preserve life but, rather, it subjects life to a power that negates or reduces its own expansion. As Esposito explains:

From this perspective, we can say that immunisation is a negative [form] of protection of Life. It saves, it ensures and preserves the organism either individual or collective, to which it pertains, but it does not do so directly, immediately, or frontally: on the contrary, it subjects the organism to a condition that simultaneously negates or reduces its power to expand. Just as in the medical practice of vaccinating the individual body, so the immunization of the political body functions similarly, introducing within

it a fragment of the same pathogen from which it wants to protect itself, by blocking and contradicting natural development. (Esposito 2008, p. 46)

Drawing from Esposito's '*Immunitas*': *Protezione e Negazione della Vita* (2002) and *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy* (2008), I argue that immunity is a counter-force that prevents another force from manifesting itself. It distinguishes and differentiates certain subjects or communities from others in that it frees or dispenses the selected few from obligations and dangers that concern everyone else within the same community. It is a condition of 'particularity' but also privilege, as it is not shared with everyone in the community [my translation] (Esposito 2002, pp. 7-10).

The elevation of the modern community (that is, forceful introduction of a new colonial order) is intertwined with immunity. It effectively 'reverses' the logic of *communitas* when considering relations with Indigenous lives and sovereignties:

Communitas is that relation which in binding its members to an obligation of reciprocal donation, jeopardizes individual identity, *immunitas* is the condition of dispensation from such an obligation and therefore the defence against the expropriating features of *communitas* ...

... the concept of immunization presupposes that which it also negates. Not only does it appears to be derived logically, but it also appears to be internally inhabited by its opposite. (Esposito 2008, pp. 50-51)

This means that with 'immunity' there always is a presupposition of the presence of a threat within the body politics of the communal. Although Esposito's (2008) work does not engage directly with raciality and indeed ignores altogether colonial processes constitutive of the (European) modernity, I would argue that immunity is present within colonial sovereign relations of Australia. In Tasmania, it produces the twofold effect of dispensing colonial settlers from any obligations to Indigenous

populations. Immunity enacts raciality in that it produces the mechanism that sanctions killing under the guise of self-preservation and determination. For the purpose of this thesis, immunity is also linked to the attempt to internalise, that is to localise Indigenous populations within the body-politic of colonial governmentality (the colonial communal) in ways that their sovereign politics in its plurality remains inchoate. That is, as affectable by nature and always understood as criminal, dangerous and as enmity.

As I will argue in the chapter, colonialisation rests on the elevation of governmental technologies that operate as internal apparatuses such as the camp and imprisonment and various forms of institutionalisation. Such apparatus immunises the self-determination of white political sovereign lives by establishing, in Suvendrini Perera's words, 'a hierarchy of belonging and entitlement' that situates white sovereign politics as one that is 'derived and asserted in relation to its multiple racial others' (see Perera 2005, p. 31). A necropolitics (Mbembe 2003) that produces the transformation and obliteration of defined 'racial others'. Death has already been instituted by raciality as a possibility attached to coloniality so that the camp and prisons, albeit differently, are zones of exception that operate as bio-technologies and as necropolitical spaces that attempt to intervene directly onto the Indigenous sovereign bodies and effect the obliteration of political sovereignties.

I argue in this chapter that in Tasmania the (biopolitical) transformation of political life emerges as part of colonial practice. This is visible in the colonial treatment of Indigenous lives, political sovereignties, law-keeping practices and future cultural productions such as newspapers. For example, *The Flinders Island Chronicle* was written in the English language and is often discussed as the first paper in Australia that was produced by Indigenous people from 1836-1837. This was produced in the so-called 'Friendly Mission' or the Wybalenna Camp of Flinders Island (see Langton 1996; Rose 1996, p. xxix). The newspaper, understood in colonial terms, was an attempt to transform what Achille Mbembe (2003, p. 26) calls 'a large reservoir of cultural imaginaries' so as to 'g[i]ve meaning to the enactment of differential rights to different categories of people for different purposes within the same space'. In this sense, this newspaper was part of the analytics of raciality that participated in the creation of cultural imaginaries that would transform existing political meanings on the violent colonial territorialisation of Tasmania, the anti-colonial wars and struggles that preceded and continued even after Wybalenna (see Ryan 1996; Reynolds 2004). Like the Wybalenna Camp, the newspaper worked as another technology of violent colonial dispossession and forced banishment from homelands. As a biotechnology, it was designed to obliterate Indigenous sovereign politics and to establish what Jenny Edkins et al. (1999, p. 7) calls 'complicity' in the creation of legitimacy for white colonial sovereignty.

As I demonstrate below, this newspaper becomes in Michel de Certeau's (1988) terms, a 'tactical' formation that enacts an anti-colonial politics present within the Wybalenna camp itself. This also leads to my proposition that Indigenous and non-Indigenous sovereignties are operative in the context of the newspapers under consideration. As they circulate within the border zone of the Wybalenna camp itself, the newspapers becomes a part of what Prem Rajaram and Carl Grundy-Warr (2007, p. x) call 'borderscapes' or 'mobile, perspectival and relational' formations that can produce points of entry into sovereign politics but also points of exit from hegemonic relations. The camp, in effect, becomes also a productive border zone where the 'multiplicity and chaos of the universal and the discomfits and possibilities of the body intrude ... [T]he term borderscapes ... indicate[s] the complexity and vitality of, and at, the border' (Rajaram & Gryndy-Warr 2007, p.x).

This chapter is principally concerned with drawing attention to anti-colonial sovereign struggles, as form of sovereignty, as they are evidenced within the newspapers. Indigenous sovereignties are treated here as ongoing, diverse, local, historically connected and embodied relations (see Watson 2007a; Birch 2007; Bunda 2007; Moreton-Robinson 2007). Following Aileen Moreton-Robinson's argument, Indigenous sovereignties are understood as:

Embodied, it is ontological (our being) and epistemological (our way of knowing), and is grounded within complex relations derived from the intersubstantiation of ancestral beings, humans and land. In this sense our sovereignty is carried by the body and differs from Western constructions of sovereignty, which are predicated on the social contract model, the idea of a unified supreme authority, territorial integrity and individual rights. (2007, p. 2)

These embodied, ontological and epistemological relationships to ancestral beings, humans and land also speak of ongoing historical configurations of Indigenous sovereignties that are marked by anti-colonial struggles: it is the latter that I will address here.

Raciality and Immunity

Past and recent debates have attempted to either silence or question the extent of the racial violence perpetrated against Indigenous populations in Tasmania.¹ Many critical historical questions have been asked about the level of racial violence that circulated in colonial Tasmania,² including the role of the colonial authorities and the types of collisions (killings and massacres) that were conducted in that period. Rather than re-open this existing discussion, however, I want to draw back from these debates in order to ask: How did the colonial settlers and the colonial state itself come to encompass a (sovereign) politics of racial violence that assumed its necessity? More specifically, I want to follow the question that da Silva (2007 p. xii) asks when considering the ‘fall of another black body’: ‘*Why kill me?*’ ‘*Why me?*’ This question, I would argue, has an affinity with my overall project of beginning to mark the discontinuous trajectories of ‘sovereign-politicals’ in Australia and their troubled relation to a colonial raciality that enacts technologies of (racial) obliteration and banishment through imprisonment and the camp.

¹ See discussion on this historical silence since the mid-1830s by Ryan 2008; 2010, pp. 39-50; also for recent dispute over existing evidence see Windschuttle (2002); Manne (2003).

² For example, see existing debates about the genocidal nature of the killings by Behrendt, 2001; Moses, 2004, 2008; Breen, 2011.

Da Silva's (2007) question effectively points out the 'knowledge apparatus' and 'scientific tools of racial knowledge' that have produced racial violence. That is, she draws attention to a 'political symbolic' order that, I would argue, is invested in the colonial biopolitical 'transformation' and necropolitical obliteration of Indigenous people political. Raciality is 'the assertion of an onto-epistemological' colonial order that is guided by the necessity to sustain the 'self-determination' of the white sovereign subject:

The tools of nineteenth century scientific projects of knowledge produced the notion of the racial, which institutes the global as an onto-epistemological context- a productive and violent gesture necessary to sustain the post Enlightenment version of the Subject as the sole self-determined thing ... This demonstrates how the knowledge arsenal, which now governs the global (juridic, economic, and moral) configuration, institutes racial subjection as it presupposes and postulates that the elimination of its others is necessary for the realization of the subject's exclusive ethical attributes, namely self-determination. (da Silva 2007, pp. xii-xiii)

Empire building and colonial occupation in effect were long informed and produced by a western onto-epistemological order that enacted a politics based on the instrumentality of violent racial tools.

European colonists were embodying what da Silva (2007) calls the 'analytics of raciality'. Da Silva explains that this is produced by the unfolding of reason as the (universal) productive regulator of the modern subject interiority and exteriority as expounded, to name but a few key philosophical figures and terms, by Kant's Formality (Universal *Nomos*) and Hegel's transformation of universal reason into Spirit (Transcendental-Poesis). The re-writing of reason as a transcendental force

(Transcendental-Poesis) is seen as setting up:

The merging of universal reason's regulative and productive powers [that] writes the scene of engulfment, where exteriority is not only rendered onto-epistemologically irrelevant but, because already a moment of transcendental productive force, it also becomes product and effect, the stuff without which 'Spirit' cannot fulfil its essentiality. (da Silva 2007, p. 99)

Joseph Pugliese suggests that Hegel's dialectic on the 'Sprit of Civilisation' and 'Reason' operates as forceful mandates for colonial expansion. This dialectic sanctions the State's physical and ontologising forms of violence:

Reason compels the expansion and consolidation of empire, simultaneously as the spirit of 'civilization' sanctions the multiple instrumentalities by which colonial empires deploy violence ... And it is through the State that the colonial apparatuses of governance – including military, the law, the bureaucracy, and so on – will proceed to maintain and reproduce their expropriative economic regimes. (Pugliese 1994, p. 166)

Hegelian dialectics, for Pugliese (1994, p. 167), re-configure colonial and empire building desires even as they are underpinned by the epistemology of race as 'doomed races, inferior in all aspects, still abiding to their natural condition of rudeness and barbarism'.

The political, here, then becomes an expression of the universal 'racial'. This is positioned not only in opposition to an 'externality' that is re-imagined as occupied by Indigenous people, but also as being based on the production of the obliteration of their existing political/sovereign internalities and lives:

I hope my critique of modern representation demonstrates that the political force of the racial resides in the fact it consistently (re)produces the founding modern ontological statement. Each deployment of the racial consistently articulates man's unique attribute, self-determination, as each brings into existence, and disavows, that which signifies "other"-wise, announcing its necessary elimination. (da Silva 2007, p. xiv)

This postulates that the political force of the racial is immersed in the elimination of Indigenous populations located ‘in exteriority’, that is, without their own autonomous sovereign laws. This obliteration is necessary for the full realisation of the exclusive Eurocentric ethical attributes, namely self-determination. This onto-epistemological order creates the (self) determination (that is, freedom) of white colonists as being guided by ‘universal reason’ and by ‘scientific’ knowledge. Further, it is asserted in the form of western-based politics, religion, or the law, economy, morality and other cultural productions whose expansion not only sanctions violence but makes killing a recurrent practice.

There is also the unfolding of an onto-epistemological order where the supremacy of European reason is informed and justified by the racial knowledge of the Natural Sciences of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and of the ‘Man and Society’ (that is, Anthropology, Sociology) of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As da Silva argues, raciality is part of scientific accounts that reproduce the philosophical ‘scene of engulfment’ attached to universal rationality that:

Presumes that the post-Enlightenment European space constitutes the moment of transparency ... the perfect actualization-exteriorization of universal reason, they locate it at the top of the classificatory schema they produce ... Cuvier’s law of condition of existence and Darwin’s principle of natural selection enabled signifying strategies that produce the human bodies, social configurations, and the global itself as expression of the law of nature without displacing the ruling principle of transcendentalism; that is, how they ensure the (re)placing of the transparent I within the spatial-temporal boundaries of post-Enlightenment Europe ... the analytics of raciality once again postpones the threat of *affectability*, outer determination, by writing post-Enlightenment European bodies and social configurations as the sole signifiers of actualised universal reason, that is, as the “original” place of the emergence of the transparent I. (2007, pp. 100-101)

Prior to the colonisation of Tasmania, Cuvier's comparative anatomy was already entrenched in the configuration of 'racial inequality and hierarchy as immutable products of physical organization' (Douglas 2008, p. 46). Cuvier's science strongly encouraged the idea of travelling abroad to collect and compare 'specimens' and to create racial taxonomies based on global geographies of origin and modes of existence. These specimens would serve to produce evidence of 'racial types' for identifying and distinguishing human collectives (Douglas 2008, p. 46; da Silva 2011, p. 144). Most importantly, it also cultivated disciplinary knowledge that provided 'racial tools' and, in turn, produced the colonial territorialisation and re-configuration of the existing imaginings of Tasmania as a space and its people (see Perera 2010).

Cuvier's science linked the measurement of anatomical features to intellectual and moral behaviour. The recent investigation of the reciprocal significance of Oceania for the science of race and of racial thinking during the two centuries after 1750 by Bronwen Douglas demonstrates that Cuvier:

instructed impending voyagers to seek empirical confirmation of the undoubtedly marked differences between the 'races of the human species' in certain key anatomical features: 'the proportion of the cranium to the face [cranio-facial ratio], the projection of the muzzle [facial angle], the breadth of the cheekbones, the shape of the eye-sockets'. These 'diverse structures', moreover, appeared to have significant 'influence' on the 'moral and intellectual faculties' of races. By 1817 (1817, p. 273), he was drawing an unequivocal nexus between the size of 'the skull and the brain' and a purported 'cruel law' (of nature) which had 'condemned to eternal inferiority the races with depressed and compressed skulls. (2008, p. 46)

This knowledge production came to constitute a disciplinary technology that asserted a eurocentric and supremacist 'normative knowledge' that

participated in the inferiorisation and obliteration of First Nations Populations, including ‘intellectual traditions and knowledge transmission’ (Rigney 2001, p. 4). As Lester-Irabinna Rigney (2001) notes in his analysis of the history of Western science in Australia, ‘race’ theories laid a firm foundation for determining whose knowledge was valid and whose science was legitimate. It determined who could do science and who could be a scientist (Rigney 2001, p. 4).

Ian Anderson (1994, p. 10) also argues that invading colonisers not only dispossessed Indigenous people, they also ‘created’ certain knowledge that controlled their lives. The multiple Indigenous communities that lived in Tasmania came to be unified and homogenised as ‘less pleasant’ than the people of the continent. Through this knowledge, they were discussed as ‘the brutes’ and the most inferior of all human races or species, ‘uncivilisable,’ and doomed to imminent extinction (Douglas 2008, pp. xii-xiii; Anderson 2002, p. 187). Lynette Russell (2001, p. 41) also discusses the ways the representation of ‘Australian Aboriginal’ culture in British and European museums included their depiction as a fierce and hostile people and, in so doing, legitimated violent colonial intervention. Disciplinary knowledge, based in ‘science,’ effectively produced justification for colonial violence of this period. It continually implied that Indigenous populations were sub-humans, affectable by nature and living outside the rational orders of ‘morality’ and the law celebrated by Kant and Hegel. This constituted a form of racial violence that ignored the ways Indigenous people, as sovereign communities, were defending themselves

and performing law-keeping practices and sovereignties. As a result of this exercise of raciality, Indigenous sovereign struggles and laws were ontologically resolved as the actions of ‘savage tribes’, ‘menace’, ‘violent’, ‘immoral’ or in Moreton-Robinson’s (2004b) words as that of ‘sub-humans’ and, most importantly, as without the political sovereignty attributed to the opposite camp, that is, to the white colonists.

Social Darwinism

When Darwin’s theories on evolution widespread circulation, they were soon applied to the notion of a ‘doomed race’. The book *‘On the Origins of Species’* (1859) proclaimed in its introduction that:

As many more individuals of each species are born than can possibly survive; and as, consequently, there is a frequently recurring struggle for existence, it follows that any being, if it vary however slightly in any manner profitable to itself, under the complex and sometimes varying conditions of life, will have a better chance of surviving, and thus be naturally selected. From the strong principle of inheritance, any selected variety will tend to propagate its new and modified form.

... we shall then see how Natural Selection almost inevitably causes much Extinction of the less improved forms of life and induces what I have called Divergence of Character. (Darwin 1859, n.p.)

The influence and availability of this knowledge effectively re-configured Indigenous populations as ‘naturally’ inferior, due to what were perceived to be ‘natural’ mechanisms of natural selection and poor genetic make up. Overall, this knowledge re-imagined Indigenous people as a ‘race’ of the ‘lowest level of culture’ incapable of surviving the trajectory of historical progress lead by the ‘white race’. As da Silva argues (2011, p. 143), ‘nature’ is perceived to have ‘produced the human body independently of the determination of the human will’ and within its ‘affectability’ it produces death and extinction. She continues: ‘that is, it would render

colonialism and slavery irrelevant in the understanding of human collectives' conditions of existence' and thus it worked to erase the violent colonial histories of dispossession, fighting, killings and massacres (da Silva 2011, p. 143). In places such as Tasmania, this ignored the violent effects of the colonial wars and exempted from prosecution anyone that had participated in the killings of Indigenous people. In his reading of Darwin's later work *Descent of Man and Selection in relation to Sex* (1871) Warwick Anderson sums its main argument noting that the:

Rise of civilization, even in its meagre indigenous forms, meant natural selection had virtually ceased to operate on the races, which therefore became fixed – or at least insignificant variant – stuck at whenever stage their ecological niche had permitted. From careful scrutiny of contemporary types, one might therefore derive ancestral forms ... Aborigines came to represent the past of advanced Europeans. (2002, p.189)

When enmeshed with Hegel's historical trajectory achievable through the violence of colonialism (Pugliese 1994, p. 167), the propensity of this 'Western superiority produces the 'engulfment' or an onto-epistemological raciality that imagined Indigenous people as representing 'the past of Europeans' or that 'the White race seemed destined not to absorb but exterminate the Blacks of Australia' (cited in Anderson 2002, pp. 189-190).

Social Darwinism, in its multiple applications and across various disciplines, becomes a powerful colonial technology that conducts the governance of modern Australia. As Douglas' overview shows, this knowledge in its variations became an intrinsic part of the very fabric of the Australian colonies and nation-state after Federation:

After 1860, the hoary conflict between monogenists and polygenists was

partially resolved or superseded with the application of evolutionist theory to man. Evolutionism yoked very long-run adaptation to milieus with heredity to explain human speciation and seemed to confirm the thesis of inevitable disappearance of Darwin's less 'favoured races in the struggle for life'. Darwinism's empirical debt to Oceania is patent in the biographies of Darwin himself and of Wallace and Huxley, each of whom undertook formative fieldwork in the region and later pronounced authoritatively on the certainty of racial extinctions. With respect to extinctions, as with the related, equally emotive theme of interracial coitus, the science of race anticipated, imbibed, informed, and at times violated popular, especially colonial attitudes which resonated with longstanding scientific disputes about hybrids as the key signifiers of specific boundaries and as racially regenerative or transgressive. Such intersections of science and public opinion were invincibly racialised: even celebrations of 'hybrid vigour' usually took for granted the attenuation or disappearance of the 'lower' indigenous element; while in Australia in the 1930s, hybridity was arguably promoted as a eugenicist vehicle for racial extinction of Aborigines, since the official policy of assimilation envisaged 'breeding out the colour' of the expanding half-caste population — ironically, in the teeth of much popular disapproval of miscegenation on racist grounds. (2008, p. xiii)

The diffusion of this 'disciplinary' knowledge came to inform and produce new violent tools of raciality that were to be embodied in the design and implementation of colonial policies and practices for years to come. Colonial imaginings of 'authentic Aboriginal people', as Ian Anderson (1994, p. 11) remarks, would place them 'outside' the trajectory of European history, either at its very end as 'dying race,' including Trugernanner and William Lanne, or as 'out of its end' as the 'descendants' and/or as 'hybrid' subjects.

The racial governance produced by the 'white sovereign' ultimately determined the right over the life and death of Indigenous people. The local Royal Society of Tasmania itself, with the support of the colonial Government of Tasmania, went against the direct wishes of Trugernanner that for her body not to be exhumed. As Ryan and Smith (1976, n.p) note, Truhernanner had told Rev. H. D. Atkinson 'I know that when I die the

Museum wants my body'. And indeed, as Anderson notes, this was to be the case:

When Trugernanner was buried in 1876 the Royal Society was again hovering for a corpse. Their requests were denied by the colonial government until 1878 when her body was exhumed, on the condition that her remains not be exposed to public view. Trugernanner's skeleton was displayed in the Royal Society of Tasmania museum from 1904 until 1947- a totem of triumphant colonialism. The displayed skeleton, and the historical figure of Truggernanna has been embellished with a potent discourse of extinction. As a colonial symbol Trugernanne signifies the land empty, and declares the colonial period over. (1994, p. 10)

The death of Indigenous people and the location of their burial grounds effectively became part of a key trade business for the emerging professional scientists, numerous 'societies of men' and museums seeking skeletons. In this regard, Ian Anderson (1994) and, especially, Helen MacDonald (2005) produce an intricate and detailed account of colonists' involvement in collecting and/or procuring the bodies or body parts of deceased Indigenous people in Tasmania. MacDonald writes:

In the political economy of bone collecting, Tasmanian skeletal material was highly prized. British medical men had been gathering Tasmanian bones since 1804, when several Tasmanians were shot at Risdon Cove. The penal settlement's surgeon, Jacob Mountgarrett, gathered up one body, which he preserved and sent in a barrel to Port Jackson. By mid-century there was some urgency to the quest, for it was believed the Tasmanians would soon be extinct. (2005, p. X)

MacDonald continues her analysis by providing a detailed list of some of the British collectors and institutions seeking and receiving bodies of deceased 'Aboriginal people'. This includes Doctor Joseph Barnard Davis, who is claimed to have had the 'largest collection of human bones,' and William Flower, from the Conservator of the Hunterian Museum and the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. Interestingly, Davis came to own the collection of the once named 'Conciliator', George

Augustus Robinson who will be discussed later in this chapter. As MacDonald remarks:

When he travelled back to England ... had taken with him a collection of skeletal material, which Davis subsequently purchased from his estate in 1867 ... [Davis] charged Robinson with holding what he considered to be futile conviction that the Tasmanians could be civilized and converted to Christianity. (2005, p. 128)

Although it is unclear if – and to what extent – Robinson may have participated in the trading of deceased bodies of Indigenous people, his extensive recorded knowledge of where these people died and ultimately were buried in Flinders Island, and his skeletal collection in Britain and Davis's later ownership of his collection, demonstrate the normalisation of this expropriative colonial activity.

In Tasmania, it is certain that key colonial figures and institutions such as Morton Allport, a Fellow of the Tasmanian Royal Society, and William Lodewyk Crowther, a surgeon from General Hospital in Hobart, worked to procure the skeletons for overseas buyers. They benefited from their positions and local contacts including people like the supervisor of Oyster Cove, John Dandridge, and the medical attendant of Flinders Island, Joseph Milligan, who knew when Indigenous people died and where the bodies had been buried. Ultimately they worked to serve the discipline of science by procuring bodies of the deceased (MacDonald 2005, p. 108). Oyster Cave, Flinders Island and other unmarked spaces, as I will demonstrate, not only served as sites of conflict, dispossession, imprisonment and death but also became part of a colonial imaginary that now marked them as zones where the deceased could be exhumed, resumed and displaced. In the west, as Pugliese (2010a, p. 34) argues, they

became ‘non-white bodies’ that could be ‘trafficked’ and ‘productively put to service the epistemic economies of western medicine and science’.

Racial Violence

A key element of my argument throughout this chapter is that colonial expansion and settler colonialism in Van Diemen’s Land was constituted by a raciality that rested on the obliteration of Indigenous political sovereignties and lives. Colonial sovereignty enacted raciality and produced ongoing exemption from responsibility to Indigenous populations and individual lives. The colonial order was established via an ‘arsenal of raciality’ that postulated Australia as a ‘post-Enlightenment European space [that] constitute[d] the moment of transparency’ (da Silva 2007, p. 100). This was the result of ‘strategies of engulfment [that] transform[ed]’ that which was set up as exterior and as open to the outer-determination of European bodies and their social configurations, perceived as the sole signifiers of actualised universal reason (da Silva 2007, pp. 100-101). This arsenal of raciality, formally or informally, rendered invisible Indigenous law and political sovereignties and, more to the point, worked towards their obliteration. In this sense, the colonial state and law are configured by a European onto-epistemological order of knowledge and its principles of political, moral, juridical universality that both predicated and unleashed racial violence.

Colonial racial politics comes to be based on biopolitical and necropolitical mechanisms that conducted the occupation of physical geographical areas.

These mechanisms were involved in re-writing on the ground a new set of social and spatial relations that, in Mbembe words, are:

Ultimately tantamount to the production of boundaries and hierarchies, zones and enclaves; the subversion of existing property arrangements; the classification of people according to different categories; resource extraction; and, finally, the manufacturing of a large reservoir of cultural imaginaries. (2003, p. 26)

This re-writing is a process of territorialisation, or the process of ‘re-ordering’ existing relations under the auspices ‘of Australia as an Island-nation’ with a colonial interiority. As Perera (2009, p. 2) stresses, territorialization ‘discloses strains of terror’ and becomes ‘the product of violent technologies of ordering and acts of emplacement’. The formation of a colonial interiority within Tasmania rested on the affirmation of *terra nullius* through the violent territorialization of land by colonial settlers who imposed ‘exclusion and erasure’ (Perera 2009, p. 2). The so-called Settled Districts were territorialised as the spaces of new ‘residents’, and rested on the dislocation of local Indigenous people as outsiders within their own countries. Colonial knowledge defined Aboriginal people as ‘wander[ing] over extensive tracts of country, without cultivating or occupying any portion and making continual predatory incursions’ (Colonel George Arthur cited in House of Commons Papers 1828, p. 259),³ thus creating a necessity for violent intervention.

Chris Cunneen (2001, p. 53) also argues that when the British arrived in Australia, ‘legal ambiguities’ around the status of ‘Aboriginal’ people as British subjects was partly linked to the territorial arrangements. But the

³ Comment made by Colonel George Arthur on the 15th of April 1828 and cited in the corresponding House of Commons Papers.

events in the colony of Tasmania speak more to a lack of legal support for local First Nations Peoples and colonial exemption from prosecuting the crimes against them. This legal ambiguity, however, is linked to whether Indigenous people, as sovereign subjects in their plurality, wished to be British subjects. It is impossible to ignore that citizenship, or 'becoming' British subjects, always rested on Indigenous dispossession and a raciality that assumed the 'obliteration' of pre-existing sovereignties and laws. This raises the question of: what does it mean to receive protection from a colonial regime that culturally imagines and rests on the necropolitical possibility of your death?

Indigenous and non-Indigenous local histories painstakingly indicate that the use of colonial violence paralleled the growing dispossession of the First Nations peoples within the territory of Oyster Bay. (see Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre 2010; Thomas dir. *'Black Man's Houses'* 1992; Ryan 2008). These histories have identified ten bands living within this territory: Big River people with an estimated five bands, Ben Lomond people with around three bands and Northern Midlands people with known four bands that included an area 'along the rivers on the Eastern Midland Plain between Hobart and Launceston, along the Tamar River north from Launceston, along the East Coast at Oyster Bay and along the Meander River west from Launceston' (Ryan 2008, p. 8). The kidnapping, killings and massacres of Indigenous people had been common in Tasmania since at least since 1803, in other words, for much longer than it has been formally acknowledged (Ryan 2008). The *Draft History Report* from the

Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre combines a number of histories on the early encounters of the Oyster Bay people that indicate that they were marked by a massacre and kidnapping from soldiers:

Close to the early settlement at Hobart, and the fertility of their country making it desirable agriculture land, Oyster Bay people were drastically affected by colonisation almost immediately. The first recorded massacre took place in the country of the Mumirimina at Risdon Cove in 1804, when soldiers fired on a large group hunting kangaroos which included many women and children. An orphaned boy was kidnapped after the massacre, one of the first known children to be stolen by whites. An eye witness reported “... *the natives were driven from their homes afterwards and their women and children were taken from them by stock keepers.*” Their fires were not seen in the area after 1808. The best southern kangaroo hunting grounds were in Oyster Bay territory. With severe food shortages in the early colony, Europeans hunted kangaroo in increasing competition with Aborigines. By 1808, 100 Aborigines and Europeans had been killed in conflicts over hunting grounds [White 1830, HRA 3; Boyce 2004, pp. 45-47; Ryan 1999, p. 75, p. 77]. (cited in Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre 2010, p. 3)

Shayne Breen (2011) and Ryan (2008) provide detailed records of the names and the broad range of occupational rankings of authorities and settlers in Van Damien’s Land that were involved in racial violence and organised the killings, massacres and kidnappings of local Indigenous people. Amongst these names, we not only see officials of military parties or troops, but also soldiers, field police officers, private rowing parties, exploring parties, free settlers, convicts, sealers, stock keepers, hunters, bushrangers, medical officers and more. Breen also provides a broad survey of the ways ‘Aboriginal people were killed’ since 1803 and argues that this violence took the shape of:

- abductions and enslavement of women and children;
- as responses to Aboriginal disputes over trespassing or bad treatment;
- as part of colonists reprisals against Aboriginal attacks;
- as random or routine killings;
- as pursuit-killings which occurred especially during the war in 1827, often with no provocation, and often as a form of sport. (2011, pp.81-83)

These killings escalated in the 1820s as the British settler colony expanded. Dispossession, conflict and organised anti-colonial fighting grew. Ryan (2008) demonstrates that massacres of six or more local Indigenous populations were ongoing, with at least twenty-eight massacres occurring between 1823 and 1828 alone. In his comparative study between California and Tasmania, Benjamin Madley (2012, p. 113) also shows that these two colonial spaces came to share massacres as part of congruent strategies that included night reconnaissance and envelopment, long-range small arms barrage at nights, dawn close-range attacks and executionary non-combatant killing. These massacres per se were perfected during the Black Wars as the colonial knowledge of the internal land and the habits of local Indigenous people grew. This knowledge was used to kill many combatant and non-combatant Indigenous people as the support for this violence not only grew, but was also legitimated by the colonial state. The introduction of laws that aimed ‘to quell’ Indigenous uprising and expedited their forced removal and dispossession in ways that obliged Indigenous people to comply to a colonial force that was ready to annihilate their cultural existence or capacity to exist as autonomous sovereign cultures (Madley 2012, p. 113).

The colonial authorities maintained that they had done all they could do to ‘protect’ Indigenous communities existence and from death and other violent crimes. A number of decrees and protection notices were posted by colonial government from 1810 to 1819 that represented the kidnapping and killings as ‘regrettable’ lawless violent actions, thus attempting to

distance the establishment of a 'colonial order' from these acts (Ryan 2008). Since 1810 the colonial authorities had responded to selected occurrences that it termed as the 'routine killings of Aborigines' and expressed 'utter indignation and abhorrence,' and the recognition that 'the resentment of these poor uncultivated beings [that] has been justly excited by a most barbarous and inhuman mode of proceeding acted upon towards them, viz. the robbery of their children!' (decrees of 1810 and 1813 as cited by Ryan 2008, pp. 5-6). In other words, this violence was perceived as conducted by 'Miscreants', that is, lawless subjects, outside the 'humanity' and guidance of colonial British Law and against racially interiorised and defenceless people. But, aware or not, the colonial governments never actually prosecuted anyone for these crimes, and more to the point, from 1826 they officially came to visibly embody and sanction forms of colonial violence over Indigenous people, including their killing.

In Tasmania (or Van Damien Land) the Oyster Bay people, Big River people, Ben Lomond and Northern Midlands people, fought hard against racial violence and dispossession between 1824 and 1831 (see Reynolds 2004; Ryan 2008, p. 8). They waged a war against the settlers that intensified to the point that the authorities had to consider the option of leaving the colony (Breen 2011). In 1831, Oyster Bay Chief Tukulunginta told Captain Robinson that the:

Reason for their outrages upon the white inhabitants [was] that they and their fore fathers had been cruelly abused, that their country had been taken away from them, their wives and daughters had been violated and taken away, and that they had experienced a multitude of wrongs from a variety of sources. (Ryan 1996, pp. 121-122)

Madley (2004) also summarises that recorded Aboriginal statements such as ‘Go away you white buggars, what business have you here!’ and suggests that these warriors attacked in order to either drive the British off the island or to bring them to the negotiating table. Henry Reynolds (1995) suggests that ‘Aboriginal Tasmanians’ sought negotiations and argues that the ‘exile’ to Flinders Island was not due to defeat and certainly not to the ceding of sovereignty.

This ‘exile’ was part of political negotiations and a treaty that the colonial government failed to honour. The 1847 petition against the return of Superintendent Dr Henry Jeanneret to Flinders Island (also discussed later on in the chapter) demonstrates this premise. It was organised by the survivors of the Wybalenna Camp, including George Arthur (to whom I will return), John Allen, Davey Bruny, Neptune, King Alexander, Augustus, King Tippo and Washington. This petition establishes that there had been an agreement struck between the local Indigenous populations and Captain Robinson and Governor Arthur that had not been upheld (Reynolds 1995; 2004). The petition stated the following:

The humble petition of the free Aborigines Inhabitants of Van Damien’s Land now living upon Flinders Island ... That we are your free children that we were not taken prisoners but freely gave up our country then the Governor after defending ourselves.

Your petitioners humbly state to your Majesty that Mr Robinson made for us and with Colonel Arthur an agreement, which we have not lost from our minds since and we have made our part of it good.

Your petitioners humbly tell Your Majesty that when we left our own place we were plenty of people, we are now but a little one ...

Your Majesty’s petitioners pray that you will not allow Dr Jeanneret to come again among us ... he used to carry pistols in his pockets and threatened very often to shoot us ...

Signed by:
Walter G. Arthur- Chief of the Ben Lomond Tribe
John Allen
Davey Bruny
Neptune
King Alexander
Augustus
King tippo
Washington. (1847 cited in Reynolds 1995, pp. 7-9)

This not only indicates political agency in the demand for the right to be treated with respect; but it also shows that, as sovereign subjects, believed their stay on Flinders Island would be temporary. But their expectation that they would return to their homelands had not been met. As Reynolds (1995, p. 159) identifies, it also represents a change in perceptions of ‘Aboriginal’ survivors of the Black Wars and Wybalenna Camp about what was possible as the treaty or agreement ‘left them with a legacy of political rights’. They had met their part of their agreement and now expected the colonial government to do likewise (Reynolds 2004; Haebich 2000, p. 119). In addition, the petition’s reference to the great loss of lives for me implies that this demand upholds an effective and embodied form of sovereign politics. In the face of attempts to create a colonial amnesia over these deaths, it visibilises the loss of lives and, in doing so, it responds directly to raciality by confronting it with the suffering and death that it had created (see Ryan 2010).

Historian James Boyce (2010, p. 54) cites the tenacity of the fighters across the District Areas. He argues that it is reflected in the casualty figures of 187 whites being killed and 211 wounded between 1824 and 1831 alone. Ryan argues that various tactics were used in the attacks:

The Big River people developed the tactic of burning the huts in retaliation for the failure of settlers and stock keepers to conform to Aboriginal arrangements ... they would take provisions out of the hut ... The Oyster Bay people preferred to raid the hut while the occupant was inside and intimidate him into handing over provisions. The North people preferred to kill the occupant in the hut first, then take the provisions. By 1830 all variations of attacks had become common to all groups. (1981, p. 115)

The Big River and Oyster Bay people fought together as ongoing allies. Both Reynolds (1995) and Madley (2004) name these fighters as enacting a form of guerrilla warfare; in particular, Madley argues that it was not recognized by western models of military training that struggled to win against their tactics. In 1829 Lieutenant Governor Arthur classified these actions as ‘most distressing’ and outside the military tactics known to him:

The species of warfare which we are carrying on with them is of the most distressing nature; they suddenly appear, commit some act of outrage and then as suddenly vanish: if pursued it seems impossible to surround and capture them. (Watson 1922 cited in Madley 2004, p. 173)

This enemy in western colonial terms was not perceived to be an equal political/sovereign fighter and their warfare systems were not comprehended by European-based military traditions.

There was ‘recognition’ that local fighters had been angered by white settlers, but no references were made to the fighters’ demands for their withdrawal from their lands and negotiations over access to resources. Transnational and local sovereign politics oscillated between seemingly wanting to protect Indigenous lives versus allowing forceful measures. The Colonial Office in Britain sanctioned the use of force whenever required for their so-called ‘protection’ through civilizing, religious and educational technologies (see Reynolds 2004, p.131). In the establishment of colonial territoriality, racial violence is configured as a ‘necessity’ or as

the preferred onto-epistemological descriptor that writes self-determined settlers as distinct from the ‘affectable’ First Nations Populations, reduced, in da Silva’s (2007) terms, to ‘no bodies’.

The Interiority of Raciality

When forms of retaliation against white settlers visibly increases, colonial sovereignty proceeds to name the Big River, Oyster Bay and North Midlands warriors as ‘enemies’. The colonial state established new social terrains that constituted ‘the realm of the sovereign political’ through an onto-epistemological order that unified and embodied all Aboriginal people as ‘open enemies’ of the colony. This naming immunised the perpetrators of racial violence from legal sanctions. In 1826, following the alleged killing of eighteen colonists by Indigenous fighters, the government allowed the police magistrates to send out military detachments, assisted by armed settlers and their servants, in ‘active pursuit’ (Shaw as cited in Ryan 2008, p. 485). This marks the beginning of the second phase of the Black War that lasted two years, before the introduction of martial law (Ryan 2008, p. 485). Ryan (dispatch 1825 as cited by Ryan 2008, p. 485) cites correspondence that stated that the Aborigines who attacked settlers and their property should be opposed ‘by force, and to repel such Aggressions ... as if they proceeded from subjects of any accredited State’. This in effect is approximating Indigenous fighters to the status of state-sanctioned warriors or combatants. But this approximation is not clear in Lieutenant-Governor George Arthur’s Notice of 1826 (Colonial Secretary Office 29 November 1826), which argued that

he had done all that it was possible to ‘inculcate a spirit of forbearance’ towards Indigenous populations and declared that the resilient actions against colonial settlers now made them ‘open enemies’ of the colony itself:

1st If it should be apparent that there is a determination on the part of one or more of the native tribes to attack, rob, or murder the white inhabitant generally, any person may arm, and, joining themselves to the military, drive them by force to a safe distance, treating them as *open enemies*.

2nd If they are found actually attempting to commit a felony, they may be resisted by any person in like manner.

3rd Where they appear assembled in unusual numbers, or with unusual arms, or, although neither be unusual, if they evidently indicate such intention of employing force as is calculated to excite fear, for the purpose of doing any harm, short felony, to the persons and property of any one they may be treated as rioters, and be resisted if they persist in their attempt. ... (Colonial Secretary Office, 29 November 1826)

Here, the Lieutenant Governor by defining the warriors as open enemies negates acknowledging this fighting as a form of sovereign war.

The actions of these fighters are understood through an onto-epistemological order of raciality that relegates the warriors’ opposition outside rationality and within the realm of nature where ‘necessities’ reigns. As da Silva argues, raciality works here to:

Produce both the subject of ethical life, who the halls of law and forces of the state protect, and the subjects of *necessitas*, the racial subaltern subjects whose bodies and territories, the global present, have become places where the state deploys its forces of self-preservation. (2009, p. 225)

As such, the Notice unleashes a ‘racial violence’ that re-configures territorial relations threatened partly by the Big River, Oyster Bay, and the North Midlands, Ben Lomond warriors. They are defined as ‘creatures’ misguided by leaders who have been exposed to (superior) European intelligence only to create ‘open enemies’, ‘wanton and barbarous’,

‘savages’, ‘murderous’, ‘treacherous’ and ‘sanguinary acts’, ‘dangerous’ ‘crimes’, ‘aggressions’, ‘felonies’ and ‘rioters’. Ryan (2008, p. 485) also notes that the fighters were not ‘treated as common criminals’. In effect, rather, the notion of ‘open enemy’ rested on a violent arsenal of raciality that predicated that obliteration was necessary to create a ‘universal’ order. What must be added here is that even as ‘rioters,’ their ‘crimes’ are acknowledged as unified formations that threaten public order and property and, more to the point, resist the colonial authorities (Barker 2006, p. 21). As Kevin Barker (2006 p.21) points out, in criminal law, ‘rioters’ historically received imprisonment for life and jail terms; but through raciality these actions effectively, in Van Damien’s Land, became death sentences. Ryan’s research confirms that in this second phase of the conflict, the number of massacres and killings was high:

In the Settled Districts, more than 208 Aborigines, comprising men, women and children, were killed in 19 incidents, in 12 of which six or more were killed. My research has also found that 76 colonists were killed, mostly in ones and twos, and that except in one case where three women were killed, and in two others where children were killed, all the rest had been men. This tally produced an Aboriginal/colonial death ratio of nearly 3:1. (2008, p.485)

This violent resistance to authority drives the enforcement of state military violence or, through intervention and the enactment of forceful and armed dispersion, killings, long term imprisonment and the forced expulsion from zones of conflict.

The ‘open enemy’, in effect, is formally constituted as indistinguishable from mortal ‘enemies of the King’ in 1828 (Reynolds 1995, p. 11). The passing of martial law in 1828 enacted a colonial sovereign power that, with the state and the support of the judiciary, accorded the ‘military ...

the right to apprehend without warrant or to shoot on sight any Aboriginal found in the settled districts' (Reynolds 1995, p. 99). This racial violence consolidated the ontological and epistemological resolution that tied what it meant to be the Big River, Oyster Bay, North Midlands and Ben Lomond sovereigns to the colonial state and its laws: that is, as internal enemies that refuse to submit to colonial power. They become, in Mbembe's words:

a mortal threat or absolute danger whose biophysical elimination would strengthen my potential to life and security — this, I suggest, is one of the many imaginaries of sovereignty characteristic of both early and late modernity itself. (2003, p. 18)

This onto-epistemological resolution sees the violence of the colonial state and settlers as a 'necessary' norm in the preservation and the self-determination of colonial sovereign power. As declared by Lieutenant-Governor George Arthur in the Proclamation of 1 November 1828 (p. 27):

Whereas the Black or Aboriginal Natives of this Island have for a considerable time past, carried on a series of indiscriminate attacks upon the persons and property of divers of His Majesty's subjects: and have especially of late perpetrated most cruel and sanguinary acts of violence and outrage; evincing an evident disposition systematically to kill and destroy the white inhabitants indiscriminately whenever an opportunity of doing so is presented ...

And whereas also it seems at present impossible to conciliate the several tribes of that people; and the ordinary civil powers of the magistrates, and the means afforded by the common law, are found ... to be wholly insufficient for the general safety ... it hath therefore become at length unavoidable necessary for the effectual suppression of similar enormities, to proclaim and keep in force martial law ...

But I do nevertheless, hereby strictly order, enjoin and command that the actual use of arms be in no case resorted to if the Natives can by other means be induced or compelled to retire into the places...of this island herein before excepted from the operation of martial law...(George Arthur, A Proclamation 1 November 1828, House of Commons 1831).

This evokes an onto-epistemological order that suggests the elimination of the 'Black or Aboriginal Natives' is necessary for the (self-) protection of the colonial state and its (racialised) economic, legal and ethical attributes.

While this did not legitimate the killings of ‘non-combatants and children,’ it certainly did not stop or at any stage enable the persecution of those responsible for these very murders (Kercher as cited in Cunneen 2001, p. 60). Again, Ryan’s research shows that at least:

143 Aborigines were killed in the Settled Districts in 31 separate incidents in 11 of which six or more Aborigines had died. I also found that 75 settlers were killed in 53 separate incidents and that six were women and five were children. This tally produced an Aboriginal/colonial death ratio of about 2:1. (2008, p. 486)

I would argue, then, that martial law came to operate as part of an arsenal of raciality that established that the normalisation of colonial governmentality and that its self-determination was based on the sovereign decision to kill and suppress the fighters. More to the point, this necropolitics became part of governmental technologies that would enable (colonial) state sponsored mass-killings and the obliteration of racial enemies living within the colony with the support of roving and military parties. In this sense, as Mbembe (2003, p. 20) argues in his analysis of early modern thinkers like Hegel, ‘death and killing become the means of realizing the ‘telos of history’. This violence obliged Indigenous people, combatants or not, to comply with a colonial force that was ready to annihilate their cultural existence and their capacity to exist as autonomous sovereign cultures (Madley 2012, p. 113).

Mbembe’s theorisation of the establishment of the state of exception through martial law requires more critical consideration here. This is not in complete agreement with da Silva’s thesis on the pre-constitutive power of raciality, precisely as adopted in this thesis. What is important to note however, is that Mbembe moves away from the Eurocentric focus on the

concentration camp as the ‘most absolute zone for the biopolitical space’ (Agamben 1995, p.111). He provides a unique analysis that is, rather, centred on the colony itself as: ‘The location par excellence where the controls and guarantees of judicial order can be suspended - the zone where the violence of the state of exception is deemed to operate in the service of civilization’ (Mbembe 2003, p. 24).

Mbembe (2003, p. 24) also acknowledges the effects of early modern philosophical and political thought and European practices. These already imagined the colony as ‘ruled over in absolute lawlessness, stemmi[ng] from the racial denial of any common bond between the conqueror and the native’. So the colony is understood in Mbembe’s work as a racialised space that has a history and, further, was described as a frontier zone:

[The] frontiers ... [t]hey are inhabited by ‘savages’. The colonies are not organised in a state form and have not created a human world. Their armies do not form a distinct entity, and their wars are not wars between regular armies. They do not imply the mobilization of sovereign subjects (citizens) who respect each other as enemies. They do not establish a distinction between combatants and non-combatants, or again between an ‘enemy’ and a ‘criminal’. (Mbembe 2003, p. 24)

In Mbembe’s (2003) work, however, the focus remains on the ‘state of exception’ that defines the colonies. That is, they are envisaged as spaces that could be ruled permanently by the state of exception and as where ‘violence constituted the original form of the right and exception provided the structure of (colonial) sovereignty’ (Mbembe 2003, p. 25). Mbembe (2003, p. 22) is interested in the violence and the right to kill exercised within the state of exception (biopolitical intervention); specifically, on the way the (old) sovereign right to kill at any time (necropolitics) is exercised in the colony. In line with Agamben’s (1998) argument, the power to

suspend the law is understood as creating, in Mbembe's (2003, p. 12) words, 'a terror formation' and is marked by the politics of race and death, that is, by the combination of biopolitics and necropolitics. The centrality that Mbembe gives to the state of exception conflicts with the power of raciality as defined by da Silva. Drawing on three sources; Foucault biopolitics, Schmitt's definition of sovereignty as based on the right to decide on the state of exception, and Agamben's discussion of the camp as the locus of biopolitical production of 'bare life', Mbembe's analysis argues that the colonial sovereign declaration of martial law becomes part of the state of exception.

This position locates racialised lives outside the protection of the juridico-law, yet within its directives as 'bare lives'. After all, as Agamben explains when discussing the meaning of the exception, it is not simply a form of exclusion:

On the contrary, what is excluded in the exception maintains itself in relation to the rule in the form of the rule's suspension. *The rule applies to the exception in no longer applying, in with drawing from it.* The state of exception is thus not the chaos that precedes order but rather the situation that results from its suspension. In this sense, the exception is truly, according to its etymological root, taken *outside* (*ex-capere*), and not simply excluded...

Here what is outside is included not simply by means of an interdiction or an internment, but rather by means of the suspension of the juridical order's validity – by letting the juridical order, that is, withdraw from the exception and abandon it. The exception does not subtract itself from the rule; rather, the rule, suspending itself, gives rise to the exception and, maintaining itself in relation to the exception, first constitutes itself as a rule. (1998, pp. 17-18)

In effect, this analysis would propose that the production of the racial 'enemy' is based on a form of stripping legal and moral protections (that is what Agamben calls the 'ban' or a form of legal-juridico 'abandonment') in order to expose 'bare lives' to colonial sovereign terror within the settled

districts. I would argue, following da Silva's thesis as mentioned above, that this stripping occurs through martial law only insofar as it re-establishes the rejection and obliteration of the pre-existing sovereign authority and law of the local Indigenous people. The problem here, however, is that by adopting the notion of the state of exception, in effect, the pre-constitutive power of raciality is ignored altogether. On this point, I am in agreement with da Silva (2009) that the racial violence unleashed by the colonial state and the law did – and does not – require the state of exception or the enactment of the martial law itself to strip off the 'humanity' and 'rights' of Indigenous populations. The colonial state, the judiciary and law enforcement were already inscribed in the order of raciality that had defined them as 'non-humans', living in a vanishing state of nature without a worthwhile system of law and overall open to the 'affectability of nature' and their killing. As da Silva argues, raciality did 'its work because it is a referent of *Necessitas* [self-preservation], the ruler of the stage of exteriority' that: 'Produce[d] humanity, the *self-determined* political (ethical-juridical) figure that thrives in ethical life, only because it institutes it in a relationship - united/separated by the lines of the Classical table - with another political figure (the *affectable I*) that stands before the horizon of death'. (2009, p. 234)

So the colonial state and legal authorities had called upon martial law and enmity precisely because they were envisaged as performing a 'necessity' with a decisive forcefulness in the assertion of colonial sovereignty. Martial law allowed the urgent conditions of war and, in turn, created a united racial front against the Big River people, Oyster Bay people and the

North Midlands and Ben Lomond people that enforced the participation and support from all white settlers without, however, formally declaring this a sovereign war (that is, between equal states). This produced a universal colonial form of governmentality that configured the white sovereign (racial) authority of settlers over the lives of First Nations sovereigns.⁴

Martial law, and the organising of the Black Line, participates in an ontological resolution that ties the meaning of being 'human' to the constitution of a colonial state that can guarantee the new order. In 1830, Lieutenant-Governor George Arthur (1830, n.p.) again called for the organising of a 'massive arm sweep across the centre of the colony', or for the so-called Black Line, to eliminate 'the enemy' by either killing or capturing them and forcing their dislocation or banishment from their homelands. The Lieutenant Governor publicly called every settler to participate in the drive as he stated in the Hobart Town Gazette on the 10th of September (1830, n.p.):

It is vain to expect that the country can be freed from the incursions of the savage tribes, which now infest it, unless the Settlers themselves come forward, and zealously unite their best energies with those of the Government in making such a general, and simultaneous effort as the occasion demands. The Lieutenant Governor, therefore, calls upon every Settler, whether residing on his farm, or in a town, who is not prevented by some over-ruling necessity, cheerfully to render his assistance, and to place himself under the direction of the Police Magistrate of the District in which his farm is situated, or any other Magistrate whom he may prefer; and His Excellency is convinced that, on an occasion so important, a sufficiently numerous volunteer force will thus be raised, that, in combination with the whole disposable strength of the Military and Police, and by one cordial and determined effort, will afford a good prospect of either capturing the

⁴ I am using '*most*' rather than '*all*' to recognize that not all Indigenous populations were dislocated or displaced as recounted.

whole of the hostile tribes, or of permanently expelling them from the settled Districts.

Should success crown the contemplated measures, the Lieutenant Governor earnestly enjoins, that the utmost tenderness and humanity may be manifested towards whatever Natives may be captured, and when in custody, that they may be dealt with as Beings who have been deprived of the blessings of Civilization, and have been actuated in their hostile attacks by a distressing misconception of the amicable disposition entertained towards them by the White Population. (Hobart Town Gazette on the 10th of September 1830, reproduced in Division of Law, Macquarie University)

This Proclamation is a call for ‘unity’ that rejects the pre-existence of Indigenous sovereign/political claims. It represents a moment in the ‘stage of (colonial) representation’ that onto-epistemologically writes a colonial universality that (self) determines Van Damien’s Land as a unified white settlers’ space by the killing and/or expelling of those that are configured as ‘deprived of the blessings of Civilization’. Here, the fighters are configured as deprived and hostile racial subjects who also threaten the trajectory of Hegelian ‘self-consciousness’. The colonial state, and its military, must be seen as a technology of raciality that, together with martial law, produces an ontologised call for ‘One Being, the Spirit of one People’ that violently suppresses ‘the heterogeneity of the other ... sublated into the totality of one’ (Pugliese 1994, p. 169). This call effectively unified the white military and paramilitary armies operating in Tasmania at the time as a universal expression of superior white colonial values and their social, moral, economic and legal-juridico configurations. The relatively newly established colonial state operates as an onto-epistemological technology that writes a juridical universality by producing a common attachment to what is perceived to be a superior British colonial system and its institutions that defend the white colonizers’

freedom against the racial enemy. The black line failed to capture the fighters from Oyster Bay, Big River, Midlands and Ben Lomond people but it did, however, succeed in forcing them out from the ‘Settled Districts’ (Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre 2010, p. 4).

Immunity as Protection

Racial violence, as an assertion of colonial sovereignty and self-determination, is effectively immunised in the territorialisation of the colony. Raciality produced forms of institutionalised violence that were not only unaccountable to law but, more to the point, also became incorporated in the interiority of the colonial state precisely as part of its governmentality. Racialised violence works to immunise colonial sovereignty, it does this by internalising and more specifically localising Indigenous populations within the colonial body politic in ways that exempt the colonial communal from any obligations to these lives, their sovereignties and laws. In this way, one begins to see here that immunity is linked not only to the banishment of these populations and the elevation of the camp based on the state of exception, but also practices of imprisonment and institutionalisation that in effect work to forcefully and violently transform Indigenous sovereign lives. In other words, it is also clear that the formation of the ‘communal itself’ (or collectives) is based, as Esposito (2002, pp. 8-9; 2008, pp. 47-48) argues, on a ‘negation’ in the sense that immunisation works to protect the ‘communal’ but in the process it creates distinctions and privileges: the non-communal. Giacomo Pezzano (2011 n.p), in his reading of Esposito, clarifies that through

immunity this negation 'is lived' rather than avoided. White settlers, colonial subjects and authorities are freed from obligations to that which is also rendered part of the communal itself. The following long extract from Breen demonstrates the ways in which the colonial state freed its violent mechanisms from any wrong doing against the various Indigenous bands living in the white colonial settlements of Tasmania:

When violence escalated in 1824-1825, Arthur could have chosen to prosecute alleged perpetrators of violence against Aborigines. From the mid-1820s, the colony was a police state. It had a supreme court, military and field police. The law was used against Aborigines in 1825-1826, but no charges were brought against Aborigines. Arthur effectively chose to give colonists immunity from prosecution ... atrocities committed against Aborigines were the key cause of their attacks on colonists. Arthur's early dispatches, however, stressed outrages by Aborigines rather than injuries done to them. From 1828, he characterized them as 'bloodthirsty barbarians'... The rights and lives of the island's original owners were no longer a concern. (2011, pp. 86-87)

The meaning of being 'exempted' from responsibilities to First Nations had, however, been identified at least since 1803 and, more to the point, was already inscribed in a raciality that inferiorised these communities. My point here is that the sovereign 'exemption' was, as I discussed above, always inscribed in raciality as demonstrated in the early history of the colony. Immunity, I would argue, operates to normalise the sanctioning produced by raciality.

It is relevant here to clarify the relation between immunity, biopolitics and raciality. Esposito (2008) stresses the specific trajectories of the category of immunity within modernity and its presence within the intersecting discourses of western biology and medicine, anthropology, politics,

philosophical-juridical and religion. It is not that immunity per se was not present before modernity but with modern biopolitics it takes on a new significance. For Esposito (2008, p. 44), in the biopolitical (as distinct from biopower) the 'bio' is linked to politics by immunization itself. As he explains, the elements are co-constitutive: 'Rather than being superimposed or juxtaposed in an external form that subjects one to the domination of the other ... in the immunitary paradigm, *bios* and *nomos*, life and politics, emerge as the two constituent elements of a single, indivisible whole that assumes meaning from their interrelation' (Esposito 2008, p. 45). Immunity in this modern sense then does not simply join life to power; it preserves life, often through killing of *other* lives, which as discussed previously, carries a negative form of protection that negates or reduces its power to expand life.

What is important to note here is that Esposito (2008) draws from Foucault (2003) and his understanding of modern racism as a mechanism that allows biopower to work as it provides the state with the justification to kill. In *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, in fact, Esposito (2008) draws especially from Foucault's (2003) discussion of Nazism, seen as a moment when the biopolitical and sovereignty converge and racism becomes an instrument of this process. Although for Foucault biopolitical mechanisms come to be exercised by all modern states (Foucault 2003, pp. 254-255). For Esposito (2008, p. 10) the Nazi regime produced a specific biological state that 'brought the biologization of politics to a point that it had never been reached previously'. Esposito's (2008, p. 10) focus on the 'thanatopolitics'

of Nazism also shows its auto-immunitarian move where ‘its protective apparatus [turns] against its own body’ (something that I will return to later in the thesis).

Esposito (2008), through Foucault, also explains that racism is inscribed in the practices of biopolitics. He suggests the relations between race and biopolitics perform a double function:

That of producing a separation of the continuum between those that need to remain alive and those, conversely who are to be killed; and that more essential function of establishing a direct relation between the two conditions, in the sense that it is precisely the deaths of the latter that enable the survival of the other ... Its absolute newness lies in the fact that everyone, directly or indirectly, can legitimately kill everyone else. (Esposito 2008, pp. 110-111)

Like Foucault, (2003) Esposito (2008) sets up a Eurocentric analysis of the biopolitical that does not connect to colonial sovereign practices thriving during modernity itself and that, more to the point, had already created the conditions that allowed the sovereign and the settlers to legitimately ‘kill everyone’ (see critiques of Foucault by Chow 2002; Stoler 1995). In terms of this thesis, this understanding does not acknowledge the productive power of race and the way the biopolitical had long been produced by the European onto-epistemological scientific knowledge of raciality that guided colonial practices (as argued by da Silva 2011). Esposito (2008, p. 15) in *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy* produces an analytics of biological life (as carried by medical discourses, genetics, anthropology, zoology, hereditary and degenerative theories, eugenics) that separates the sciences of life from that of race in order to show how the former is ‘penetrated by politics’ and ‘becomes other from itself’. For example, the work of scientists like Lombroso, encapsulated in his conception of ‘atavism’ or the

notion that ‘degeneration is the animal element that re-emerges in man (sic)’, ignores altogether how raciality has already produced the key assumptions held by this work (Esposito 2008, p. 119). Esposito (2008, p. 129) defines race as a ‘category’: as this is after all described as creating a ‘*clivege*’ in the human race (typifies, divides and hierarchizes it) and as a process involving ‘racist reconversion’ of genetics. This (political) racialisation, however, is not only unexplored and taken for granted but also, more to the point, it does not consider the way raciality has already produced the key assumptions and operations of the biological sciences discussed in *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy* (Esposito 2008).

Esposito does not consider race as constitutive of the very onto-epistemological scientific knowledge that he critiques. This becomes a political ‘category’ that is perceived to ‘racialise’ scientific knowledge historically rather than as a productive power of the onto-epistemological knowledge applied here. It is in this sense that his analysis can neatly separate race from a biological epistemology of life itself. I refer here to da Silva’s critique of Agamben and Foucault:

Beginning with the conception of the body, I read the human body as inscribed by the arsenal of scientific reason, the instruments of productive violence, always-already comprehended by the tools of raciality, namely social scientific signifiers of human (racial and cultural) difference. (2009, p. 233)

Esposito (2008) is well aware of the ways in which the sciences inscribe life and the relation between life and politics. Yet his analysis still insists on an epistemological separation between (biological) life and race, as the latter is limited to be a ‘political fact’, operating historically in the Nazi biopolitical but remaining overall without ‘history’ and without ‘science’

(da Silva 2009, p. 233).

Colonial governmentality protected or better immunised and dispensed itself from its own sovereign illegitimacy. Moreton-Robinson (2004a, p. 7) reiterates that the possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty has defined 'white personhood and property through the law ... [this] operates to discriminate in favour of itself ensuring it protects and maintains its interest by the continuing denial and exclusion of Indigenous sovereignty,' Historically, it establishes a colonial form of protection from an obligation to these 'originary' sovereignties. The establishment of a colonial sovereign regime produced an interiority that relied on what Esposito calls a mechanism of 'immunity' that responds to the lack of an 'originary autonomy'. Timothy Campbell's (2008, p. xi) translation of Esposito calls this 'originary autonomy' the lack of a 'freedom from communal obligations' that, as I argued above, is gained from an exemption to responsibilities to Indigenous lives, their 'originary' political sovereignties and customary laws.

The lack of an 'originary sovereign autonomy' is relieved by the violence of raciality that includes immunity in its state-based and legal mechanisms. For colonial biopower, however, this relief remains historically locked in an ongoing position as it is based on the violent dispossession of the originary owners. More to the point, this is questioned continually by Indigenous sovereignties that were never ceded and, as Watson (2007b, p. 29) argues, continue to 'live differently, living in Indigenous bodies, minds and spirits of those who carry and still hold to the law'. Cunneen (2001, p.

48) goes as far as to argue that anti-colonial mechanisms, such as resistance, have directed the state's policies and practices including the institutional relations on the part of the police and judiciary with Indigenous populations.

In this way, this chapter also begins to signal that colonial sovereignty over time produces an auto-immunitarian system. As discussed above, Esposito (2008) also sees immunity as leading to 'auto-immunity,' as exemplified in the case of the Nazi regime that turned against its own political body. In *Faith and Knowledge*, Derrida (1998) develops the notion of immunity as a form of exemption that is also in an ongoing proximity to the process of auto-immunity that self-destructs immunity. This process in effect becomes of primary relevance to Derrida (2004; 2005) who uses the term 'auto-immunity' (rather than immunity). So sovereignty, as the force of coloniality, is experienced as a violent imposition that operates as a form of 'auto-immunity' that produces the very forces that threaten its protection from within and without the body politic of the colonies and nation-state (Derrida 2004, 2005). The creation and protection of a sovereign autonomy, within a colonial context that cannot effectively guarantee its legitimacy, becomes 'auto-immunitarian' as it opens itself up to its others or, as Derrida (2002, pp. 250-251) argues, 'opens to something other and more than itself'. The auto-immunity of sovereignty in effect, as Michael Naas's (2006, pp. 17-18) reading of Derrida argues, always 'produces, secretes ... the very forces that would compromise or undermine it'. It produces counter-sovereignities: a 'constitutive

autoimmunity that at once threatens [sovereignty] and allows it to be perpetually rethought and re-inscribed' (Naas 2006, pp. 17-18). Naas suggests that its focus on (self) 'protection' as a signifier of raciality enables the institutionalisation of a colonial sovereign politics: 'By justifying and providing reasons for itself, it opens itself up to law and to language, to the counter-sovereignty of the other, and so begins to undo itself, to compromise or autoimmunise itself. That is the aporetic — indeed the autoimmune — essence of sovereignty' (2006, p. 21).

In agreement with Derrida (2005, p. 36), self-protection not only comes to exempt sovereign killings but it also becomes quasi-suicidal. The self-protection of the sovereign in effect, needs to be continually re-invented so to distinguish 'its enemies' and by so doing risks destroying its own protection: to immunise itself against its 'own immunity' (Derrida 2005, p. 94). In effect, precisely via limiting and threatening itself, the protection of colonial sovereignty is secured via this mechanism. Certainly 'immunity,' as a colonial biopolitical mechanism of necessity and (self-) preservation, rests on the premise that there is always an internalised racial politics operating within the colony. The point here, as I show further on, is that the state and the law work to internalise what it is already constituted by raciality as 'the threat'. By so doing it signifies the self-determination or self-appointed 'right' of the colonial sovereign to intervene, conduct and transform life by making decisions over who, where and how people must live and die. As a zone of sovereign immunisation, the colonial camp continues to assert a violent form of dispensation from any sense of obligation to Indigenous sovereignties (as

this thesis establishes, this also applies to diasporic or transnational non-Indigenous demand for political sovereignties). Through the signifiers of raciality, Indigenous lives and populations are forcefully brought under biopolitical mechanisms of transformation, including by ‘terror’ as ultimately these practices historically have always been marked by death and/or violent transformation.

Mechanisms of (self-) immunity and protection operate here as part of an early form of colonial state governmentality. This is based on the biopolitical management of political sovereign lives, the biological and populations. As Foucault argues, biopolitics in early nineteenth century emerges as a new technology of power that does not exclude disciplinary power:

Unlike discipline, which is addressed at the bodies, the new non-disciplinary power is applied not to man as body but to the living man, to man as living being; ultimately ... to man as a species ... And that the new technology that is being established is addressed to a multiplicity of men, not to the extent that they are nothing more than their individual bodies but to the extent that they form, on the contrary, a global mass that is affected by overall characteristic of birth, death, production, illness, and so on ... a massifying that is directed not at man-as body but at man-as-species. (2003, pp. 242-243)

For Foucault (2003, p. 241), biopolitical state control is inculcated with the right of the sovereign to “‘make’ live and ‘let’ die” that complements the older right to ‘let live and die’. Life becomes the ‘rights’ of the Sovereign including the life of ‘populations’ who become a political as well as a scientific problem (Foucault 2003, p. 245). Although da Silva does not utilise the notion of biopower per se, she refers to it indirectly as a product of the analytics of raciality: ‘The apparatus of modern knowledge and its onto-epistemological devices are part of the biopolitical apparatus which

has been assembled with the deployment of the Classical toolkit to classify, order and manage populations. In other words, the analytics of raciality constitutes the biopolitical arsenal operating in the postcolonial/global political terrain'. (2011, p.46)

In this sense, the earlier technologies of colonial governmentality marked in this chapter are instrumental to the establishment of the Tasmanian colonial state. They assert forms of biopolitics that in Foucault's (2003, pp. 254-255) words are inscribed with race and racism as mode of categorising, differentiating and creating caesurae of political lives that include the 'old right' to kill life. Extending and moving this argument closer to da Silva's discussion of raciality, I argue that in the colonial setting of Tasmania the biopolitical focus on 'conducting' sovereign political lives is the product of a racial arsenal that is also always in proximity to the enactment of the colonial white sovereign self-determination to transform and to kill.

Under the auspices of 'immunising' white settlers and 'protecting' Indigenous people from extermination, there is a growing focus on internalising these populations in mass within delineated border-zones of the colony. This banishment was part of the territorialization that, as Perera has argued, drew 'internal fault lines' by banishing and displacing the lives of the racialised 'Others':

In order to construct Australia as an island of 'whiteness' that is traversed by internal fault lines, by borders within the border that mark the contours of a racial fear that is, once again, topographically inscribed. 'The Leper line' designed to confine the racialised disease leprosy north of the 20th parallel, and the Brisbane line ... Internal lines of defence against

contamination by sickness or invasion, they trace the east-west and north-south axes of racial Risk. (2009 p. 30)

In this instance, this 'banishing' becomes linked to the colonial state's capacity to set up an effective mobilisation of Indigenous populations and to produce what Norman Naimark (2001) names an 'ethnic cleansing'. Naimark (2001, p. 3) argues that 'ethnic cleansing' includes the banishing or 'remov[al] [of] a people and often all traces of them from concrete territory ... and to seize control of the territory they had formerly inhabited'. Accordingly, as Ryan (1996, p. 106) shows, at various stages it had been argued that rounding up and relocating Indigenous people in designated areas of Tasmania such as the Bass Strait could resolve the 'Aboriginal problem'. This worked to dispossess and remove Indigenous populations access to their countries without any further opposition (Ryan 1996, p. 108). For the survivors of the Black Wars, this meant that some would be banished from their home countries and be taken to Bruny Island, Flinders Island, prisons and even asylums. Children would be separated from their kin relations and parents and re-located in the Hobart Orphanage School or at the Wybalenna Dormitories (see Haebich 2000).

George Augustus Robinson, was appointed as a 'Conciliator' who 'would persuade' local Indigenous people from the settled districts that it was in their best interests to move in the delineated border-zones under his protection. Following this line, part of the biopolitical function of colonial authorities such as Robinson was to 'identify ethnic groups and concretising difference and otherness with the goal of banishing it' (Naimark 2001, p. 8). In 1829, Robinson was also issued a 500 acres land

grant at what is now known today the Missionary Bay. Here, he worked to establish a village for the re-located people and the distribution of supplies. The mission closed in less than six months: declared a failure in the face of mounting deaths from 'introduced diseases' (Murrayfield para.5). But the idea of 'introduced diseases' in Van Damien's Land is one that has already been questioned by historians like Ryan (2006) and Breen (2011) and requires more attention. As is identified out by Breen (2011, p. 84) 'two thirds of the forty or so' Indigenous people taken here died because of their confinement and the mode of living that was imposed upon them. This mode of living includes a poor diet, lack of access to fresh water, exposure to respiratory diseases but also from being separated from their children and the loss of kin. The point here is that this project, like Wybalenna Camp in Flinders Island, continued to produce racial violence and death; as colonial border-zones they became zones of death (see for example Rae-Ellis 1996; Ryan 2010; Murrayfield n.d). Following this necropolitical logic, out of 135 prisoners sent to the Wybalenna Camp on Flinders Island in Bass Strait, only 45 survived. From 1835 to 1839, Robinson became Commandant of the Wybalenna Camp and it is estimated that 59 deaths occurred under his management including those of 12 children. The only children that survived were 'Mathinna, Fanny Cochrane, and Hanna daughter of Henrietta' (Haebich 2000, p. 115).

The banishment and redeployment processes were invariably operating as an early form of biopower. By restricting Indigenous populations from multiple sovereign nations within Tasmania to a confined area, it

positioned First Nations Populations under the direct and forceful sovereign colonial authorities and produced a necropolitical effect. Whatever the 'intention' of Captain Robinson, or how 'good his intentions' might have been, the practices of 'civilising' Indigenous lives produced high mortality rates. Mbembe (2003, p. 14) argues that a necropolitics within the space of the colony is 'the generalized instrumentalisation of human existence and the material destruction of human bodies and populations'. In the camp, biopower and necropolitics are two sides of the same coin aimed at obliterating and transforming Indigenous sovereignties.

The Protectorate, under Commandant Robinson at Flinders Island, did not grant 'sovereign rights' available under colonial law to Indigenous people. The Wybalenna Camp, as a form of colonial immunisation and protection that internalised captured populations within the body politics of the colony, treated its residents as indefinite prisoners without access to legal recourse. This form of segregation based on lack of rights and high mortality rates has led historians and descendants of the imprisoned to categorise Wybalenna as an 'internment camp' and a 'concentration camp' (Thomas dir. 1992; Hughes 1987; Ryan 1996; Walter & Daniels 2008). I would argue that the banishment and removal of racially profiled populations from sovereign spaces and their systematic imprisonment for an indefinite period of time means that the Wybalenna operated as a prototype of modern governmental technologies of security. The banishment to Wybalenna Camp enacted the bio- and necropolitical relations discussed by Perera (2007, p. 12) as 'the paired modalities' over

life and death; that albeit differently also came to circulate in Internment camps in Australia (see also Mbembe 2003; Wadiwel 2007). The internments of twentieth century in Australia, however, generally occurred after that the nation-state had openly declared (sovereign) war against selected populations' countries of origin, a process that did not occur in Van Damien's Land precisely because it was informed by a raciality that would not acknowledge the (sovereign political) internalities of Indigenous populations and worked to obliterate any traces of this. In this sense, the Wybalenna Camp acted also as the precursor to modern biopolitical concerns as discussed by Foucault (2003).

The Wybalenna Camp, however, also participated in the creation and collection of a state-based arsenal of colonial knowledge about the First Nations Populations and communities that were held in captivity. As demonstrated by Wadiwel's (2007, p. 122) work on 'flogging' in colonial Australia during this same period, within the zones of the camp there was a calculated reinforcement of a 'civilizing' objec[tive]' focussed on transforming the political sovereign life of Indigenous populations. He argues that:

We may further speculate that where racialised violence does not aim solely at the wholesale annihilation of communities, it may turn its attention to the development of disciplined subjects of power within targeted populations. In this sense, the pedagogical aspect of flogging reinforces its 'civilising' object: despite injuring the body, flogging is aimed at 'cultivating', in Foucault's words, the 'soul' of its recipient. (Wadiwel 2007, p.122)

The cultivation of the soul, within the Wybalenna Camp, was enacted daily by the enforced surveillance and regulation of people's autonomous sovereign lives and spiritualities. In this setting, zones such as the

Wybalenna Camp operate, in Agamben's (1998, p. 117, p. 80) words, as a fundamental 'biopolitical paradigm' where the 'absolute capacity' of killing Indigenous sovereign lives reigns sovereign. Here colonial sovereign authorities guide directly where, how and with whom Indigenous residents lived and if they lived. They monitored the daily movement and attendances to the scheduled daily activities, their access to sources of food and ratios, the performance of daily jobs that conformed with Eurocentric and gendered modes of living and enforced new routines that prohibited hunting and included attendance to schools and religious based services. Robinson even renamed the prisoners with European names and prohibited them from performing cultural ceremonies on the site (Thomas dir. 1992; Haebich 2000; Ryan 1996). Emphasis was placed on adult literacy so they would learn how to read the Bible. Further, Robinson insisted that children located at the Hobart Orphanage school be re-located under his command to Wybalenna where they were taught through the Bell system of Education developed for 'mixed race children' that 'intended to produce good Christian subjects' (Haebich 2000, pp. 111-112). These practices operated as normative bio-technologies that attempted to study, observe, frame, shape, differentiate and intervene directly in the lives and bodies of Indigenous people so as to shape their 'souls'.

The colonial biopower operating within the camp intervened in the (bio) regulation of gender and sexual norms. It included the performance of gendered daily duties such as domestic roles and the intervention in

interracial relations and reproduction. As Anna Haebich observes, for example, at Wybalenna ‘vocational training’ included boys like Peter Burney, Thomas Bruney, Augustus and Walter George would be apprenticed and trained as tailors, shoemakers, office work, while girls were trained to become ‘domestic servants’ and were supervised in cleaning, personal hygiene and laundry and sewing (cited in Haebich 2000, p. 113). This preparation for fulfilling gender norms was not successful at Wybalenna, but it was part of a biopolitical intervention in the embodiment of racially and gender ‘productive subjects’. As Ryan argues, in 1837 Robinson even organised the marriages of four women who had been previously living with white sailors and refused both Robinson’s authority and that of ‘Aboriginal men’:

He organized marriages for ... Matilda, Emma, Flora and Rebecca, because they refused to live with men. Once married, Robinson believed they would become more tractable and bear children ... But within a week they left their husbands for the bush ... Then [Robinson] sent the boys from the *Flinders Island Chronicle* to visit them. They told the women if they did not clean the houses and clean themselves they would put them in the paper ... They seemed to have a great abhorrence of being put in the newspapers. (1996, p. 191)

As Ryan argues, Robinson was partly driven by concerns for the way sealers had treated Indigenous women, but this was always part of a direct and sovereign intervention in these women’s lives and their sexualities. Haebich (2000, p. 113) has noted, however, that these women resisted this interference ‘and threatened to take the dogs and go into the bush’. In this and other similar cases, as da Silva (2004, p. 224) notes, the ‘sexual was perceived as threatening the boundaries that raciality was deployed to produce’ as interracial relationships and miscegenation in effect, would place at risk ‘the transparency of the being that modern philosophers write

as essentially self-determined'. So the colonial sovereign within the space of exception or the camp operates to transform and implicate its prisoners in the establishment of white colonial heteronormativity. Yet, in the face of these hegemonic colonial relations, in the chapter that follows, I want to bring to light the anti-colonial contestations staged by Tasmanian Aboriginal people in the context of the Wybelenna Camp through the medium of the *Flinders Chronicle*.

Chapter Two

***The Flinders Chronicle* and the Exercise of Indigenous Anti-Colonial Politics in the Context of the Camp**

The Indigenous people that were held captives at Wybalenna Camp had a distinct fear being inscribed in the *Flinders Island Chronicle* (1836-37). This fear introduces us to the powerful normative role of the newspaper itself. The *Flinders Island Chronicle* came to operate within the borderzone of the Wybalenna Camp at the exact moment when the death rate within the camp itself had started to accelerate and became difficult for colonial authorities to ignore. In the paper's first edition, the biopolitics of the camp and the representation of the Indigenous prisoners as bare lives to be acted upon is rendered visible by its very references to its functions of civilising and Christianising the 'Aboriginal Inhabitants'. The violence of this function is enlisted with claims of 'registering' daily events. The first edition of the *Flinders Island Chronicle* stated that the objective of the journal was:

To promote Christianity, civilization and learning amongst the Aboriginal Inhabitants at Flinders Island. The Chronicle professes to be a brief but accurate register of events of the colony Moral and Religious. This journal will be published weekly on Saturday the copies to be in manuscript and written exclusively by the Aborigines the Size half foolscap and the price two pence. The profit arising from the Sale of the journal to be equally divided among the writers which it is hoped may induce Emmulation in writing excite a desire for useful knowledge and promote Learning generally. Proof sheet are to be submitted to the commandant for correction before publishing. Persons out of the colony may Subscribe.

Signed: Thomas Brune

Signed: Walter Juba Martin

Prospectus

I Certify that this Copy was written by one of the Aborigines at Flinders Island whose Signature is herewith attached.

Signed G.A. Robinson
Commandant Aboriginal Settlement
Flinders Island.
10 th September 1836.

(Robinson, 10 September 1836 reproduced in Rose 1996, p. 187)

This ‘inaugural’ statement effectively situates the newspaper within a colonial bio-politics that is fixed on re-shaping and transforming Indigenous lives, thus treated as ‘bare lives’ ready for intervention. In this sense, Ryan (1996, p. 187) argues that the newspaper was a public exercise to convince various authorities that Indigenous lives could be ‘civilised’. For Bain Attwood and Fiona Magowan (2001, p. 7), the newspaper recorded ‘aspects of day to day life on the island, such as church services, the arrival and departure ships, illness, deaths, food shortages and hunting’. And it is within this very reportage of daily ‘life’ within the camp that the representatives of nine different nations are re-imagined as transformable bodies accessing western ‘Civilization and Christianity’.

The appointed Indigenous editors were Walter George Arthur and Thomas Bruny who, by 1837, had already received, and were still receiving, Christian education and were writing and reading in the English language. As was the case with the rest of the Wybalenna community, the two editors were from different Indigenous languages and nations. The editor Walter George Arthur, was the son of Rolepa, a senior man of the Ben Lomond tribe in north-eastern Tasmania; according to Reynolds (2004, p. 16), his mother ‘may have had a European father....Arthur was separated from his tribe in unknown circumstances’. Arthur shared the job with Thomas Brune (or Bruny), the youth editor of the *Flinders Island Chronicle* and the

copy clerk of the Commandant. It is reported by various scholars that he was born on Brune Island (Tasmania) (see, for example, Van Toorn 2006). These two men had also already been introduced to Christian doctrines, taught how to write and read in English and assigned English names at the Kings' Orphan School for boys at New Town on the northern outskirts of Hobart (Reynolds 2004). Under the colonial regime of Wybellena, Commandant Robinson perceived their newly acquired skills as desirable attributes. This attempt to implicate Indigenous writers in the colonial project is also discussed by Penny Van Toorn who points out that Robinson's recurrent *modus operandi* was divisive. It attempted to 'create and exploit divisions within Aboriginal societies and use a small group of known and trusted individuals to mediate between himself and the larger less familiar, less predictable group ... Arthur and ... Brune played an important mediatory role between Robinson and the wider Flinders island Community ... [and at] Wybalenna' (2006, p. 104).

The selection of the two Indigenous editors seems to re-articulate Robinson's persistent attempt to manage Indigenous political agency. He had already attempted to implicate key Indigenous people in the difficult process of re-locating Aboriginal communities into the camp to live under white colonial rule (for a detailed history of Robinson's strategies see Ryan 1996). In the colonial context, the editors were expected to enact a form of immunisation or protection of the white colonial sovereignty that closed in on the 'Indigenous communals'. They were expected to be part of the creation of a 'continuum between immunity and community' in ways that would have prevented the radical opening of social relations that are based

on obligations to Indigenous sovereignties (Campbell 2008, p.xxii). This newspaper, then, becomes part of a process of immunisation that inserts Indigenous cultural productions within a regulatory bipolar colonial framework. Their selection seems to reiterate a colonial attempt to implicate these two Indigenous writers in a white sovereign project.

The attempts to convert Indigenous locals to Christianity are embedded in the editors' reportage of daily events and occurrences in the Wybalenna Camp. The following two examples show how daily events were reimagined through a Christian-based language in the *Flinders Island Chronicle* that positioned Indigenous locals as 'transformable' lives:

The Native people of Van Diemen's Land is gone out hunting and some of these men has got some books out with them and they are singing and reading out in the bush and praying to God every night I suppose; and they behave themselves under the Directions of the commandant ...

... The Natives people has learning about God and learning about Jesus Christ and the way we should go to heaven when we dies and if we bad men we will go down into everlasting burnings. It is better for us to Look after God and he will take us up to heaven were we can enjoy all happiness ... (Not Signed 28th September 1837 reproduced in Rose 1996, p. 5)

And again:

The Native people of Van Diemen's Land is not only people of the Devil these are the people of God is not the people of God very good yes it is my friends very good the School is going to be put up for them as the Commandant directed them in a short time we will sung in that School ...

... The people gose to the church and the people hears about God the Aboriginal Youths Walter and Thomas Bruney assisting Mr Clark in the Church of Sundays then Mr Clarck tell them about God and about Jesus Christ who came down from heaven into our world to save sinner and then he was crucified and the cross was in form of a T and then he was buried and on the third day he rose from the dead ... Signed: Thomas Brune Aboriginal Youth. (Brune, 2 October 1837, reproduced in Rose 1996, p. 6)

Here, each of these articles reports the ways the idea of a Christian God was being introduced into the daily life of the camp and it denotes how the newspaper itself enacted religious teaching. Its re-imagining of ‘hunting’ as a Bible reading and prayer expeditions, the announcement of the establishment of a school and the recounting of the purpose of Church attendance on Sunday are all embedded within the repeated claims of improving the tenor of life and providing eternal salvation.

Van Toorn (2006, p. 104) suggests that part of this writing performed ‘the biblically authorized assimilationist agenda’ of the time’. It joined the ‘thirty-one sermons’ and other writings also produced by the two editors of the newspaper and many of which were ‘read aloud to the assembled congregation’ of Wybalenna. In this sense then, the newspaper is located within colonial interests aimed to transform Indigenous spirituality and, within this, to sever the cultural connection to their own Indigenous nations. The paper then becomes part of what Esposito (2002) calls a form of (self-) colonial immunisation against Indigenous sovereignty; after the anti-colonial wars, Indigenous cultural productions are inserted within the colonial order of the camp itself to implicate them in the protection of that very order.

Following a different but related trajectory, Van Toorn (2006) concludes that the work of these Indigenous editors was a highly ‘mediated’ form of writing. In line with the colonial assimilationist agenda originally dictated by Tasmanian’s Governor Arthur, the newspaper was to be written by

Indigenous writers in the English language that would mediate between ‘Robinson and the Flinders island Community’ (Van Toorn 2006, p. 104). More specifically, this paper adopted multiple genres of reportage, prayer and moral exhortations that amongst various things centred on Scriptural education through ‘repetitive, ritualised, ostensibly dialogic exchanges that in effect imposed a monologic reading of the Bible’ (Van Toorn 2006, p. 109). So, for Van Toorn (2006, p. 108) the newspaper was primarily part of a mediated and selective teaching of the Bible to the people of Flinders Island that was conducted by the Indigenous editors under the rulings of Commandant Robinson and the Catechist Mr Clark.

There is a problem here with this type of analysis of the Indigenous editors, their lives and writing. It risks closing off the reading of their writing and lives to suit a postcolonial framework of analysis that focuses on a well-established colonial framework. Following Nevzat Soguk’s (2007) reading of Michel de Certeau’s (1998) critical engagement with the relationality of the map, within the border of the camp the newspapers becomes part of the ‘borderzone’ that also offers spatial ‘possibilities’ for an imaginary enactment of sovereign formations. As Soguks’ argues:

In much the same way, though the border as a marker of sovereign territorial and statist politics in the world may be the predominant claim, the border can neither privilege or empower separations and exclusions alone. Simultaneously and inescapably, it also reveals the multiple ontologies and knowledges of translations, flows, and transformations. (2007, p. 288)

Following this logic, I argue here that although cultural productions were always expected to abandon Indigenous sovereignty in order to honour white sovereignty – and despite the fact that they are regulated through

various political technologies of bio-power – in the border zones of the camp, the formation of the newspaper itself produces a cultural space where anti-colonial politics also emerges (see Soguk 2007, p. 296).

The onto-epistemological order of raciality, as discussed previously, certainly negated the political value of pre-existing cultural productions of Indigenous people. As the case of the *Flinders Island Chronicle* evidences, these cultural productions were positioned within a biopolitical modern calculability operating within the camp that would guide it to become complicit in the ‘civilizing’ project of the colonial order. In this sense, cultural texts like newspapers operated in terms of what de Certeau’s (1988, p. xix) calls a colonial ‘strategy’ driven by the authorities within the Wybalenna Camp that assumed the newspaper would produce the ‘proper’ (colonial) positioning and as ‘the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it’. This colonial ‘strategy,’ however, does not detract from the newspaper becoming a *tactical* site that for de Certeau (1988, p. xix) cannot be named as ‘proper’ and it ‘belongs to the ‘other’’. A tactic insinuates itself into the other’s place, fragmentarily, without taking it over in its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance. It has at its disposal no base where it can capitalize on its advantage, prepare its expansions, and secure independence with respect to circumstances’.

The editorial work within the paper produces effective interventions within a seemingly completely disempowered situation that, although it does not destabilize coloniality, works tactically to contest it. It is relevant here also

to consider briefly how Perera (2007a, p. 57) conceptualises a complex border zone that is shaped and re-configured by multiple actors. Following this, the newspaper itself can be conceptualised as, in Perera (2007a, p. 206) words, a 'borderscape' or an 'act that brings space under different forms of control that in turn gives rise to multiple resistances, challenges and counterclaims' to colonial conceptualisations of the border zone. This newspaper is not only a new formation within the zone of the border that produces points of entry for a colonial biopolitics; it also becomes a site for the reconfiguration of Indigenous ontological and epistemological embodiments of unceded and unextinguished sovereignties that produce anti-colonial relations. The editors like other residents of Wybalenna, experienced the effects of both colonial and anti-colonial practices that had informed the very formation of the Wybalenna Camp and their imprisonment within the camp. As time went by, these editors also saw the growing number of deaths within the camp. That is, they were embodying different socio-cultural historical relations and ontologies and epistemologies that brought what Perera (2007a, p. 206) calls 'new dynamics, new dangers and possibilities into the zone'.

Van Toorn (2006, p. 8) rightly approaches the newspaper as a mediated text and points to the problematic of understanding the extent to which these editors 'were able to express their own perceptions and interpretations of events'. But this critical approach in itself seems to overemphasize the level of control exercised by Robinson and ignores, as Anita Heiss (2003, p. 48) has argued, that 'there is no evidence of the level

of influence Robinson had over the Reports published in the paper or even how many Aboriginal people could read it'. This focus on mediation does not question its own location within a current postcolonial academic discourses that already accepts the colonial and its impact as a given. The repercussion of Van Toorn's (2006) postcolonial mode of 'mediation' is that this seems to take for granted the finality of the act of colonisation in a spatio-temporal location that, as I have tried to show in previous chapter, was already the result of an anti-colonial struggle in its historical moment. Van Toorn's use of work by Homi Bhabha (1994), Anne McClintock (1995), Sidone Smith and Julia Watson (1992), and James C. Scott (2012) mounts an analysis that is informed by and concerned with the centrality of colonial practices that does not connect with the anti-colonial framing of Wybalenna itself that potentially operated within the camp and in the newspaper. The homogenising centrality of colonial operations through limits the anti-colonial practices of this historical period.

Van Toorn's (2006) analysis of this anti-colonial struggle in relation to the newspaper itself is ignored. Through a postcolonial reading of political scientist and anthropologist Scott's critique of 'political hegemony', Van Toorn (2006) offers a discussion, for example, of 'camouflage' as a form of resistance that not only protected Indigenous people from serious forms of punishment but was also used as a method to achieve better outcomes for communities. The author argues that such camouflaging was interrupted as a more overt form of resistance 'from time to time, however, these performances of paternalistic care and submissive acquiescence

would suddenly collapse into open expression of mutual contempt and hostility (Van Toorn 2006, 156). How these moments of contempt may also operate as anti-colonial manifestations is ignored here.

Textually speaking, this discussion of camouflage is reiterated also by Van Toorn (2006) even when dealing with direct and clear subversive acts of resistance within the newspaper itself. Her analysis acknowledges specific and visible moments within the newspaper that resisted colonial authorities and also recognises that Robinson's teachings were not effective and were being challenged by Aboriginal members of the Wybalenna community (Van Toorn 2006, p. 119). This acknowledgement, however, is reduced to few 'moments' that are persistently closed off with an analysis of colonial 'mediation'. Thus it ignores the way the paper, its editors and the colonial authorities, the camp, were immersed in anti-colonial spatio-temporal practices. For example, in the third and second last editions of the *Flinders Island Chronicle*, Thomas Brune's writing circulates affective anti-colonial sentiments through a concern for his life and that of the Indigenous people at Wybalenna. At this stage, the high mortality rate was becoming more and more visible. He writes:

The brig Tamar arrived this morning at green Island. I cannot tell perhaps we might hear about it by and by when the ship boat comes to the Settlement we will hear news from they are Hobartown. Let us hope it will be good news and that something may be done for us poor people they are dying away the Bible says some of us shall be saved but *I am much afraid none of us will be [a]live by and by as there is nothing but sickness among us. Why don't the black fellows pray to the king to get us away from this place.* (17th November 1837 reproduced in Rose 1996, p. 17; my emphasis)

And again:

And my friends hear this I got rite to you the same things over and over again. Commandant has directed me to work and if I don't attend to it I must be put in to jail. (7 December 1837 reproduced in Rose 1996, p.18)

The sense of urgency implied in this writing against the violence and failure of bio-political colonial relations of the camp, constitute a tactical anti-colonial intervention that calls upon black fellows to take actions. In this sense, I would argue that this is not an unexpected moment of contempt but rather a space where Sovereign and anti-colonial political relations are circulating and activated. More recently, Gregory Smithers (2008 p. X) in his comparative study of sites of resistance acknowledges the anti-colonial political power operating through this text. Smithers through a transnational comparative reading of this edition of the *Flinders Island Chronicle* argues that:

This was a call to political activism couched in Christian rhetoric. By using the word 'pray,' instead of the more incendiary 'petition,' Arthur [sic] concealed his very public, political objective. Aware that the British excluded Aboriginal people from the public domain of Van Diemen's Land politics, the language of evangelical missionaries provided the best means for Aborigines such as Arthur [sic] to subvert their political exclusion and thereby gain legal protection against the violent outrages being committed by settlers. (2008, p. x)

Although it must be clarified here that it was Brune that wrote these comments and not Arthur, as wrongly stated by Smithers (2008), the point about the political objectives being produced through Christian rhetoric of 'praying' itself is an important one. It acknowledges the anti-colonial political power operating through the text of the newspaper.

In her analysis of these very quotes, however, Van Toorn (2006, p. 119) falls back on a postcolonial discussion of mediation that minimizes the anti-colonial possibility opened by the text. Van Toorn (2006, p. 119)

argues, when considering the first quote, that ‘the final sentence is missing from other copied versions of this edition in Robinson’s papers, suggesting that Brune smuggled the subversive suggestion in after Robinson had checked the original draft’. The analysis is then shifted to discuss of a petition that was organised ten years later by Walter G. Arthur (the second editor) and seven other Pallawah men opposing the arrival of Superintendent Jeanneret. This petition and the *Flinders Island Chronicle* are cast together, as signs of colonial mediating power:

The petition’s political leverage derived not from a demand of Aboriginal sovereignty or political autonomy, but by an evocation of moral values espoused by English abolitionists, philanthropists and other influential sections of British society ... Yet, this communal voice is no more autonomous than the voices of the journalists who wrote the Flinders island Chronicle, because out of political necessity the document was created with the help of, and for the eyes of, a series of white officials occupying positions of institutionalised power. The petition was clearly written with those others’ sense of propriety in mind. (Van Toorn 2006, p. 122)

The different historical contexts that informed this writing and specifically their different relation to colonial and anti-colonial practices and possibilities are also not evaluated here (Van Toorn 2006, p. 119; see also Reynolds 2004). This analysis in effect proposes a postcolonial approach that not ignores the historical shifts affecting and motivating Indigenous writing per se, but it also fundamentally ignores their relation to anti-colonial tactics and political discourses.

The anti-colonial presence is an important part of these newspapers that demands more attention. In her critique and survey of post-colonial writing in Australia, Michelle Carey (2008) argues that analysis often ‘fail[s] to take account of the central critique offered by Indigenous people preferring to direct their focus on reconfiguring the meaning of *post* in

post-colonial'. This omission points to the need for developing an anti-colonial approach:

Post-colonial theory 'accommodates' Indigenous viewpoints, [but] it is not easily swayed by them. By absorbing Indigenous critiques of the post-colonial back into post-coloniality, post-colonialism is revealed as another colonising ideological practice, colonising the views and self-representations of Indigenous people to serve the purpose of its own redemption narrative. Is it any wonder then that some Indigenous people argue (however facetiously) that the 'post-colonial tension' can only be resolved once the 'colonisers have gone home'. (Carey 2008, p. 32)

In Van Toorn's case, historical Indigenous critiques of the colonial are absorbed by a postcolonial methodology of 'mediation' that ignores altogether the anti-colonial practices that inscribe the paper. This failure re-centres the dominance of the colonial past itself but also ignores altogether anti-colonial Indigenous voices and practices. In this analysis, mediation becomes a fixture that I want to re-consider through the idea that this it itself was a product of an anti-colonial struggle for sovereignty. Following Tony Birch's (2007, p. 107) critique of 'white histories,' the problematic of this historical interpretation of colonial representations is that it ignores that 'sovereignty within Indigenous communities themselves is not reliant on either European law or occasional state paternalism ... It is both actual and spiritual (within a coexisting framework). It is also enacted in daily struggles of Indigenous people striving to retain autonomous lifestyle'.

Through the privileging of the (post-) colonial centre and focus on mediation, Van Toorn's (2006) mediating process diminishes sovereign rights to land and the processes by which Indigenous sovereignties have been contested over time. The effects of this privileging is also questioned

more broadly via Irene Watson's (2007b, p. 24) proposal that 'Aboriginal sovereignty' is a 'struggle' that arises 'from the fact of colonialism that make Aboriginal laws an impossibility'. Through Derrida's discussion of aporia, however, Watson locates (2007b, p. 25) 'Aboriginal sovereignty' within an ongoing colonial context as an aporetic '(im)possibility' marks the very ground for its own possibility; this (im)possibility can set in motion a discussion of Aboriginal sovereignty/ies as possibilities. In this sense, Indigenous writing within the newspaper becomes tactical, a borderscape there is 'possibility' within the impossibility of colonialism and that carries traces of Indigenous anti-colonial sovereignties.

I would argue therefore that the two Indigenous editors may have overtly followed Robinson's orders, but, simultaneously, they covertly, and in practice, interrogated colonial rule and contested its subjugating effects. We need to reconsider the fact that the *Flinders Island Chronicle* as a handwritten newspaper, as it claimed, had to be 'written exclusively by the Aborigines' in the English language and was paralleled by the decree that all 'proofs of sheets [had] to be Submitted ... for correction to the Commandant' before its release we begin to see a different picture emerging here (10 September 1836 reproduced in Rose 1996, p. 3). Although this marks an attempt at mediating Indigenous cultural productions and writing, as part of biopolitical technologies of colonial power, these processes also reveal that the newspaper was situated within the political tensions operating within the borderzone of the camp itself.

In the *Macquarie Pen Anthology of Australian literature*, Nicholas Jose (2009) argues that in the process of colonisation, the usage of English writing became a ‘necessity [and] a tool of negotiation’ recognisable to the British authorities. As Jose argues ‘these works reveal modes of performativity that are central to literary writing’ (2009, p.8). They also demonstrate one of the persistent and now characteristic elements of Aboriginal literature – the nexus between the literary and the political’. Drawing from this analysis, the newspaper itself, that is located within the borderzone of the camp, can also be argued to have been a political ‘necessity’ not just for the colonial order but also for Indigenous people themselves. It is also useful here to consider here how Tracy Bunda’s (2007) critical intervention marks Indigenous writing as an embodiment of Indigenous sovereignty. For Bunda (2007, p. 75), Indigenous sovereignties are embodied practices that are often rendered invisible or limited by western readers in the fields of law, policy and history. As she argues, that this ‘is tied to particular tracts of country, thus ... [Indigenous] bodies signify ownership and we perform sovereign acts in our everyday living. Writing by Indigenous people is thus a Sovereign act’ (2007, p.75).

Following Bunda’s (2007) argument that Indigenous writing embodies Indigenous sovereignties and Jose’s (2009) commentary on the necessity of Indigenous political writing, the newspaper itself within the border of the camp becomes a border-zone that also embodies the political struggle for Indigenous sovereignties. My point is that the colonial violence of assimilation, that informs the production of the newspaper within the camp

itself, continues also to produce the ‘necessity’ for an anti-colonial struggle that carries Indigenous sovereign embodiments. The newspaper’s daily mediated articles mark ‘the moment of an impossibility’ that is confined and restricted by colonial authorities, but it is also one that embodies the political necessities to respond and survive and that is linked to the struggles for Indigenous sovereignties. This ‘borderzone’ is, as Perera (2007, p. 206) argues, a ‘multilayered space’ that is brought into existence through differential acts of control.

This newspaper, I argue, is documenting the tension between colonial and anti-colonial practices. Langton’s (1996, p. xxix) analysis of the paper in 1996 argued that this is the first Indigenous newspaper that operates as a form of ‘reportage’ of the ‘living conditions and grievances of Aboriginal people’; thus representing a new configuration for not only colonial but also for anti-colonial histories. It also becomes an anti-colonial formation that documents the violent historical colonial relations that operated to manage and transform Indigenous sovereign relations. If we consider the time/spatial relation that informed this paper, Langton’s (1996) argument, and specifically its focus on the ‘grievances’ of Indigenous people, can be extended to include the documentation of anti-colonial conflicts within the camp. When reading Walter George Arthur’s writing, the reportage of daily occurrences and calls to pray for the Christian God also produce traces of Indigenous writing that are repeatedly grasping the logic of assimilative (protective) values inflicted on Indigenous people within the camp. The writing describes daily occurrences within the communities of

the camp and thus become documentation of how biopolitical sovereign relations attempted to transform and re-shape Indigenous lives by introducing western practices. This writing also traces how these colonial practices were resisted within the camp. In Arthur's writing, the documentation of bio-political relations is produced through a genre of reportage that I would argue produces the sense that he is pondering over the rationale that qualifies and determines the hegemonic decision of practising Christian values within the camp itself.

The following excerpt from Walter George Arthur in the *Flinders Island Chronicle* relays the procedure of continually negotiating with colonial authorities what was permissible and not permissible within the camp. In a way this writing is preoccupied with the camp's biopolitical regime transformation of life:

And now my Dear friends I want to tell you and I saw some women carrying woods upon Sunday so I went to ask Mr Clark if it right to carry wood upon Sunday I don't think it is right to carrying wood on Sunday no I don't think it is right to carry woods on Gods day no that I am sure it is not right for nay one to do such a things of his day. You should not play or work on that day you should not do any thing on God day you do not Growel you should not kill the little Robin breast or the swallows or the martins for they are God. Gods favourite birds. And also another thing you should not throw about the soap then have to much ... and yet they don't care for it no they would sooner put on that there clay stuff what they have been always used and they like it. Better then they would have soap to wash their faces. (24 October 1837 reproduced in Rose 1996, p.9)

In this excerpt, the recount of 'asking Mr Clark' if it was right for women to carry wood establishes a sense of reflection over the multiple and clashing practices operating within the camp. Questions on the validity of daily life practices such as working or not working on a Sunday, or washing with soap when preferring to use clay, renders visible the

discursive relations that visually marked and differentiated Indigenous practices within the camp itself. This specific example of surveillance, marking and classifying Indigenous lives, is linked to the biopolitical intent of annihilating Indigenous sovereign lives or political lives via both the disciplining and regulation of these lives; more specifically, by ‘civilising’ these lives through Christian values. Arthur documents this preoccupation in the extract above. Yet it also reconfigures the racialised Indigenous body. Here, the writing ‘performs’ the clashes between colonial and anti-colonial practices: what I mean, is that this writing renders visible the ways the ‘racialized colonial regime’ was confronted by not only Indigenous practices and Indigenous people repeatedly doing what they had been told was prohibited or non acceptable but also by what was preferred by Indigenous locals or, as he states, ‘what have been always used and they like it’. In other words, the anti-colonial is still resident within the colonial regime.

Returning to Jose’s (2009) words on writing becoming a ‘necessity’. The writings of Thomas Brune and Walter George Arthur editors convey a necessity. Langton (1996, p. iv) argues that this newspaper operated as reportage of the ‘plead[ing] and cajole’ of the Aboriginal survivors who saw ‘inmates die one by one’. I follow here Langton (1996) who notices a sense of urgency, an ‘immediacy operating through the ‘reportage’ of daily events:

Reading ... the *Flinders Island Weekly Chronicle* (1836-1837) ... fills me with a special kind of sadness; not just because they prayed so fervently to a deaf god and preached earnestly about his power, but because of the immediacy and intimacy I feel in their arguments. (p.iv)

I argue that this sense of immediacy produces urgency in the writing. This sense of urgency is linked to and responds to the bio-political production of (assimilable) bare-lives within the camp and to the necropolitics that created the camp and was killing so many Indigenous lives within its borders. This urgency connects with Jose's (2009) discussion of Indigenous writing as a 'necessity [and] a tool of negotiation' as this operates as a semiotic including, as also as discussed above, as a textual system of warning of events that are occurring to Indigenous people under white sovereignty. It cannot be known, as Heiss (2003) previously pointed out, who reads this newspaper. However, Brune's daily reportage clearly prompted Indigenous people to take action within the camp. This sense of urgency documents and questions the bio-politically violent exchanges within the camp itself, its production of 'bare-lives' and necropolitical relations.

The newspaper within the border-zone of the camp re-counts a relationship of violence (Edkins, Pin-Fat & Shapiro 2004, p. 4). This relationship confines Indigenous political sovereign lives and that also exposes them to a necropolitics that produced deaths within and outside the camp itself. This re-affirms the function of the racialised space to 'protect' Indigenous lives by 'dictat[ing] who may live and who must die' and, in doing so, exposing to assimilative practices and death all those that come in this zone. The discussion of dying and sick lives within the camp evoked an urgent call to act and help these lives and embodied traces of anti-colonial discourses within the newspaper on:

Aboriginals which are in the bush what business they stooping put too long in the bush what business they stooping out too long in bush the people is gone have plumpuddon to day on the 11th of October 1837 the which are in the bush wants have none at all for the absents of Mutton also distribute to day by the Commandant and they do not look after the sick do you see there was one of our sister die she died on Monday 9th October which is I hope is gone to glory.

And now my friends I am telling you now, don't you know that we must die in a short time and Alexander just in time and the Market is held for them onese a week they buy tobacco, pipes, sugar and threads the Aboriginal Mate Henery his going to Badger Corner to bring up the sick from that place. When I was standing at Mr Clarks house I saw the coffin carrying the settlement we will be all like that ...

And now my dear brothers and sisters will you lisson to these things or if you do not God will cut you off from the face of the earth he will cut you off in a moment of time.

[Signed] Thomas Brune Aboriginal Youth editor and Clerk of the Commandant Office. (11th October 1837 reproduced in Rose 1996, p.7)

In this excerpt, the sense of urgency is embedded within the concern for the ongoing refusal of the locals to stay within the camp itself and to continue hunting in the bush. This urgency is linked to a call to ensure that this practice does not overtake the safeguarding of the lives of the sick and dying Indigenous people in the camp itself. This writing evokes the resistance that some Indigenous people exercised against the bio-political relations that worked to reshape Indigenous lives by controlling their movements and access to food within and outside the camp. But this urgency also documents a form of political evocation that clearly attempts to safeguard the well-being of Indigenous communities by not giving up on the lives of Indigenous people and specifically not to abandon the sick. In this sense, the newspaper documents the violent force of the bio-political relations within the camp, but it also contrast this with the multiple forms of political resistance operating within the camp and the newspaper itself.

The *Flinders Island Chronicle* in effect denounces colonial power. It denounces its link to the very establishment of the camp and the sovereign surveillance of political cultural productions and/or political lives through bio-power – even as it marks the attempt to produce newspapers and Indigenous writing as a racialised heteropatriarchal normative technology. This is further underscored by sovereign attempts to dissipate the formation of an anti-colonial politics. The newspaper then enacts forms of (self-) protection from white sovereign colonial interests within the border-zone of the camp. This does not operate solely as a colonially mediated newspaper but also as a form of Indigenous writing affected by anti-colonial discourses that contested the establishment of the camp itself. The texts that I analysed in the course of this chapter give embodied glimpses of the ways white, sovereign colonial relations in the context of the nineteenth century operated to retain colonial sovereignty by terrorising, banishing and necropolitically controlling Indigenous lives – even as Indigenous people continued to contest these murderous relations. As I demonstrate in the chapters that follow, the biopower that ‘negotiated’ Indigenous people’s lives at Wybalenna, through its claim of ‘protecting’ Indigenous people, becomes an ongoing feature of the operations of the Australian settler-colonial state in the twentieth century.

Chapter Three

White Australia's Racial Arsenal and the Biopolitical Construction of the Federated Nation

In the wake of Australia's federation into a unified nation-state in 1901, a key feature of the order established by the biopolitics of the liberal racial state was the demand for political loyalty from Indigenous subjects, migrants, citizens and non-citizens. As seen in relation to the *Flinders Island Chronicle* and the Wybalenna Camp in the previous chapter, colonial sovereign relations carried pre-established racial assumptions on political self-determination. They were based on the obliteration and affectability of defined (racial) enemies and on the forceful demand for compliance to the settler-colonial project that worked to constitute the white nation. Biopolitical technologies of banishment and imprisonment were used to obliterate Indigenous political sovereignties in Tasmania and were, in the early twentieth century, expanded to constitute part of the mechanisms of security and population control enacted by the recently federated nation-state. The constitution of a biopolitical regime of governmentality through liberal rationality is always partly premised on the *a priori* of raciality and on the calculability of the mutations of the meaning of the (sovereign) political within the communal. With the establishment of the modern nation-state, bio-political technologies of security and population control were planned and expanded in ways that would saturate every aspect of communal life so as to continually intervene

and transform individual and communal (political) life. In this chapter, I proceed to map in detail the way the nation-state re-shapes – and is shaped by – mechanisms of biopolitical governmentality premised on the control, subjugation and assimilation of racialised populations.

The Modern Liberal State

Federation can be seen as a forceful plan to transform and control existing colonial arrangements and interests within the Australian context. In line with Foucault's discussion of the modern, liberal state and its sovereignty, this function is not the product of an autonomous power. The transformative force of the federated state is based on a set of heterogeneous practices and mobile effects, as well as being productive of regimes of multiple governmentalities:

The mobile shape of perpetual stratification (*etatisation*) ... or stratification in the sense of incessant transactions which modify, or move or drastically change, or insidiously shift sources of finance, modes of investment, decision-making centers, forms and type of control, relationships between local powers, the central authority. (2010, p. 77)

Liberalism in Australia, more specifically, is tied to the promise of not only transforming but also protecting or immunizing existing transnational and local western colonial market exchanges. This includes the control of the geopolitics of exchanges outside the British Empire's interests, the desire to diversify the economy through introduction of smaller investors and local economies, and the introduction of protectionism as a key mechanism of the market, especially from 1901. It is also tied to governmental utilities (that is, intervention through policies and practices) directed at populations. Utility and exchange both come to operate via a range of security mechanisms that inflate 'the juridico-legal codes and the

propagation of the disciplinary corpus' (Foucault 2007, p. 7).

Security is simultaneously the effect, as well as a central conductor of the process of immunization, of liberal forms of governmentality. In the Australian context, it develops into a key network of practices (Burke 2007) that securitizes white colonial sovereignty and it is both national and transnational in its reach. The notion of security, in other words, becomes central to political technologies of governmentality that are perceived to respond to both external and internal dangers and fears. These dangers include, but are not exclusive to, the following occurrences – some of which will be further explored in this chapter:

- 1) the British-Australian assertion of Australian colonial interests in Asia and Asian-Pacific Region called for colonial control and expansion of economic exchanges;
- 2) the ongoing presence of European powers in the region;
- 3) the annexation of Papua New Guinea and Australian calls to control New Hebrides;
- 4) a growing fear of military isolation in Asia in the era of 'New Imperialism' and its involvement with British imperialism (for example, sending troops to stop the Boxer Rebellion in China, the Boer war, and the South African expedition);

- 5) repeated challenges to British imperialism from non-European economic imperial formations and alliances⁵ such as China (and, after 1901, Japan);
- 6) the conflicts over modernisation of existing colonial economies (for example, attracting new investors and creating new local economies in places such as Queensland);
- 7) industrial conflicts marked by local hostility against indentured labour and non-white labour;
- 8) the rise of a national Anti-Asian migration movement and by the call to introduce colour bars and racial restrictions;
- 9) the impossibility of maintaining the newly federated nation solely through the skills of white British born subjects⁶;
- 10) Australia's continual conflicts against Indigenous Australians;
- 11) the continual decline in the birth rates of white subjects and reproduction rates and fears of racial miscegenation. (see Lake & Reynolds 2008; Banivanua-Mar 2007; Anderson 2006; Martinez 2005; Clark 1981)

⁵ Britain feared competition from the Russian, Chinese and Japanese Empires and military isolation in the Asian Pacific Region; especially after its refusal to adhere to Treaty of Commerce and Navigation with Japan (Willard 1978; Davison 1979; Clark 1981).

⁶ McConville has also argued that in the 1890s, British run unions were also concerned with the arrival of British immigrants that did not possess what were constructed to be the 'required skills'. As McConville (1988, p. 83) argues, the 'problem of matching immigrants skills to colonial labour requirements remained. Many unassisted immigrants came from the industrial cities of Britain ... were highly literate and included large numbers of skilled craftsmen (sic) ... But there was not a lot of work for [them]'.

What is clear is that these insecurities collectively worked to produce an anxious racial liberal nation-state that did not develop direct, open or friendly relations with Indigenous Australians or Asian and Asian-Pacific countries and their populations living within and outside Australia (Knight & Heazle 2011, p. 220). Rather, these perceived threats participated in the production of an insular modern nation-state that was, however, also part of a transnational project operating within the larger domain of the British Empire and in connection to other colonies and that was articulated through bitter political conflict and violence (Burke 2007, p. 2).

As Foucault has so clearly demonstrated, the freedom promoted by the liberalism of the modern state is effectively formed by a biopolitics of race (Foucault 2003). The biopolitical governance of the liberal state intervenes in the realm of securing white supremacy in governmental exchanges and utilities partly by regulating the population. Biopower, in Laura Anne Stoler's (1995, p. 82) words, becomes a primary instrument that is not solely based on the disciplinary technology of the 'individual dressage,' but also through regularization, a 'technology of security,' a 'bioregulation by the state' of its internal dangers. These governmental technologies conjoined a calculated disciplining of life on a colonized ground with the regularization of racialised populations. They created 'national citizenship' and in so doing exercised a sovereign authority that claimed to protect national lives whilst simultaneously enacting biopolitical regimes of letting die and direct killing. In this biopolitical context, populations become a key organizing principle, a political problem that is at once

scientific and a biological problem and, also, as power's problem (Foucault 2003, p. 245). These lives are either protected or left to die; they are fragmented, hierarchised or contained as distinguishable racial and sexual bodies whose 'animacies,' as Mel Chen (2012, p.8) argues, are selectively projected as either 'humanness' or 'animality'. By 'animacies,' Chen refers to the biopolitical construction of differential subjects and objects that work to figure in the nation's calculation of internal and external dangers. Governmental biopolitics is both the effect and cause of immunizing white sovereignty. It measures and decides where, how and when to intervene in the lives and deaths of fragmented populations not only within the nation-state but also those outside the nation-state (Foucault 1979, pp. 139-140; Stoler 1995, p. 33). Rey Chow's (2002) reading of Foucault has argued that racial discrimination is a logical manifestation of bio-power as it 'gives justification to even the most aggressive and oppressive mechanisms of interference and control in the name of helping the [white race] increase its chance of survival, of improving its conditions and quality of existence' (2002, p.7). In its many facets, biopolitics becomes a necropolitics that is the effect but also the creator of a white heteronormative national order.

As security mechanisms, biopolitical technologies worked to create a racial heteronormative order that would protect and immunize the white nation-state and its political sovereign interests. The liberal racial state promised securitized immunity (protection) for the white nation-state and the privileges of white citizenship. Although this promise was calculated and enacted by force, it was never fully achieved and produced; rather, what

resulted was, in Derrida's words, a political-juridico sphere that was bound by auto-immunization responses that threatened to paralyze it (Derrida 2005, p.35).

The creation of the settler-colonial nation, and its success, could only be guaranteed or secured by establishing a nation made up by white bodies and a white nationalism. The state fundamentally proposed to use a biopolitics of race to defend white Australia against perceived dangers via the restriction, segregation and deportation of target populations. In 1901, Deakin argued that:

The unity of Australia is nothing, if that does not imply a united race. A united race means not only that its members can intermix, intermarry and associate without degradation on either side, but implies one inspired by the same ideas, an aspiration towards the same ideals, of a people possessing the same general cast of character, tone or thought – the same constitutional training and traditions – a people qualified to live under this – the broader and most liberal perhaps the world has yet seen reduced to writing- a people qualified to use without abusing it, and to develop themselves under it to the full height and extent of their capacity. (reproduced in Dutton 2002, p. 32)

In this speech, Deakin's figuration of the urgency of national unity and of a united (white) race displays an anxiety about the death of the white race if the White Australian Policy is not introduced. This anxiety circulates as a national 'necessity' that populations are not only asked to 'see' but also to embody. Anxiety surrounding the 'death' of the white race affectively binds white populations to the biopolitics of the nation-state as a security mechanism (Ahmed 2004; Chen 2012).

This anxiety is part of what Sara Ahmed calls an 'affective economy'. It carries and connects its *a priori* onto-epistemology of raciality to and

across the social, psychic fields and bodies of the population. In Deakin's speech, this economy of anxiety operates within a biopolitics of race and attaches itself to the configurations of the signs of degradation that will result from inter-racial sexual relations. These are biopolitical attachments that create differential affective values dependent on the histories of associations and that, as Ahmed argues, 'are never over ... as it awaits for others who have not yet arrived':

Affect does not reside in an object or sign, but is an affect of the circulation between objects and signs (= the accumulation of affective value over time). Some signs, that is, increase in affective value as an effect of the movement between signs: the more they circulate, the more affective they become, and the more they appear to 'contain' affect. Another way to theorize this process would be to describe 'feelings' via an analogy with 'commodity fetishism': feelings appear in objects, or indeed as objects with a life of their own, only by the concealment of how they are shaped by histories, including histories of production (labor and labor time), as well as circulation or exchange. (2004, p. 123, p. 120)

In this context, the anxiety circulating in Deakin's speech is an affective approach that binds white populations to the values that inform the biopolitical security mechanisms of the state. It is based on social, scientific and biological disciplinary knowledge that channels this anxiety against those categorized as non-white subjects. This anxiety operates in the figuring of the biopower of the white nation itself by bringing it into being through a variety of mechanisms (legislative, cultural, educational, and so on) that enable it to circulate amongst the population (Pugliese 2002b).

Racial Science and Eugenics

Local and transnational scientific apparatuses also inform this biopolitical mode of normativising the protection of white populations. As discussed

in the previous chapter, a wide range of European and locally based disciplinary knowledges from within geography, linguistics, physical and social anthropology, history, biomedical sciences, medicine (including physiologists, anatomists, haematologists, serologists, pathologists, psychologists), all effectively worked toward securing white dominance (Anderson 2006; Garton 2010). In the early twentieth century within Australia, racial sciences, and eugenics in particular, continued to be guided by the onto-epistemology of raciality. It also guided the state's biopolitical regulation of populations both wishing to enter or already living within the nation-state by focusing on issues such as population health, family formation, reproduction and child welfare (based on establishing hierarchies of whiteness, race, sexuality, gender, disabilities and class) (Pugliese 2002b, 2010a). In particular, eugenics was concerned with the reproduction and improvement of the stock of the white population. The influential work of English scientist Francis Galton (1904, n.p) argued that eugenics was 'the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race; also with those that develop them to the utmost advantage'. He argued that it focused on spreading eugenicist knowledge, testing populations and researching the laws of heredity:

It has, indeed, strong claims to become an orthodox religious, tenet of the future, for eugenics co-operate with the workings of nature by securing that humanity shall be represented by the fittest races. What nature does blindly, slowly, and ruthlessly, man may do providently, quickly, and kindly. As it lies within his power, so it becomes his duty to work in that direction. The improvement of our stock seems to me one of the highest objects that we can reasonably attempt. (Galton 1904, n.p)

In Australia, the ideals of eugenics influenced a wide range of scientists, but also politicians and organizations seeking political reforms. This

included Aboriginal Protectionists, child welfare reformers, birth controllers, moral puritans, temperance advocates and juvenile reformers.

Australia's post-Federation population debate must be seen as embedded in not only a biopolitics of race but also of sexuality and gender. This debate scripts the population problem as 'power's problem' (Foucault 2003, p. 245). In the newly federated context of the Australian nation-state, the state's biopolitical population problem was especially concerned with:

- the mental and physical fitness and vigour of the white population; control of the sexuality of populations to either prohibit altogether or regulate racial-miscegenation, including enforcing or disallowing inter-racial relationships and marriages with regard to Indigenous populations;
- forceful removal of Indigenous 'half-caste children' from their families to discipline their 'absorption' into whiteness;
- blocking the arrival of non-white immigrants into the country;
- disciplining racial and ethnicized populations;
- demanding white migrants reproduce so as to reverse the decrease in the sizes of white families and the diminishing but still visible high infant mortality rate of children;
- the measuring and calculation of the adaptability of selected white populations in non-temperate regions in order to diminish their exposure to environmental harshness and tropical diseases;
- preventing the introduction of contagious diseases that came to be signified as brought by non-white indentured immigrants and named as 'Eastern diseases' to protect white workers' wages. (Pugliese 2002b; Douglas & Ballard 2008; Anderson 2006; Ellinghaus 2000)

Biopolitical governance would intervene at various levels of the population to participate in an ideological mandate to create a white heteronormative national order.

Biopolitical governance deployed technologies that measured, selected, categorized, hierarchised, excluded, segregated and restricted population lives. The following summary from Warwick Anderson's findings shows

how a rich biomedical and scientific racial vocabulary on the improvement of the stock of the white race guided biopolitical governance of the nation's population:

Avoid sources of pathology ... guide[d] to hygienic behaviour and civilised conduct. Race and environment jostled together in this civic vision. In Australia, most doctors assumed that only whites would ever reach the necessary standard of hygiene and decorum; some of them wondered if there were places – the tropics, for example – that were inimical to a cleanly, self-possessed, white civilization, places – that could never be successfully colonised and remain purely white. How might one live in such places in order to remain white? How could whites avoid pigmentation and degeneration? How must citizens behave in Australia if it was to become truly white, even in the tropical north? Medical sciences and public health came to provide a rich vocabulary for social citizenship in an anxious nation. Scientists and doctors counseled politicians and the public on how to implant and cultivate a working white race ... intellectuals sought to unsettle whiteness and then offered to resettle it. (Anderson's 2006, p. 4)

Whilst Anderson (2006), however, treats the anxious nation as a compact entity already established, I would argue that the unity of the white nation actually takes effect by an intensification of the aggregation of the state's biopolitics of race within scientific racism and eugenicist concerns. The circulation of an affective economy of anxiety and fear enabled this approach. This economy proliferated within the assertions of the danger of racial degeneracy and hereditary factors, mapping patterns of diseases, especially mental diseases, and the prevention of genetic flaws constructed as threatening the white race. For example, the work of Professor Harvey Sutton held 'an amalgam of hereditary and environmental' views and worked on improving the national 'racial ideal' that promoted the elimination, forceful sterilization and segregation of the 'unfit' type (Rodwell 1998, n.p). As Rodwell demonstrates, Sutton also believed that Aboriginal people were an example of a deteriorating race and were in fact 'rapidly becoming a minus race' (1998, n.p). What Sutton's work suggests

is that one can eliminate such ‘threats’ and improve the vitality of the white race via a range of biopolitical and necropolitical interventions in the body of the population by deploying a range of measures that included raising the birth rate of white children and the control of reproduction and racial mixing by segregation and forced sterilization (Anderson 2006, Pugliese 2010a). Sutton’s work demonstrates that scientific racism and eugenics operated as biopolitical and necropolitical onto-epistemological technologies that worked towards ensuring the biological security and health of the white nation.

The work of racial scientists informed the production of the White Australian Policy. Their work provided the racialised onto-epistemological ground upon which the ‘biopolitical mode’ of state security was based. For example, it influenced the segregation of Indigenous populations categorized as ‘full blood’ and the ‘absorption’ of Aboriginal children categorized as ‘half-caste’. It also led to the calculation, measurement and prevention of racial miscegenation that prohibited sexual relations and marriages between Indigenous people (including half-caste girls) and people defined as ‘Asiatics’ so as to prevent the reproduction of non-white children. This racialised regime also segregated non-white diasporic subjects within certain fields of work and business. It created a type of ethnic cleansing by deporting South Sea Islanders (who had been brought into the country through a violent regime of indentured labour) and it restricted new arrivals by measuring their whiteness via physical examination and dictation tests.

Working at the University of Melbourne, British professor of anatomy R.J.A Berry was a follower of Valentine Mott's work on hereditary degeneration theories and Karl Pearson's work on biometrics. He argued that the White Australian Policy was a 'medical problem' (Anderson 2006, p. 112) that needed to be tested. Berry's 'genetic determinism' used metric measurements of skulls of the population to neatly hierarchise Australian Tasmanian Aboriginals in the context of a racialised hierarchy that located them 'nearest to *Homo fossilis*, but morphologically [they] had progressed a very long way from *Homo primigenius* and the anthropoid ape — very much farther than most writers would have us believe' (cited in Cawte 1986, p. 44). Entering the human hierarchy meant also positioning these populations with other lowly ranked and inferiorised social categories including 'mental defective' and 'criminals' (see Anderson 2006) so as to compare and test their mental capacities:

Apparently, in primitive races, in delinquent types, and in the lower social grades of the population, the post-pubescent brain development is limited in extent and duration, when compared with that of the educated or more intellectual class of the population. Doubtless, it is the supra-granular or controlling layer of the cerebral cortex that lacks full development ... Here, as we previously pointed out, is the physical basis of a great percentage of pauperism, vice and crime. (reproduced in Cawte 1986, p. 46)

In effect, what circulated in this work was an anxious urgency to postulate a scientific narrative that could locate key signs of racial deterioration. Indigenous people, delinquents and the 'mentally defective' were all branded as non-normative bodies with signs of racial deterioration. This economy of anxiety attached itself to the dangers and necessity envisaged by biopolitical racial technologies of the state. It formulated a necropolitical, scientifically-based proposal for state intervention in the

termination of the existence of such small-headed people (mental defective and criminals) through voluntary sterilization or segregation (Anderson 2006, p. 171; Garton 2010, p. 244).

The White Australia Policy

As biopolitical racial technologies, population policies interlocked with the commitment to protect the interests of a white British colonial diaspora and the assertion of a more independent control over the colony's economic, social, political interests. These interests however, would not undermine the cultural, military and economic dependency on and support for the British Empire⁷. The speeches of protectionist politicians such as Edmond Barton and Alfred Deakin supported the introduction of the White Australia Policy through the *Immigration Restriction Act 1901* (Cwlth) (IRA). They discussed national security mechanisms that would re-draw geopolitical relations and, in doing so, consolidated a political strategy of engulfment. For da Silva (2007, p. 31) this strategy 'transforms exteriority into a moment of the version of the universal reason'; this transformation, I would argue, enables the moment of normativisation. In his support of the IRA, Edmund Barton, as Marilyn Lake notes, read out loud a passage from Charles Pearson's 1893 book *National Life and Character: A Forecast*, stating that:

⁷ This represents a nationalist call to incarnate through Federal regulations particular ethnic, racial, linguistic, class, sexual and gendered meanings that privileged British Australians and that supported through its economic, military links British imperial interests (ie. economic and military). Thus, with Federation the idea of an independent, homogenous British-Australian national culture embodying a specific organic history and heritage takes hold (Malik 1996, p. 37).

The Day will come when the European observer will wake to find the black and yellow races no longer under tutelage, but forming independent governments, in control of their own trade and industry, invited to international conferences and welcomed as allies by the civilised world (cited in Lake & Reynolds 2008, pp. 137-138).

When that day comes, Pearson had suggested, the white man's 'pride of place' in the world would be humiliated. Whilst Pearson's book saw these growing threats as almost historically inevitable (Lake 2008), Barton's vision of the Australian nation can be seen to be predicated on a Hegelian dialectic that would see the pure white state as the final realisation of a superior white civilization and self-consciousness outside of the parameters of old Europe (Pugliese 1994). In effect, for Barton, it was mechanisms of racialised security that, through biopolitical technologies such as the IRA, could enforce the institutionalisation of whiteness as a norm that identified and could eliminate the so-called 'Asiatic' threat from the Australian nation. For Barton, there were unequivocally and scientifically 'unequal and inferior' races that, he also argued, could never partake of the promise of liberal freedom or equality (Barton 1901 reproduced in Chiro 2011, p. 20).

Perera's (2009) notion of the 'insular imaginary' illustrates the formation of the modern Australian nation-state as an island-nation insulated from the racial threats posed by its regional location in the Asia-Pacific. She suggests that the configuration of an (ideological) insularity and the sense of a compact, singular, white Australian race and heteronormative nationalist imaginary rests on the perpetual displacement to externality, or negation, of co-existing and pre-existing relations with Asia and the Asian-

Pacific (Perera 2010). She argues that it forcefully re-draws the nation's territorial borders. So the nation-state marks a definitive stage:

In the self-constitution of Island-Australia, [through] its disavowal of an age-old link with Asia, and its emplotment henceforth as Island territory ... The plotting of Australia as an insular formation both expels the 'foreign' bodies around its edges and encloses Indigenous bodies around its edges and encloses Indigenous peoples more closely within clearly demarcated national borders ... the inauguration of this new geography confers a new territorial as well as racial corporeality on the geo-body of the island-nation. (Perera 2009, pp. 26-27)

This displacement is pre-established by the *a priori* onto-epistemology that produced raciality as always-already in place in the construction of the white settler-colonial nation. It is a racialised onto-epistemology that is maintained by strategic mechanisms that continually dispense the nation-state from obligations to geographies and relations that pre-exist the foundation of the colonial state (see Perera 2009). From 1901, with the passing of the White Australian Policy, this logic worked as part of the colonial nation's security mechanisms to immunize and optimize the institutionalization of whiteness and white privileges via biopolitical technologies.

The White Australia policy restricted the entry of non-white subjects into the nation, namely but not exclusively, those defined as part of the 'Asiatic' problem, especially Chinese, Indian, Japanese and South Sea Islanders. Whiteness is figured as part of a defensive regime. It becomes part of what da Silva (2007) calls 'an arsenal of raciality' that, in Moreton-Robinson's (2000) words, 'translocates' white British ethical, political, legal and economic values to the Australian colonial context. As Moreton-Robinson argues, this arsenal of raciality becomes embedded in:

The Australian mode of production [that] is derived from, and is part of the western system of capitalism; Australian systems of government are based on both British and American models; the system of law is British as is the system of education. Decisions that affect the nation and its politics, bureaucracies, policy and business are made predominantly by white males. Australia's immigration policy up until 1962 was 'whites only', and although government promotes a multicultural and tolerant society our institutions remain white in ethos and practice. (2000, p. xxi)

This whiteness was articulated within a wide range of technologies embodied by policies that included as already discussed the *IRA*, but also the *Pacific Island Labourers Act 1901* and *1906* (Cwlth) and variations of state-based Aboriginal Protection Acts that were amended and expanded especially after Federation and gave more powers to either Protectors or Aboriginal Protection Boards. The ability of these and other Acts to enact a white sovereign authority is derived by the forceful and violent onto-epistemological systems of comparison, selection, hierarchising and historicizing that confer supremacy to a white liberal, political order. In effect, Australia's federation into a unified nation-state enabled the introduction of new national laws that postulated the governance of the liberal racial state by the disciplining and regulating populations and individuals 'at every level of the social body' (Foucault 1998, p.141).

The *IRA* and the *Pacific Island Labourers Act* came to operate, in the context of the newly federated nation-state, as forceful and violent biopolitical racial technologies that governed populations through a type of territorial ethnic cleansing. This was practically actualized by the deportation, prohibition and restrictions of populations hierarchized and categorized, for example, as Pacific Island and 'Asiatics' or as non-white populations. What must be made clear here is that these *Acts* were not

‘exceptional’ developments per se; rather, as I discuss further on, their forcefulness was located within ongoing histories and practices of raciality. In 1901, however, in the context of the securitisation of the liberal state and the expansion of racial sciences, these policies planned to eliminate inferiorised populations from the territory of the nation-state itself. They operated through the forcefulness of deportation or by intervening directly in everyday diasporic lives by restricting and segregating ethnicized populations such as Chinese diasporic subjects, and the broader range of racialised groups homogenized as Pacific Islanders who were also targeted by the various racist policies.

Segregation was a key technology employed by the White Australian Policy. In her thesis, *‘Chinese Labour and Capital between 1847 and 1947 in Western Australia,’* Anne Aitkinson (1991) indicates that between 1886 and 1920, a wide range of legislations, including the *IRA* and the *Factories Bill 1903* (Cwlth), banned altogether the arrival of Chinese labor employed in white businesses and Chinese diasporic enterprises. In Western Australia alone the Chinese population dropped from a total of 1621 in 1901, including children born in Australia, to 680 in 1933 (Atkinson 1991, pp. 115-128). Irrespective of the time spent in Australia, or the fact that this was their home and/or birthplace, the creation of these racial policies set up internal borders that discouraged family formation and prohibited Chinese diasporic subjects from accessing any form of governmental support for migrants or their Australian-born children. Economically, this worked to segregate these populations to ‘specific industries that posed the

least threat to white labor and capital: market gardening, furniture manufacturing, retail and wholesale trading and laundry-work' (Atkinson 1991, p. 128). This reduced many Chinese families to poverty, often forcing them to leave Australia.

On the other hand, from 1901, approximately 7,500 South Sea Islanders were banished through the deportation mechanism of the *Pacific Island Labourers Act*. Opposition to their presence lay within sections of the labor movement due to the economic reshaping of the plantation systems of the Queensland economy (Douglass 1995). This opposition however, was infused with biomedical racial knowledge that argued white Europeans could adapt to the 'harsh conditions' linked to the tropical settings of North Queensland and that given:

The qualities of the white race appeared more robust than once thought, so it should prosper regardless of climate and circumstance; coloured races, by contrast, were now more commonly regarded as fixedly disease-dealing-germ growers and transmitters and white contact with them, behind a thin line of quarantine, must forever be limited. (Anderson 2006, p. 98)

In this sense, like segregation, deportation operated as a form of ethnic cleansing that dovetailed into racial scientists and eugenicist's calls to eliminate inferiorised populations and their children. These mechanisms further activated a raciality that prefigured the modern state's governmental implementation of biopolitical technologies committed to the supremacy of white political sovereignty through the introduction of white bodies and the governance of the racial make up of the population.

This process did not, however, stop political organizing from Chinese and Chinese–Australian diaspora. As Julia Martinez (1999) strongly argues,

these migrants and their Australian born children worked to shift the racial perceptions deployed by racial governmental technologies. Chinese storekeepers in Darwin produced a petition in 1911 that drew attention to the severe level of hardship and poverty produced by the introduction of the White Australian Policy. The petition does not question the introduction of the *IRA*, thus evoking an acceptance of the legitimacy of white sovereign state to banish diasporic subjects or restrict new arrivals. It does however, adopt a liberal democratic political strategy that demands the recognition of citizenship and citizens' rights for a specific business class of diaspora. This class is defined here as 'free migrants' that 'expended ... money in business here and have always been law abiding and paid our rates and taxes and in every other respect conformed to general and local laws' (1911 reproduced in Martinez 1999 p.251). This petition can be seen as a response to the totalising and universalising values set in motion by the biopolitical mechanisms of the White Australia Policy. It contests the categorization of Chinese immigrants as inferior types who endanger white capital and businesses on multiple levels. For instance, it contests the notion that they are 'servile' and 'cheap' labor that places white workers' wages in danger. It also rejects their positioning as biological threats, contaminators of the white race, sexual reproducers of a 'Mongrel nation', diseased and immoral, violent sexual predators (Atkinson 1991, Clark 1981 p.16).

By 1901, national concern grew about the rise in the number of Chinese-Australian born children. This second generation was effectively re-

working a gender imbalance that had been created by previous immigration programs and set a new pattern for the growth of Chinese diasporic family formation (Fitzgerald 2010, p. 50). Whilst racial policies produced the normativisation of the sovereignty of the white nation and the dominance of white bodies, the petition also narrates the ways Chinese-Australian diaspora was contained by fears. As an affective act that 'closed in' on these diasporic populations, raciality produced their suffering and a fear of 'dying of starvation'. The 1911 petition continues:

Many of these Chinese are married men with families, and they are dependent upon their manual labors for a livelihood. If all areas of employment in connection with Govt, works (which have previously been open to them) are absolutely closed to them it means great hardship and in many cases starvation ... most of us have lived in Palmerston for a great many years. At the time we came we were free to do so and to settle here. We expended our money in business here and have always been law abiding and paid our rates and taxes and in every other respect conformed to general and local laws. We are not for a moment complaining about the Immigration policy and want that to be understood ... All we ask is that the Chinese who are left shall not by future legislation be adversely affected as against the rest of the community without any compensation or redress. Had much of the legislation that has been passed ... recently been in existence years ago most of us would not have settled here. As it is now we have had no notice that such changes were about to be made and we have no compensation offered us? Most of our fellow countrymen are too poor to leave, and the only alternative seems to be to die from starvation. (1911 reproduced in Martinez 1999, p. 251)

Chinese-Australians were, as this petition demonstrates, racialised by capitalist relations and segregated into poverty and fearing starvation. As both Martinez (1999) and Atkinson (1991) note, the White Australia Policy exempted the state from any obligations to the Chinese diaspora's ongoing presence within Australia. In this particular case, the response to the petition was to offer 'free passages' back to Hong Kong (Martinez 1999, p.251).

In the inter-war years, there were also a growing number of attempts from the Chinese based Internationalist Communist organization, *Kuomintang*, to gain support for their demands from Trade Unions, like the Australian Workers Union (AWU). *Kuomintang* was a semi-Leninist body that allied itself with Soviet Union and it 'had 5,000 members and 23 branches in Australasia' by 1925 (Benton 2007, p. 74). In Darwin in 1928, the *Kuomintang* met with the founder of AWU Harold George Nelson. A Chinese-Australian member is recorded to have asked if the union would allow membership given that they were Australian citizens in need of support and:

Had been compelled to enslave ourselves in breaking down Australian conditions, face starvation, or ask for Government maintenance. We are greatly in need of Government protection, because we are born here and have no intention to leave the country except on holidays, because this is our home. (Martinez 1999, p.262)

I would argue that this statement demonstrates the way Chinese-Australians were placed in racialised exteriority by unions like the AWU. Their articulation of having been 'compelled to enslave ourselves,' for me, evokes the way Chinese labor historically comes to be constituted by a *racialised* hierarchical division of labor that, as Rey Chow (2002, p. 34) argues, benefits capitalist biopolitical interests. The biopolitical economism of the broad range of policies discussed above was advancing the proliferation of capital itself through segregation along racial lines. In this case, the union's commitment to the raciality of the White Australian Policy is shown to produce the same racialisation of labour that benefited capitalism including through slavery.

South Sea Islanders organization and supporters implemented a range of forceful responses against deportation. There was an outright refusal from some South Sea Islanders to accept deportation and, as Mercer (1981) painstakingly shows, they decided to stay and hide. These subjects were formally identified as ‘illegal’ subjects and were wanted by the authorities. Oral histories and interviews from their supporters recall that they had to hide from authorities:

One Islander lived in the hills south of Cardwell Ear some thirty years until he was apprehended and sent to an Aboriginal reserve, and in Innisfail a European hid a favourite servant for weeks in the bush and supplied him with food. In the Burdekin, Charlie Pentecost was one of several Islanders who were said to have evaded deportation: Charlie Cawaat from Tanna and his wife Rosie hid him from the police on many occasions and he stayed with them until he died in 1940. In Mackay, which had the largest Islander population, present day descendants recall that their parents and grandparents helped to hide many countrymen from the authorities; the heavy scrub around the Eungella Range was particularly suited to this. When these men finally re-appeared, local farmers (although aware of their illegal presence did not turn them into the police). (Mercer 1981, pp. 131-132)

Although it is unclear what informed their decision to stay, these escapees exemplify a direct refusal to accept to be contained by the biopolitics of the state and its white sovereignty.

This refusal also emerges with the formal questioning of the legitimacy of the sovereign authority of the Commonwealth to legislate the *Pacific Island Labourers Act*. Questions concerning the legitimacy of the state were taken to the High Court that, in its final findings, sustained the sovereign rights of the Federal Government over the arrival of so-named ‘aliens’. In its report on the proceedings, the *Queenslander* stated that:

The Commonwealth Parliament had no authority to pass the Act, and that the order of the magistrate for the deportation of the particular islander was therefore invalid. On those contentions important questions arose, and

these were exhaustively dealt with in the judgments of the court. It was held that the Commonwealth had power to pass this Act, and having authority to do that, it had the power to enforce it. That proceeded upon the principle that every self-governing State has the right to say whether or not aliens shall be admitted to prescribe the conditions under which they may remain and where it may be deemed necessary to expel them. The court considered that the Commonwealth held that right, and that legislation with regard to Pacific Islanders came within the authorisation of the Constitution Act. ('Deportation of Kanakas Validity of the Act' 1906, *n.p*).

In 1906, an amendment to the Act was also passed. It introduced a number of important exemptions that protected some migrants, such as those who had arrived in the country before 1879, been in the colony for twenty years, were too old and frail and unable to obtain support, were married to a woman from another island, or were married to a non-Pacific Islander woman, or were owners of a freehold (Mercer 1981, p.128-129). These exceptions allowed around 1,000 carefully selected diasporic subjects to stay (Mercer 1981, p.130). Yet although this was a political victory, the exemptions were a manifestation of the white biopolitical state's sovereign authority to decide on the final composition of the nation's population and on the 'value' of certain lives. Non-white diasporic subjects were inserted within a system of raciality that particularized their presence as an exception and as mere minorities, regulated by banishment or deportation and positioned as external to white citizenship. Despite the exclusionary racial policies, however, not all Pacific Islanders migrants left the colony (with or without the formal exemption).

Regulating Inter-racial Relations

The growing presence of South Sea Islanders and Chinese communities effectively indicates, as we are reminded by Perera (2009), that the white nation-state was always an 'imaginary' relation or only 'an inspiration, a

statement of intent rather than an achievement'. Perera (2009), Julia Martinez (2005), Regina Ganter' (2006), Michael Schaper (1995) and John Bailey's (2002) critical histories all work to map the continual reconfiguration of 'polyethnic communities' and the longstanding segmented hiring of 'non white' subjects from Asian-Pacific areas such as Indonesia, Syria, East Timor, Japan, China, Sri Lanka (Singhalese), Philippines and Malay in the Western and Northern part of Australia. In 1901, the pearling industry was also subjected to exemptions from the White Australia Policy:

The pearl shell industry was the only industry to be exempted from the *Immigration Restriction Act* ... Pearling masters were permitted to import Asian divers, tenders, and crew under indenture contracts. The exemption was controversial ... given that both coloured labour and indentured labour were contrary to overtly exclusionary policies of the new Australian nation. (Martinez 2005, p. 127)

This move to exempt non-white diaspora was not merely controversial; it was also a site for biopolitical relations that violently produced forceful governmental intervention over everyday diasporic and Indigenous relations. Since the mid-nineteenth century, Aboriginal Protection policies internalised and rendered normative the sovereign right of the government to take control of Indigenous people's lives. These governmental technologies 'exercis[ed] supervision and care over all matters affecting the interests and welfare of the Aborigines, and to protect them against injustice' (Paisley 2000, p. 27) 'through establishing either white "Protectors" or an Aborigines Protection Board' (Moreton-Robinson 2000, pp. 76-77). With the new protection policies of the early twentieth century there is a reconfiguring of protective or immunising technologies of the white nation-state that re-work the inter-racial relations linked to

Indigenous and racialised diasporic subjects by intervening in the regulation of labour, hetero-sexual relations and marriages.

The relations between Indigenous and non-white diasporic subjects are constituted as threatening the life and supremacy of the white order. These relations are perceived as creating unfair competition against whites that wanted total access to Indigenous labour. They are also posited as regressive and degenerative acts that were producing a ‘disgraceful state of affairs’, spreading diseases amongst Aboriginal populations and as encouraging prostitution, alcohol and opium consumption (Report by The Royal Commission on the Conditions of the Natives 1905, pp.11-12). With whiteness in mind, the 1901 Amendment to the *Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act 1897* in Queensland included a clause that banned ‘aliens of the Chinese race’ from employing ‘[A]boriginal or half-caste people’ (Ganter 2006, pp. 77-78). Racial segregation was further consolidated by the extension of the sovereign authority of Protectors to not only regulate all employers access to Indigenous labour, but also to intervene in domestic relations. Through this Act, they now had the authority to re-locate entire Aboriginal families into designated spaces of missions or reserves and to restrict and prohibit sexual relations and marriages with ‘Asiatic and Kanaka’ men. Protectors also intervened in the formation of families and domestic life by removing children categorised as either ‘half-caste’ or of ‘Native’ women (Roth 1899 cited in Ganter 2006, p. 77).

The legal changes in Queensland were part of a series of moves in the nation-state to assert an ongoing colonial white sovereignty to govern in totality Indigenous people's lives, communities and children. As Tony Birch (2001, p.4; p.2) also argues in relation to Victoria's protectionist practices, they 'alienat[ed] Aboriginal people from our country' and positioned Indigenous people 'outside [white] citizenship'. In 1901, the state also made ongoing attempts to obliterate Aboriginal autonomy by regulating Indigenous economic and domestic relations with racialised diasporic subjects. This enabled the negation of pre-existing Indigenous laws that governed everyday relations; in particular, it reiterates the lack of access to modern citizenship by both Indigenous and non-white diasporic subjects as it formalises the grounds for banishing these relations and the possibilities of sharing lives and children. As a result of these changes, Ali Hoosen, an Arab stockman and Topsy, the mixed descendent of Rosie, a Gangalida woman from the Point Parker, had to escape from Queensland to the Northern Territory in order to evade authorities attempts to take their children to a mission (Ganter 2006, p. 79). In the face of such action, however, it must be noted that some of Ali and Topsy's children were eventually removed by force and placed at the Doomadgee Mission at a later stage. The so-called 'protection' of Indigenous people through the prohibition of relations with non-white diaspora evidences the white nation's biopolitical deployment of racial technologies in order to secure and reproduce white sovereignty.

Inter-racial relations were constituted as incalculable sites of disruption

that required state-based interventions through biopolitical and necropolitical governmental technologies. They were legally scripted as a criminal and immoral but were also grounded as a biological problem or a degenerative threat that caused the spread of venereal diseases, and brought to life non-white children categorized as 'half-caste' that overall threatened the survival and homogeneity of whiteness. In this setting, in Chow's words, sexuality is locked into biopolitical concerns over (biological) reproduction of life and it works to intervene at the very level of inception of life:

Sexuality is no longer clearly distinguishable from the entire problematic of the reproduction of human life that is, in modern times always racially and ethnically inflected. Race and sexuality are thus coterminous with sexuality, just as sexuality is implicated in race and ethnicity ... their categorical miscegenation, so to speak, ... needs to be foregrounded. (2002, p.7)

In this context, Indigenous women's and diasporic men's sexualities are constituted as 'immoral' and thus sexuality and gender are becomes targets of biological sexual-racial concern.

The onto-epistemologies of the racial sciences and eugenics promoted an understanding of sex that was driven by the 'evolutionary narrative' of making a white [heteronormative] Australia (Oikkonen 2013, p. 6). As discussed in relation to medical scientists and eugenicists like Sutton and Barry, selective breeding programs were defined as preventing and therefore eliminating the reproduction of inferiorised and hierarchised lives within the white population. Although forced sterilisation was not legalised, I would argue that in the early part of nineteenth century the prohibition of inter-racial relations and intervention in the formation of

families with half-caste children enforced by Aboriginal Protectionist policies were operating as breeding prevention and control technologies. They intervened at the inception level of life and that worked to create a (biological) racial cleansing. In 1905, Western Australia also set out to minimise 'sexual intercourse between the Asiatics and aborigines (sic)' and 'its resultant evils' by criminalising and introducing police intervention, deportation of diasporic subjects, incarceration of Indigenous women and men, and the separation and relocation of children identified as 'half-caste' (Report by The Royal Commission on the Conditions of the Natives, WAGP, Perth, 1905, pp. 11-12). Environmental degeneracy theories also defined inter-mixed families as dysfunctional entities that created 'undesirable environments' for the growing number of 'problem' children categorised as half-caste (Roth cited in Haebich 2000, p. 306). These views thus legitimated the necessity for segregation, with the ultimate aim of eliminating the racial problem by way of legal-juridico interventions and the consequent removal of 'mixed-race' children in missions or reserves.

The Australian state's commitment to the national assimilation program incorporated a necropolitical attempt to eliminate and prevent the birth of 'half-caste' children from 'Pacific Island, African, Malay and Asiatic' families through biological absorption into whiteness (Beakley cited in Ellinghuas 2006, p. 206; Anderson 2006, p. 247). To this end, Kate Ellighaus (2003) suggests that both the Northern Territory and Western Australia supported racial or biological absorption that included the

prohibition of inter-racial marriages or miscegenation with non-white diaspora. They also strongly encouraged the marrying of 'half-caste' women to white men, in line with the racial scientific proposition that that such marriages were not likely to produce inferior black generations. Ellinghaus evidences the state practices on these issues:

In the late 1920s and 1930s both the Northern Territory and Western Australia were under the direction of strong-willed Chief Protectors who attempted to use the anti-interracial marriage clauses in the legislation to promote biological absorption. In Western Australia Augustus O Neville and in the Northern Territory Cecil E Cook endeavoured to set up a process by which the mixed-descent population would gradually be 'absorbed' into the white population through interracial sexual intercourse. These men were perhaps the most influential advocates of the elimination of Aboriginal physical characteristics during this period of Australian history. (2003, p. 190)

The enforcement of racial control over who could marry whom was the basis of a system of biopolitical but also necropolitical intervention in the sense that it worked to eliminate people of mixed descent via a system of absorption. In Queensland, under the rule of Aboriginal Protector Bleakley, a different approach was taken that explicitly opposed any interracial form of miscegenation, including with white men. This program planned to prevent altogether 'the impurity of mixed blood' (Ellinghaus 2003, p. X) and 'poor imitation whites' so the focus shifted to ensure that half-cast women 'should marry only Aboriginal men' (Anderson 2006, p.X).

Biopolitical racial technologies effectively categorized and hierarchised the everyday relations of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous women and their children. The fear of creating an inferior white race was monitored by a biopolitical securitization of whiteness based on the establishment of

an ideal heteronormative white family that reiterated the hierarchisation and categorisation of populations based on their sexuality, gender, reproduction and family formation. The fusion of pro-natalist concerns with racialised eugenics produced the prohibition of inter-racial relations and family formation. It saw the issuing of racialised policies directed toward the prevention of 'race suicide,' associated with the decline in the fertility rates and high mortality rates amongst white populations that had seen a decrease from an average of seven children per white families in 1881 to four children in 1911 (Matthews 1982; Howe & Swain 1992). In relation to white reproduction, the infamous 1904 *Royal Commission into the Decline of Birth Rate* (Charles K. MacKellar, President of Commission, 1904) is often cited. It concluded that the decline in birth rate was a result of white women's 'love of luxury', their 'selfishness and pleasure seeking' and ability to ask 'for abortifacients as openly and indifferently as they would ask for a toothbrush' (Crum 1904, p. 122; Featherstone 2011, p.22). The Commission recommended the prohibition of selling such 'preventatives' (Crum 1904, p. 122; Featherstone 2011, p.22). A closer look at the pro-natalist Chair of this Royal Commission, Charles K. MacKellar, who had been active in NSW on the Health Board, Immigration Board and State Children Relief Board, shows that he long advocated the increased reproduction of white babies within the family unit rather than increased immigration. MacKellar professed that the creation of healthy environments for white children was dependent on a scientifically rationalized form of motherhood that would stop the transmission of 'vicious' habits and ultimately constitute a productive

healthy white citizenship (Parry 2007, pp.143-150). He argued that the heteronormative white family run by white mothers was the ideal biopolitical environment necessary to eliminate the production of 'delinquents,' (Garton 1986, p. 21) specifically, 'illegitimate children' (Reekie 1998, p. 108) largely from single parents households of white but also of non-white women. The 'unwed mothers', white or also defined as Indigenous with white ancestry, are in these documents represented as 'feeble-minded' and racially inferior subjects that present a 'monstrous spectacle: immoral, undeveloped, uncontrolled and unthinking ... a national affront' (Reekie 1998, p. 121) to the notion of white bourgeois motherhood. Poor and single mothers were defined effectively as participating in the creation of inferior white children. They represented as unable to rear their infants to become industrious useful white citizens and were often compelled forcefully to give up their children.

What is operative in these discourses of the ideal, heteronormative family are the complex intersections of race and gender and their differential hierarchies. White single women with children, within biopolitical economies of heteronormative nuclear families, are scripted as dysfunctional and immoral and thus unable to produce healthy white children. They were then disenfranchised of their rights to bring up their own children. This disenfranchisement is, of course, further amplified for Indigenous single mothers, who had their mixed-race children forcibly removed, even as they also experienced the full panoply of violence enabled by the racist *Aboriginal Protection Acts*.

Within the ambit of raciality, sexual and also gender imaginaries become ‘an imperialist subject production’ (Spivak 1999, 284). In this context as Spivak (1999 p. 287) has long argued when asking the question of ‘Can the Subaltern Subject Speak?’ – the ‘white men are configured as saving brown women from brown men’; that is, through the prohibition of inter-racial sexual relations, the Protector ‘saves’ Aboriginal women from non-white diasporic male sexuality and their contaminating biologically-based criminality. I also want to note here that half-caste children are also posited as ‘saved’ from promiscuous mothers, dangerous relations, and in Heabich’s (2000) words, the ‘primordial’ family unit ... [with] a black woman living in comparative savagery’ with her abandoned child, living in a cultural limbo of disease, immorality and squalor (Haebich 2000, p. 137). Effectively, these categories, as da Silva (2013, p. 47) argues, ‘hold violence in the subjects of affectability produced by the biopolitical and disciplinary apparatuses that deploy them: the black other, the female other, the sexual other, in which other possibilities also hide’.

Australia’s racialised biopolitical regime must be seen as situated within the larger transnational network of the British Empire. These transnational networks of biopolitical raciality encompassed a wide swathe of colonial nation-states, including:

The US, Canada, New Zealand, Kenya, South Africa, Rhodesia and Zimbabwe ... [These were] zones where colonial relations attempted to prevail over Indigenous sovereignty. These networks operated through a racialised knowledge that privileged the positioning of a “white man” by displacing their British identification. (Lake 2003, p. 352)

In *Drawing the Global Colour Line*, Lake and Reynolds (2008) provide an

insightful engagement with not only the spread of a global politics of whiteness at a time when the US, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa were forming as nation-states, but also with the great political opposition and resistance against white imperial domination. The networks were created through debates, conversations and extensive intellectual trans-Pacific exchanges produced through the work of W.E. B Du Bois, Charles Pearson, James Bryce and they involved key political figures, including Theodore Roosevelt and Edmund Barton. Their aim was to encourage the growth of segregation in California and the American south, the rise of Apartheid in South Africa and the White Australia policy in Australia (Lake & Reynolds 2008). What needs to be added, here, is that the racial sciences and eugenics were also part of these transnational conversations: for example, Professor Sutton's work in biometrics at University of Sydney, or Ian Berry who was influenced by biometrics and trained and published in European journals before and during his position at the University of Melbourne (Cawte 1986; Rodwell 1998). What interests me most here is the ways these transnational exchanges were underpinned by the violence of white colonialism. This colonial violence had been exercised, tested and strengthened against Indigenous populations and non-white immigrants, including indentured and/or temporal forms of labor in the production of a hegemonic white sovereignty.

An analysis of transnational relations demonstrates that the *Immigration Restriction Act* (IRA) and the *Pacific Island Labourers Act* in effect attempted to nationalize white colonial sovereignty, even as it drew upon

its transnational networks and relations of power. My argument here, on the transnational dimensions underpinning nationalist instantiations of colonial white sovereignty, can be exemplified by how Australia's IRA was guided by the racial biopolitics of the South African *Immigration Restriction Act (Natal Act) 1897*. This Act had imposed an 'educational, health, age and means test' largely against Indians, that is, on colonized subjects that had also long been employed as temporary labour in South Africa (see Jupp 2002, p. 46).⁸ This same *Act* was also used in the US, in Mississippi in 1890, to 'prevent African Americans from voting, by administration of an oral or written dictation test that would be eventually extended to Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, South and North Carolina, and Virginia' (Jupp 2002, p. 46; Lake & Reynolds 2008). Against this transnational background, the Australian IRA represents a transformation of the original act and an expansion of the local colonial aims to introduce a *Coloured Restriction Bill 1896* drawn from the anti-Chinese legislations in NSW, Victoria and South Australia introduced in the 1850s (Clark 1981, p. 11). The IRA as a biopolitical racial technology came to embody an amplified ability to regulate sexuality, class, gender and abilities of immigrants. As Pugliese (2002b, p. 160) has shown, it operated within the ambit of the onto-epistemology of raciality and the racial sciences of the late nineteenth century that procured the biopolitical mechanisms to conduct 'diagnostic screenings of race' or intrusive physical examinations that were expected to guarantee the embodiment of whiteness by migrants subjects. What must be stressed here is that these racial screenings and the

dictation test in a European language produced quite an effective totalizing outcome, that is, it produced the ability to regulate ‘the exclusion of all whom you really desire to exclude’ (Keith 1912, p. 1082). This infusion of transnational and local practices founded on regimes of biopolitical raciality worked to ensure the power that white sovereign authority could exercise over the lives of a nation’s subjects.

The circulation and availability of temporal forms of non-white labor in the Australian colonies since the 1840s was circumscribed by a range of transnational debates. The introduction of the *Master and Servant Acts* (1892) was derived from existing the transnational movement of temporal laborers from India (Hinks et al. 2007, p. 366) and the internal political debates in the US about hiring free-slaves or their children as indentured labourers, (Freehling 1994; Lake 2008, p. 112). The Indian temporal workers in Natal (South Africa) and the South Pacific Islanders in Queensland were both derived from colonized geopolitical spaces and engulfed by a coloniality that immunized its violence against these populations by positing them as dangerous natives, needing the forceful discipline and regulation that could be administered by the colonial system. As Franz Fanon (1967, p. 36) argues, ‘the settler owes the fact of his very existence, that is to say, his property, to the colonial system’. In Queensland, the same force and violence that had been deployed to colonize ‘Melanesia’ and its varied native populations, re-positions South Sea Islanders in the 1860s as economically viable but also as needing restrictions and control. Like many others non-white indentured laborers

in Australia, they were re-located into the existing colonial system of racial stratification and were subjected to forceful and unfair legal treatment⁹. As shown by Tracey Banivanua-Mar, South Sea Islanders lives were shaped by the violent colonisation of Melanisia itself:

The indentured labor trade ... was ... the product of a systematic violence that drew its moral acceptability from the position that Islanders were widely seen to occupy on that sliding scale of civilization. In other words ... the automatic association of Islanders with savagery, cannibalism, and blackness, in concert with the self-defensive, punitive, and pre-emptive violence that was visited against them, was the dynamic that produced Melanesia as a colonial frontier. Indeed, it was only by locating their operations on a frontier between savagery and civilization that advocates of the labor trade were able to claim moral authority in the eyes of a vocal British-Australian public skeptical of race-based labor regimes in the post-abolitionist period. (2007, p. 21)

Within the Queensland colony, raciality informed labor (and gender) stratification; it signified these populations as needing forceful treatment and, when necessary, as removable from Queensland itself. This forceful treatment was evidenced in 1867 with the prohibition against ‘naturalization’. The introduction of the *Aliens Act 1867 (Qld)* that allowed ‘British naturalization to become accessible’ to ‘any alien being a native of

⁹ Since the 1840, the importation of non-European indentured workers from India, China, the Pacific Islands, the Filipinos, Malays, Japanese, Indonesians and Javanese, Syrians and Singhalese (Kabir 2013; Martinez 2005; Jupp 2002; Atkinson 1991; Saunders 1984) under the *Master and Servants Acts* was defined through a colonial raciality that differentiated them from white indentured labor in terms of desirability, type of work, contractual arrangements but also by their forceful treatment. They were interiorized and categorized as fluid, dispensable, cheaper and temporal workers but also as affectable and obliterated populations. When discussing the pearling industry in Western Australia, Martinez (2005, p. 133) argues that although all indentured labourers were covered by the same penalties of the *Masters and Servants Acts*, this was applied differently. The Master Pearlmen believed, as did the Australian government, that force was a necessary and everyday tool when dealing with non-white workers. Atkinson (1991) also draws attention to the way Chinese workers were not only, at times, underpaid or original agreements were not fulfilled, but they also faced hostilities in the courts and by police who gave preference to the masters.

a European or North American state' (Kabir 2010, p. 74) illustrates the colonial violence of this system of racial subjugation. It ensured that South Sea Islanders were subjected to harsh physical and emotional recruiting methods that included bribery, arson, forced marriages for single women, kidnapping murder and even massacres (for example, the massacre that occurred during the voyage of the *Carl* in 1872). Once in the colony, they were also subjected to poor working conditions in the domestic realm and plantation camps (Saunders 1984; Evans, Saunders & Cronin 1988; Banivanua-Mar 2012).

The White Australian policy also created a Northern European alliance. Britain preferred to include in its formation of the West abroad only countries and subjects identified as part of the Northern axis of Europe. This selection was influenced by racial onto-epistemology that effectively 'Divided the white races themselves into classifications that included "Nordic" (the Anglo Saxons, who had restless creative energy, were conquering explorers and were politically efficient) and the Mediterranean (who were swarthy, emotional and lacking in a high sense of discipline)' (O'Connor 1996, p. 61). In *Animal Kingdom* (1849), Cuvier had long distinguished the Caucasian race from the Mongolian and Ethiopian. Further, he also divided and ranked the Caucasian race into three principle branches, which 'foreshadowed later tendencies to subdivide the Caucasian race into several distinct races' (Cuvier 1849; Baum 2006, p. 103). British physiologist William Lawrence (1783-1867), as Bruce Baum argues, also claimed that there were 'moral and intellectual differences' between the

“dark” and “white” races’ and amongst “white races” that comprised the Caucasian variety of human beings... the more noble virtues and talents were found in a higher degree among the Celtic and German, than among the Slavonic and Oriental People’ (2006, pp.104-105).

British colonists were long adhering to knowledge that gave preference to a ‘Caucasian race’ against Indigenous and non-white diaspora. This preference, however, was always based on a system of whiteness and racial classification that differentiated Northern from Southern Europeans. Racial scientists argued that British subjects shared similar characteristics, including ‘racial genes’ that rendered them racially superior (white European) subjects. As Anderson notes, W.E. Agar, a zoologist who gave strong weight to genetic inheritance, argued that the Australian state needed to produce a ‘purification and re-assortment of Northern European genes’ through immigration:

With the higher birth rates among the poor, it was evident that the intellectual capacity of the white race would soon decline, leading to national disaster. Like Berry, Agar recommended that the state limit the breeding of unfit members of the population encourage the reproduction of the talented middle class and select only a good class of immigrant especially those of Nordic ancestry (2006, p. 173).

The identification of Northern European diasporic populations as desirable migrants since the 1850s led to the selective acceptance of subjects from specific religious, occupational backgrounds and locations within Northern Europe, including Germany, Sweden, Denmark and Norway and eventually Northern Italy (Lyng 1935). As Northern Europeans, they were positioned as sharing similar characteristics with British colonists; for example, in the Legislative Assembly of the colony of Queensland it was argued that ‘would it be better ... to confine our immigration to the British

isles, Germany, Denmark and Sweden, men of our own colour' (cited in Galassi 1991, p. 44). These similarities were perceived as desirable indicators of the (racial) capacity to assimilate into Anglo-centric diasporic customs and the ability to reproduce forms of colonial European whiteness that would benefit British imperialism. Subjects identified as Nordic migrants who received assisted passages to Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania in the 1850, 1870s, 1880s (and that also came to include Northern Italian subjects in the colony of Queensland in 1896) were expected to assimilate into the racial and heteronormative roles of agricultural and domestic skills, knowledge and biological capacity. They were expected to reproduce and institutionalise a 'superior whiteness' – as I will discuss in more detail the next chapter (Lyng 1935; Anderson 2006).

In 1896, the Queensland Government, during their attempt to shift from an economy based on large plantations to one based on smaller farms, sponsored women and men as agriculturalists and domestic workers from the Northern region of Piedmont of Italy. The IRA and the *Pacific Island Labourers Act* gave preference to the racialised category of Northern Europeans from 'British Isles, Germany, Denmark and Sweden', and Northern Italians were to join this list (Galassi 1991, p. 44). Even as Northern Italians were allowed immigrant status, Southern Italians, who were racialised as 'non-white, non-Europeans, immoral, criminal and racially contaminated through racial miscegenation' (see Pugliese 2002a; Palombo 1999; O'Connor 1996), were often blocked entry. By the early twentieth century, the construction of the assimilable white diaspora is

locked within a British-Australian colonial discourse; it viewed these Northern populations as providers of 'labor' and 'skills' necessary to build the white state.

The transformation of the colonies into a unified modern liberal state becomes reliant on a call for 'white Europeans' to provide a way of unifying and solidifying what are constructed to be white western interests and values within Australia. In the historical context of the late nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth century, a realization about the impossibility of establishing a colony solely constituted by white British labor resulted in diasporic and transnational agreements between Australia, Britain and other European countries to help fulfill the Western project of colonization abroad. Mass migration from selected European countries was part of the production of a white Australia. Significantly, European countries such as Spain, France, Germany, Holland, Sweden, Greece and the newly forming Italy, conceived of themselves as superior white 'colonial powers' that endorsed in specific ways the practice of white European colonization. Countries like Italy shared an idea of the 'superior white West'. Since the late 1860s, Italy had attempted to establish colonies in North Africa, including Eritrea. In 1883, Italy also signed a *Treaty of Commerce and Navigation* with Britain which enabled Italian subjects and labour to enter, travel, reside and acquire property in each other's colonial dominions (Cresciani 1982, p. 83). In 1887, it signed the first 'Mediterranean Agreement with Britain', which supported British presence in Egypt, while gaining support for Italian presence in North

Africa (Cresciani 1982, Clark 1984, p. 48; Cunsolo 1990). Crucially, Italy had a large pool of labor available to emigrate. Its unification (which I will discuss in the work that follows) and industrialization in selected areas of the North had displaced local economies and led to the formation of a large and mobile labor force ready to migrate to countries like Australia or the US (Gabaccia 2000; Verdicchio 1997; Gramsci 1999). Their individual selection and presence became part of a racialised call to form a 'white or Western alliance' abroad in a moment of colonial need and expansion (Hall 1992). European migrants, then, including subjects identified as of Italian origins, are not only part of these western colonial global relations; but their very formation as diasporic subjects can also be understood as the effect of these historical colonial relations. In this context, any discussion of European migration promulgates the formation of subjects identifiable as diasporic colonizers or as colonial settlers. This is not to imply that all migrants uncritically accepted the colonial project or that their roles were fixed or equally shared; on the contrary, as I discuss in my final chapter, it denotes the way colonial violence differentially informed the formation of European migrants in Australia.

In their attempt to normalize British white sovereignty in Australia, biopolitical formations limited the identification of diaspora as precisely as *colonizers*. Although these colonial settlers were selected on the basis of a type of *a priori* commitment to western colonialism associated with their country of origins, this knowledge was regulated and restricted. It seems that British-Australian diaspora feared that the nation would be threatened

by possible claims for European sovereignties within Australia. My point, here, is concerned with Australia's racialised national narrative that allowed British-Australian diasporic interests to dominate and silence any non-British colonial claims. By assimilation it was meant that white European colonial settlers were expected to acquire whiteness or Anglophilic characteristics including demonstrating political loyalty to the building a white sovereign nation and its support for the interests of the British Empire. The state based call for racial assimilation becomes enmeshed in the securitization of the modern state. As I discuss in the next chapter, enmity relations linked to World War One re-shape whiteness, redefine the existing racial caesurae within the population and define civilians as 'enemy aliens'. The internment of civilians will be carefully discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter Four

The Turn to the Empire

As Britain enters World War One, the sovereign assertion of political loyalty to British Armed Forces re-signifies the onto-epistemology of the nation and the national subject. This loyalty forcefully re-imagines the modern Australian nation and its national subjects insularly and, exclusively, as part of a British imperial global and transnational mechanism of defense that, in Robin Cohen's words, are marked by a continuing connection with the homeland, as deference to and imitation of its social and political institutions and a sense of forming part of a grand imperial design whereby the concerned group assumes the self-image of a chosen race with a global mission (Cohen 1997, p.62).

As discussed in the previous chapter, the territorialisation of a white colonial Australia was always grounded on its exchanges with Britain and an established transnational network across colonial grounds. In World War One, however, there was a focus on totalizing the sovereignty of these relations by asserting more violently within the communal what Derrida (2005, p.10) would call 'a turn' to (sovereign) British imperial origins. The technologies of the state conduct the democratic space toward a British imperial sovereign self, as Derrida states:

Whenever it is a question, for example, of sovereign self-determination, of the autonomy of the self, of the *ipse*, namely, of the one self that gives

itself its own law, of autofinality, autotely, self-relation as being in view of the self ... so many figures and movements that I will call from now on ... *ipseity* in general. By *ipseity* I thus wish to suggest some “I can”, or at the very least the power that *gives itself* its own laws, its force of law, its self-representation, the sovereign and reappropriating gathering of self in the simultaneity of an assemblage or assembly, being together. (2005, pp. 10-11)

This ‘turn’ to the sovereign-self consists in the re-assembling of an arsenal of raciality that asserts an insular, supremacist white imaginary. The modern nation-state is imagined as an exclusive Anglo-Saxon space that is part of the British imperial global project as part of British Armed Forces. As discussed previously, racial sciences and eugenics were already invested in the calculability of planning and defending a biological and somatic white nation in opposition to blackness. They informed the elimination of non-white populations and encouraged the arrival of white European diaspora. This ‘turn’ to the self, however, also re-configures the supremacy of white sovereign political loyalty to the British imperial project by appealing to an onto-epistemology of raciality that locates the modern nation-state as owing its existence to its shared blood and racial origins with the British nation. In this context, the origins of the sovereign-self is figured as the exclusive expression of an imperial Anglo-Saxon white race (physical body) and its political, juridical, and economic expression, namely the Australian modern (racial) nation-state as a part of the British Empire (da Silva 2007, p.202).

On the eve of World War One, the Prime Minister Andrew Fisher pledged the nation-state’s exclusive allegiance to Britain and to its allies. In this sense, the state pledged the allegiance of the Australian people in both

physical and cultural terms and their commitment 'to help and defend her [Britain] until our last man and our last shilling' (Fisher 31 July speech reproduced in Warhaft 2004, p. 74). The successive Prime Minister, Billy Hughes, also promoted the Australian state's loyalty to the war. He appealed to a racial commitment when he argued in London in 1916 that:

I speak as one from the frontier of Anglo-Saxonism when I say that, to those who know the British Empire, and the resolute men and women who inhabit it, there is not a shadow of doubt that the vast might of the Empire, and of our race as it can and must be organised, will be invincible and completely victorious. (Hughes 17 March 1916 speech reproduced in Warhaft 2004, p.76)

Here state sovereignty can be seen to turn its focus toward re-assembling the political loyalty of the nation-state; it is posited as devoted to the defence and security of the supremacy of the British Empire and of its armed forces. The Australian Imperial Force consequently, occupied German New Guinea and fought in Gallipoli, France, Belgium and the Middle East as part of securitizing the dominance of the British Empire and white British race during a process of European colonial reconfiguration.

During this war, state sovereignty was also defined by growing colonial interests abroad. As part of the British Armed Forces, Australia was guided by British imperial interests in the taking of military control over German New Guinea. This territory came under Australia's 'de facto rule' after 1916 (Winter 2012, p.46 p.34; Bastian 2009). Christine Winter in a personal conversation expressed the view that the desire for colonial rule abroad grew during the war:

Australia was not at all certain that German New Guinea would or should stay with them. In 1916, however, when there were discussions to end the

war on the Western front, to demand territorial cuts from Germany but give back all colonies, it is at this time that Australia got into the spirit of keeping New Guinea. (Personal Conversation 2013, 16 November)

Winter, also points to Brundson-Fletcher's argument in *The New Pacific: British Policy and German Aims* (1917), which contains a forward by Prime Minister Hughes and demonstrates Australia's growing colonial interests in this war at this time. The book argued that:

[T]he people of Australia and New Zealand look upon the German New Guinea Protectorate and German Samoa with very different eyes to-day from what they did in the beginning of 1914. Their representatives hold these possessions for the Allies, but they have begun to think of them now as British. It is impossible to discuss a Pacific thrown back into the old conditions. It is a new Pacific. (Brundson-Fletcher 1917, p.xii)

This text in effect assembles a colonial state desire to take full responsibility for German New Guinea as part of the British Empire. The assumption of this responsibility, however, was only formally agreed upon in 1921 as set in the C Mandate of the League of Nation (Winter 2012, p. 3).

The political loyalty to the Empire in this war essentially re-writes the limits of white sovereignty within Australia. White national citizenship is re-defined in 1914 by the insularity of enforcing a unitary form of state allegiance to the British Empire. The territorialisation of white citizenship is conducive to a heightened national loyalty for the British Empire. This was mobilized partly by the configuring of the war as a battle for supremacy between contending white European races and empires. In Hughes' speeches, for instance, the analytics of raciality assembles a Hegelian differentiation that postulates British colonisation as a signifier of a superior physical whiteness (body) that institutes a superior modern

civilisation (culture) that produces democratic institutions and ‘liberty’ (da Silva 2007). Thus loyalty to the British Empire rests on the racial distinguishing of the German Empire, and its people, as an inferior but also dangerous white civilisation run by a ‘despotic’ state with underdeveloped political institutions and barbaric morals or inferior sovereignty (Hughes 17 March 1916 speech reproduced in Warhaft 2004, p.76; da Silva 2007). In the Australian context, Hughes’ speech tracks a shift in existing white settlers relations that had been enforced and produced so far by the biopolitical/racial mode of colonial authorities and the modern state. This is a shift that, as I demonstrate further on, is calculatedly enforced by martial law, its military technologies and ultimately the establishment of the concentration camps around Australia.

In particular, the shifting settler relations with Germans in Australia had been a product of onto-epistemologies of whiteness. German-Australians came to be constituted as the largest group of civilians interned in World War One, with around 4,500 German-born Australian residents interned (Bandhauer & Veber 2009, p. 155), including seven hundred naturalized subjects and seventy British-born subjects (Fischer 1989, p. 23). As white settlers, their arrival was seen as crucial in constituting a modern white state that stood in opposition to Indigenous sovereignties and blackness. They confirmed the insular imaginary of white national citizenship by conforming to biological restrictions that sought the elimination of non-white populations by calculatedly encouraging the arrival of white European diaspora. As a result of this process, Germans came to be the

second largest group of white settlers encouraged to migrate to Australia. As white, Northern European migrants, historically in friendly relations with Britain, German diaspora had been characterised as desirable subjects. They were perceived as peaceful, possessing valuable agricultural and business skills and as religious people that would reproduce large families that shared with Anglo-Saxons, the Teutonic hereditary white somatic features /or genetic attributes (Scully 2012). With the formation of the German Empire, however, as Richard Scully's research on the writing of British travellers in Germany shows, there is a growing perception from the end of the nineteenth century that the Germans possess a 'dangerous consciousness'. This negative view was informed by British-based charges of 'military aggrandisement', of being 'insolent' or 'overbearing', with dubious morals and politics especially the support for (ultra) nationalism amongst its intellectuals (Scully 2012 p.70; da Silva 2007).

In Australia, during War World One, German-Australian diaspora is re-imagined through an affiliative raciality that embodies them, irrespective of their civil status or political affinities, as inferior and immoral German nationals. Raymond Evans in his study of newspapers responses shows that there is an 'amplification of anti-Germanism':

and the general targeting of German residents... German 'frightfulness' was entirely consistent with Germany's history and character, the monthly Lone Hand argued in late 1915, for no race was "so clotted with iniquity" as they. Originally, Germans in Australia may have been "peaceful folk" but it was no longer possible to disassociate them from their European kinsmen. "It is known that German emigrants all over the world had been secretly organised by German agents to act whenever necessary in the interests of the Fatherland" ... German Australians were thus "not to be considered as ordinary human beings. There is something diabolical about their methods which puts them beyond the pale. (1988, p. 11)

This form of raciality re-constitutes the somatic whiteness attributed to German populations as a dangerous racial signifier that embodies a diabolical propensity to schemes and plots against the Australian nation-state. In one of his speeches, Billy Hughes alerts the public to the way (physical) appearance effectively disguises an inferior culture:

We should fall back into what, although it might be disguised under the thin veneer of Kultur, would nevertheless be a real state of barbarism, for barbarism does not differ from civilisation in appearance, but in reality; not by their garments alone do civilised men differ from barbarians, but in their thoughts, in their outlook upon Life, in their conduct and in the acceptance of the standard of Rights not Might. (Hughes 1916 cited in Warhaft 2004, p. 76)

It is relevant here to re-connect the social and scientific knowledge evoked here to the epistemological regimes of raciality that had professed that one's intentionalities were knowable, open to ordering and disclosable by the observation, study, comparison, measurement and surveillance of what was defined as a natural body (Pugliese 2010a). This racial regime had been of course a key producer of the biopolitical and necropolitical differentiation between white bodies worth protecting and black bodies constituted as racial enemies that could be killed. Martial law and the establishment of the Wybalenna Camp in Tasmania had violently constituted heterogeneous Indigenous populations as black bodies that could be killed or alternatively could be transformed through the civilizing purpose of the camp. In this respect, the categorisations introduced by the *War Precautions Act 1914* (Cwlth) and its *War Precautions Regulations 1915* (Cwlth), including the establishment of concentration camps across Australia, shift the racial focus onto whiteness and to the actual 'origins' of the (white) enemies. What we see operating through the legislated regulations are categories that ethnicise these white settlers as 'enemy

aliens' irrespective of their actual civil status or declared allegiances. By hierarchising the cultural or what are perceived to be inferior political, moral and economic pro-German and nationalist intentionalities, this ethnicised diasporic population becomes criminalized as a foreign enemy of the Commonwealth. In this sense, the establishment of concentration camps across Australia as biopolitical racial technologies of security works to shift the focus to questions of (ethnic and gender) origins and nationality so to enable the state to identify and surveil (white) political dangerousness.

The Technologies of War

With the outbreak of World War One, political allegiance to the British imperial nation becomes mandatory within the context of the Australian nation. This 'turn' involves the suspension of liberal democratic processes and the introduction of martial law in order to institute violent defense mechanisms that would now also target those previously protected as 'white' European citizens and non-citizens. For historian Henry Reynolds (2010), the formation of Australian nationalism has been shaped by the limited sovereign autonomy of the state to the point that its loyalty to Britain must be seen as informed by a lack of independence in foreign politics. As Reynolds explains:

Any discussion of the evolution of Australian nationalism comes up against the inescapable problem of sovereignty. Australia was not an independent nation state either before or after 1915. It had no control over its foreign policy, no diplomatic service and the monarch remained the Head of State. The national government had no say in the decision as to where the Australian Imperial Force (AIF) would go, who it would fight and for what reasons of state they would kill and be killed. Australia could not even choose its own enemies. (2010, p. 27)

Without doubting the effects of this restricted sense of sovereign political autonomy, what must not be omitted from this discussion is the forcefulness unleashed into the larger society by biopolitical and necropolitical defense technologies directed at the population. The introduction of martial law within the *War Precautions Act* 1914 (Cwlth) and its three volumes of *Regulations* 1915 (Cwlth) suspended the law and legitimated the unleashing of forcefulness into the community.

These Acts and Regulations allowed the relevant Minister and Governor General to make decisions without Parliament's approval. Martial law was defined as 'necessary' or 'expedient for securing the public safety and the defense of the Commonwealth' (*War Precautions 1914 Act* s.5). These *Regulations* were constituted as a mechanism of precautionary protection from a political danger that was construed as already circulating within and without the communal. This danger is figured as nationally allied and as originating from the 'German Empire' and the 'Austrian-Hungarian Empire' (*War Precautions Act 1914* s.5). Martial law then sets out securitizing the nation-state or in Robyn Lui's words as:

[That which] wages a permanent social war on those external and internal threats to the vitality of its population. This war claims the right to kill and justifies a range of demonic treatments of some in the name of protecting others. In other words, the affirmation of the life of those others and of their particular ways of life compels the elimination of objects that symbolise threats. (2002, p. 4)

This protection under martial law expands the capacity of the state to immunize the community by displacing its obligations and thus rendering it, as Esposito (2002, p. 270) argues, as 'necessarily less communal'[my translation]. For Esposito the communal refers to the 'totality of persons

united not by 'property' but precisely by an obligation' owed to the community or a 'pledge, a gift that is to be given and that therefore will establish a lack' (Esposito 2008, pp. 6-7). He elaborates this point further:

The subjects of community are united by an 'obligation' in the sense that we say 'I owe you something,' but not 'you owe me something'. This is what makes them not less than the masters of themselves, and that more precisely expropriates them of their initial property (in part or completely), of the most proper property, namely, their subjectivity. (Esposito 2009, pp. 6-7)

Immunization does not simply protect the community but it rather creates an exemption from ongoing obligation to the communal and by so doing it negates community. Thus military biopolitical security mechanisms, including martial law, by creating the category of 'enemy aliens' of enemy origins violently introduces the war conflict within the community and in the process reshapes it by negating obligations to those members designated as 'enemies'.

The negation created by martial law takes effect through its re-defining of the existing internal racial hierarchies. This is achieved by setting up, as Foucault (2003, p. 254) argues, 'a caesura' or a break between 'what must live and what must die', who will go to war and use the right to kill and who is the enemy of the nation-state and can thus be subjected to de-nationalisation, banishment from the communal through short term imprisonment or indefinite imprisonment in the concentration camps, deportation and co-ordinated surveillance. In this case, state sovereignty declares precautionary protection against its expanding categorizing of enemies of the Commonwealth that differentiate those re-imagined by Prime Minister Fisher on the eve of the war as of 'our own' (Fisher 3 July

1914 cited in Warhaft 2004, p. 74). The national subjects of British and Anglo-Saxon origins who are deemed to be politically loyal and ready to enlist for the war are posited in contradistinction to diasporic ethnicised categories of the 'alien' and 'enemy alien' of enemy origins.

The biopolitical caesura created by martial law redefined the 'right to kill' in war without shifting, however, the necropolitics that situated Australia's First Nations Peoples as black enemies that could be killed in the defense of the nation. The exact number of enlistments is unknown due to lack of records but it is estimated that between 500-800 Aboriginal volunteers went to war. It is relevant here to acknowledge that enlisting to a war overseas was perceived, although provisionally, as a form of relief and as an opportunity to receive a wage, regular food, try different duties and freedom of movement (Creative Spirit, Anzac Day Coloured Digger March 2012). When discussing the enlistment from Raukkan, Doreen Kartinyeri argues that the survivors were told that:

Well look, you'll be getting paid good pay and we'll also be sending money to your families, particularly your mother and father", and they thought that was the best thing ever because all they was getting on Raukkan - if you wasn't working, all you was getting was rations. (Kartinyeri 25 April 2005)

This hope for relief must be situated within the context of a colonial necropolitics that defined Aboriginal people as 'enemies' of the state that were at war with white settlers. Frontier wars were very active at this time. As a military technology, martial law constituted Aboriginal people as the racial subjects of the white state. In this respect, it both participated in and extended what Fiona Nicoll (2014, n.p.) calls a 'war by other means' on and over land. The *National Defence Act 1908* (Cwlth), like the

Aboriginal Protectionists Acts, effectively continued to generate fear and control multi-layered forms of resistance in missions and reserves. It was 'aimed at the elimination of Indigenous cultures by deploying the same biopolitical racial caesura' that was used to segregate Aboriginal communities in missions, camps and remove Aboriginal children from families and communities (Fiona Nicoll 2014, n.p.). The *Recruiting Regulations Booklet* (cited in Winegard 2009, p.195) rejected altogether any enlistments of Aboriginal volunteers but, since the introduction of the *National Defence Act*, the military had adopted a discretionary approach that allowed a 'half-caste born in the Commonwealth whose father is a European and whose mother is an aboriginal [sic] native' to be considered for enlistment (Winegard 2009). This understanding was still operational during the war.

Calls from the British War Office, however, effectively pushed for the selective enlistment of a 'better class' of Indigenous soldiers. In October of 1915, The War Council solicited at first all Governors General and Administrators of British Dominions and colonies to report on the possibilities of 'raising native troops' and then 'required the military inclusion of Indigenous men' (Winegard 2012, p.78).¹⁰ As Richard Smith

¹⁰ At the transnational level, France at first, and then Britain through the War Office, began to plan the selective enlistment of Indigenous populations from the Dominions, as historian Winegard sums up the events:

On 8 October 1915 all governors general and administrators of British dominions and colonies received a confidential memorandum from the Canadian-born colonial secretary, Andrew Bonar Law: "The [War] Cabinet have asked for a report as to the possibilities of raising native troops in large numbers in our Colonies + Protectorates for Imperial

(2204 p.68), in his analysis of Jamaicans enlistment, argues the British War Office was always concerned with 'political dissidence' of black soldiers and called for the selection of a 'better class' of 'coloured' and 'half-caste' Indigenous soldiers and even a quota system and stratification of duties. Smith cites the Secretary to the Army Council's 1918 statement:

The intention of the Army Council was, and is, to provide a place in the combatant arms of the British army for British subjects of colour resident in Great Britain and the United States and also for the better class British subjects of colour or half-caste resident in the colonies. It was not, and is not, the intention of the Army Council to accept for units of the British Army natives of unmixed blood from Colonies for whose reception specially raised labour battalions have been formed or any British subjects, being natives and resident in Colonies which maintain appropriate combatants units. (Army Council 1918 cited in Smith 2004, p. 68)

The introduction of a 'better class' of Indigenous soldiers, in effect, rests on the notion of selecting a better 'race' of Aboriginal soldiers that could assimilate in an already racially hierarchised colonial military order and its duties¹¹.

service. What is wanted is an estimate of the numbers that could be raised; the length of time needed for training; an opinion as to their fighting value; and any pertinent remarks on such points as climatic restrictions on their employment, the influence of religion...[and] the difficulty of officering”.

A second request was sent on 18 October. War exigencies now required the military inclusion of indigenous men (2012, p. 78).

¹¹ It must be noted here that historically these recruitments were well in line with nineteenth century British and French colonial practice of creating Native police units across colonies (Richards 2008) including in Australia where local corps of Aboriginal trackers, Guards, Native Police or Mounted Police were recruited in New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland and Western Australia to operate as 'military units' (Laurie 1959; Foster & Nettlebeck 2012; Nettlebeck & Foster 2007; Richards 2008). These units as Richards (2008, p. 2) concludes were forcefully recruited for their skills and survival knowledge as part of 'a widespread campaign of frontier racial violence' crushing the slightest signs of resistance to colonization; killing was their business.

The enlistment of Indigenous soldiers was largely signified, with some known exceptions¹², by military technologies that deployed hereditary and blood-based categories. These technologies re-deployed the biopolitical racial caesura of Aboriginal populations inscribed in the *National Defence Act*. Formally, however, it was not until 1917 that a memo was circulated confirming the cautionary and selective enlistment of ‘half-castes’, ‘that the examining Medical Officers are satisfied that one of the parents is of European descent’ (Pedersen 2012, p. 397). This demonstrates that those constructed as ‘full bloods’ were, in the first instance, thought of as irrelevant to the war. They were constructed as lacking political will, skills and the somatic physical attributes required to fight white enemies. As a result, only medically examined and selected ‘half-castes’ of mixed European descent were considered assimilable to war duties. This formal deployment of the categories of ‘half-caste’ of mixed European descent with the carefully selected enlistments, in effect, tracks the ongoing military perceptions of Aboriginal people as racial enemies that could not be trusted with the ‘right to kill’.

The racial differentiation adopted by the *National Defence Act 1908* (Cwlth) is part of what da Silva (2007, p. 224) calls ‘a strategy of

¹² It must be stated, however, that the Military did not always reject all those racially constituted as ‘of full bloods’ or ‘half-caste of dark complexion’ as evidenced by soldiers Charles Blackman from Gayndah, Queensland who was enlisted in August 1915 and his two brothers Thomas and Alfred who followed him to war in 1916 (Winegard 2009, p.197). Indigenous volunteers also responded to the constitution of their somatic features as ‘dark’ by passing as ‘Maori, Indian or Pacific Islanders’ backgrounds (Creative Spirit Anzac Day Coloured Diggers March 2012) or even, as in the Albert Tripcony case, of Italian background (Winegard 2009, p. 197).

particularization’ or more precisely ‘miscegenation’. It demonstrates as da Silva argues, that miscegenation is not reducible to the crossing of racial sexual borders; this crossing is re-inscribed as a political symbolic gesture that provides continuity to the global project of the British forces at war and does not shift the affectability of Aboriginal populations. For da Silva (2007) the focus of this particularization does not rely on the placement of the racial ‘other’ outside the national call to war. Rather, it relies on ‘how [its] eschatological meanings ... produces a mode of racial subjection premised on the obliteration of the always-already affectable bodies and minds of the other of Europe’ (da Silva 2007, p. 225).

These ‘eschatological meanings’ constituted the raciality that produced the ‘war by other means’ conducted against Indigenous populations. Protectionist technologies incorporated racial differences in order, on the one hand, to prevent those constituted as ‘full bloods’ from participating in the war, and, on the other hand, it scripted ‘half-castes’ as assimilable to the white order insofar as they could serve imperial needs. What transpires after the war is that racial differentiations of Aboriginal enlistments worked to preclude them from the white supremacist national imaginary that came to memorialize the war. Michael Anderson points to the ongoing racialised wars faced by Black Diggers before and after the war:

It’s quite an irony actually when you consider these fellas [enlisted Aboriginal soldiers] took time out in their own war ... they fought in the war and engaged in that process and then came home and they still have to battle – for their own lands, for justice and rights. (as cited in Nicoll 2014, n.p.)

Formal acknowledgement of Black Diggers’ war efforts, including the loss of life, imprisonment and participation in key battles, never took place.

Soldiers were not always welcome to RSL Clubs and Anzac marches, their names remained unmarked on War Memorials, many Aboriginal Diggers had to go back to the missions, their children were taken away, their pay was withheld from their families, there was no access to veterans' benefits and when Aboriginal Diggers died their graves remained unmarked (Anzac day Coloured Diggers March, 2012). Noting in great detail the ongoing injuries and illnesses that the Ngarrindjeri war veterans carried after the war, Doreen Kartinyeri (2008, p. 188) argued that 'those men never received any recognition from the government ... and some of them were badly wounded and needed medical treatment for the rest of their lives'. What is known is that George Kennedy was the only war veteran who received allocated land under the Soldier Settlement Scheme. In fact, the Minister of Defence argued against Black Diggers' rights as veterans by stating that:

The fact of an Aboriginal having served with the A.I.F. does not remove him from the care or supervision exercisable by the Board appointed for the protection of Aborigines under the Aborigines Act, 1909, neither does it relieve that Board of its duties towards the Aboriginal. (cited in Winegard 2009, p. 39)

In effect, the *National Defence Act* operated as yet another racial technology in order to further the colonial agenda of the white Australian nation.

Martial Law, White Ethnicity and Concentration Camps

Martial law constituted a forceful regime of militarized biopolitical technologies directed at enforcing political loyalty and transforming the meanings of the political circulating at all levels of the population. As biopolitical racial mechanisms, these military technologies defended the

state's political allegiance or interests in the global project of empire by internalizing and normativising the enmity relations of the war. The *Aliens Restriction Order 1914* (Cwlth), *War Precautions Act - Aliens Registration Regulation 1916* (Cwlth) and, later, the *Unlawful Associations Act 1917* (Cwlth) and the *Amendment to Naturalisation Act 1917* (Cwlth) and *Disloyalty Regulation 1918* (Cwlth) all operated as militarized biopolitical racial mechanisms that violently infiltrated 'a conflict within the population or the enmity divisions of this war between 'Her Majesty' and the 'German Emperor' and his allies from the 'Austrian-Hungarian Empire' (*War Precautions Act 1914*, s.10). The racial and gendered figure of the 'political enemy of foreign origins' is exemplified by the expanding use of multiple categorisations of the 'alien enemy' directed largely at those ethnicised as non-British diasporic subjects, including 'Naturalized Enemies' and 'Natural Born British subjects' (*War Precautions Regulations 1914*, s.10-25; *Regulations 1915* s.55, s.56; *Regulation 1915* s.56a; *Aliens Restriction Order 1915*; *Aliens Registration Regulation 1916*). With the subsequent enforcement of the registration of 'Aliens,' all of the categories that were considered non-British diasporic subjects came under the direct regulation of the *War Precautions Act 1916*, including its surveillance mechanisms, restrictions and indefinite internment.

Posited as part of the arsenal of raciality, the categories of 'alien' and 'alien enemy' operated as military technologies of ethnicisation that regulated populations. These categories worked to internalize within the population of the nation-state the signifiers of an inherent ethnic political

danger that was defined as being constituted by the national origin and nationality of non-British diasporic members of the population, citizens and non-citizens alike. Ethnicisation through martial law and the camp, then, enforces a 'shifting relation' that re-draw internal borders. Rey Chow elaborates on this ethnicity/border nexus:

Always a shifting relation, ethnicity is virtually society's mechanism of marking boundaries ... the ethnic stands in modernity as the site of foreignness that is produced from within privileged societies and is at once defined by and constitutive of that society' hierarchical division. (2002, p. 35)

I would argue that this form of ethnicisation within martial law and the camp operate to shift dominant relations of whiteness that had been performed in Australia. Ethnicity, here, shifts the emphasis from (physical) somatic features that had informed the White Australian Policy to an onto-epistemology of blood (biological) affiliations to nation expressed culturally by political loyalty to the nation of origin. These multiple categories of 'alien' marked non-British nationals as carriers of an inherent (ethnic) political affiliation (including loyalty to enemy nations and disloyalty to the Commonwealth) that was based on a 'call of the blood' that could no be altered (Finlanson 1917 cited in Dutton 2002, p. 92). In this respect, the configuration of the categories of 'aliens' and 'enemy aliens' produced the figure of the ethnic 'enemy' within. These categories, in Chow's (2002, pp. 34-35) terms, ethnicise members of the population as the figure of the 'foreigner' or 'inferior' who inherently responds to bloodlines expressed through 'their' nation as a call from the country/nation of origin. Independent of their citizenship status, country of birth, naturalization or declared political allegiances, then, those categorized as 'aliens' are not only always perceived as of 'foreign origins'

and ‘nationality,’ but also as inherently politically allied to their countries of origin.

Martial law as a military technology that dispensed the state from its obligations to certain ethnicised and racialised populations produces a conflation between nationality and political loyalty. Dutton (2002, pp. 92-93) argues that the political allegiance to nation (or ethnic nationalism) was conceived as a ‘characteristic of all civilized people’ and that it was discussed in terms of a ‘call of the blood’ that is both inherent and unbreakable. Although Dutton (2002) does not connect this conflation to the deployment of an ethnic nationalism to create a racial break within the population, the centralization of nationality here again produces an attribution of ‘foreignness’ and inherent ethnic differences based on blood affiliation with nation of origin. In this sense, National affiliations with nation/country of ‘origin’ are then treated by military technologies as pre-established and unchangeable. The dispensation or immunity created by martial law, now effectively dispenses the state and the military from acknowledging long-term relocation by migration, naturalization, taking the Oath of Allegiance and birth in Australia (that is the category of British born subject is irrelevant) as they are all re-defined by militarized racial conflations as unable to ‘break’ the bloodlines or ‘ethnic’ affiliations to national origins. Effectively, Germans were also seen as subjects that could hide their allegiances and were categorized as ‘enemy aliens’ (Beaumont 2013, p.550). In 1914, Hughes argued during the second reading of the *War Precautions Bill 1914* that:

If I were in Germany for 100 years ...I should still be British or Australian, and I would not think it wrong to do what I could for Great Britain or Australia. I put a German in Australia on exactly the same feeling. His sympathy is for Germany in this struggle ... Naturalisation is nothing but a form if the substance does not accompany it – that is, if there is no change in the heart and mind. (War Precautions Bill, Second Reading 1914)

It must be noted here that, as Gerhard Fischer (1989, p. 23) reported, ‘among the German-Australian internees 700 were ‘Naturalized British subjects’ who had become Australian citizens through naturalization, some 70 were ... native born British subjects’ and in their files they will be mostly identified as ‘Germans’. In sum, these origins were considered incompatible, non-assimilable and dangerous to the interests of the Commonwealth. Naturalization, especially in World War One, is considered a suspicious process or ‘unnatural’ and is perceived as creating ‘a conflict of allegiance’ (Dutton 2002, pp. 92-93). This demonstrates that individual subjects were ethnically profiled as political enemies according to an assumed ‘hostile national origin and association’ (Dutton 2002 pp. 92-93).

Throughout the war, this political enmity through ethnic profiling was amplified by the *Unlawful Associations Act 1917* (Cwlth). This Act combined existing war-related concerns with not only a ‘drive to expel socialism and communism from Australia’ but also to eliminate anti-war organizations, ‘anti-conscription[ists], radical socialists, Bolshevists, Woblies, pacifists, trade unionists, Sinn Feiners and anarchists’ (Fischer G. 1989, p. 48; Fischer N. 2002, pp. 224-225; Dutton 2002, p.106; Beaumont 2013, p.550). When considering the intelligence file on ‘Disloyal Germans

and Others in S.A'¹³, the category of disloyal subjects in effect embodies 'any person' associated with 'Pro-German sympathies, Pro-German Internees, Membership to IWW, Pacifist defying the law, Extreme Socialist making statements prejudicial to recruitment, Extreme Socialist of the Revolutionary Kind, anti-British sentiments in relation to Irish question'. The broad range of people that were under surveillance by local intelligence shows the totalizing effect of Martial Law that, since 1914, effectively cast suspicion over a wide swathe of subjects. Nevertheless this Act, as Louise Curtis (2006, p. 2) argues was, first and foremost, always 'directly linked to the application of new wartime legislation, which implicitly perpetuated suspicion of and hostility towards non-British subjects'. (Curtis 2006, p.2)

The system of raciality that distinguished dangerous enemy aliens and produced their detention was regulated by gender differences. When martial law re-allocated the right to kill, it also established the sovereign right to expose 'enemy alien' populations defined as a security risk to detention for indefinite periods of times in concentration camps or within a time limit in public prisons. Within the framework of martial law, the detention of civilian enemy alien bodies is locked by the deployment of militarized biopolitical racial technologies of violence that, whilst largely segregating ethnicised male bodies, also maintained open the threat of

¹³ AA S.A: Disloyal Germans and Others in S.A', Department of Defence 1918-1919, List, pp.1-26.

interning any female enemy aliens civilians.¹⁴ In an investigation file of 1915, the narrative from the 'Command' in charge gave a formal warning to a group classified as 'German women' who were considered by intelligence as breaching war restrictions in their outgoing correspondence (that is, making disloyal statements in their written correspondence).¹⁵ The authorities, however, did not call for their internment but rather it disciplined the female enemy alien bodies by issuing them with a warning that all 'enemy alien' women could be subjected to the 'order [of] ... removal' and thus of internment ¹⁶. This warning effectively re-established the power of the sovereign to decide over ethnicised female bodies and it alerted them to the fact that they were under constant surveillance and open to internments.

Whilst locally based civilians were threatened with internment, the military detained women and children categorized as prisoners of war. As Agamben (1998, p.181) declares, the camp as the 'fundamental biopolitical paradigm' expands its intervention over lives by functioning as a transnational security mechanism for the British Empire that detained prisoners of war captured in war zones. The camp operates as a prison zone that would militarily biopoliticize and detain captured female prisoners of war by classifying them within an ethnicised heteronormative

¹⁴ Whilst is also known that some civilian women moved in closer vicinity to some of the Internment Camps where their partners were detained and they were compelled to live in the shadow of the prison camps (Thompson 2011).

¹⁵ AA WA: PP 14/1, 4/3/493, Hostility of German Women, Department of Defence, Correspondence, Melbourne, 10 January, 1915.

¹⁶ AA WA: PP 14/1, 4/3/493, Hostility of German Women, Department of Defence, Correspondence, Melbourne, 10 January, 1915.

family order and its imagined blood filiations, as either ‘single women’ or ‘married people with families.’¹⁷. The Bourke Internment camp and the Molonglo Camp were officially deployed as military technologies that detained and intervened upon the bodies of ‘married people with families’¹⁸. By 1917, there were imprisoned 66 women, 77 children and 55 men deported from Straits Settlements (now Singapore and Malaysia), Ceylon, Fiji and Hong Kong at Bourke Internment Camp (Office of the Governor General 1918 AA; Thompson 2011; Beaumont 2013, p.51)¹⁹.

Amongst the prisoners, Daisy Mildred Schoeffel and Mena Hallet Kienzels were Australian-born sisters who had married naturalized British subjects of German origins and lived in Fiji (Foskett 2008; Fischer 1984). Declared ‘enemy aliens’ in Fiji, they were deported and interned in Australia. The dispensation or immunization of state sovereignty itself from its obligations to Daisy, as an Australian/British born-citizen, effectively created both her denationalization but also re-territorialization as a German enemy and a figure of national anxiety. It is Daisy’s marriage to a naturalized British subject of German origins and the familiar blood filiations embodied by their children that is militarily biopoliticized as a signifier of an allegiance to enmity relations. Daisy as a prisoner of war is

¹⁷ AA Vic: MP 367/1, 567/3/1406, Matron Internment Camp, Bourke NSW, Department of Defence, Single Women Internees, Memorandum, June 18, 1918.

¹⁸ AA Vic: MP 367/1, 567/3/1406, Matron Internment Camp, Bourke NSW, Department of Defence, German Concentration Camps Headquarters NSW, Correspondence, 21 October 1915

¹⁹ AA Vic: MP367/1 Inspection of Australian Prisoner of War Camps by Consul General for Sweden Closure Prisoners of War Camp at Bourke, Consular Swiss, Report Visit to Molonglo Concentration Camp, p.7, 5 November, 1918’.

an enemy figure that, in Perera (2002, p.3) words, embodies the ‘crisis of the nation-state’ precisely because sovereign anxieties over national security banish and imprisoned her to the space of the camp. In a surviving letter written by Daisy Schoeffel written to avoid deportation to Germany after the war, a narrative of despair and decisive criticism exposes the brutality of the camp and the anxiety that produced it:

Needless to say I had not a taste of food for 24 hours after arriving in Bourke. I politely asked the Sergeant Major could I have a plate to make my baby some food, and he answered ‘There’s the plates (pointing to the filthy rusty tin ones) that the Australian Gov. give to German Prisoners’. I looked him fair in the face and said ‘I am neither a German nor a prisoner, but an Australian woman!’ He said ‘if you were not a German Prisoner you would not be here!’. (reproduced in Fischer 1984, p. 393)

Daisy goes further in the letter to mark the known harsh conditions of the Bourke Camp. As she explains, although prisoners who had access to bank accounts were able to improve their living conditions, those like Daisy without any money had to rely on the support of other prisoners:

Regarding the rations we received at Bourke it was simply disgraceful, & no human being could have lived on what we got there. For 2 months one time we received absolutely nothing but bread & meat, the latter being flyblown. We simply had to buy all we wanted in the stores & also pay our house rent. What would have happened had I not been able to borrow money I simply cannot think. You might say, why didn’t I write & complain? It was simply impossible; we were allowed to write 2 letters a week of 150 words each but were not allowed to complain of anything, or letters would be returned. We soon found the only thing to do was to grin & bear it like the rest. In May 1918 we were packed off to Molonglo, Canberra, which camp had just been opened. Oh, the difference in the treatment here was very marked indeed & we all said if only we had been sent here in. (reproduced in Fischer 1984, p. 394)

The relief Daisy felt at the move to Molonglo in mid-1918 was partly motivated by an international request from Germany to the Swiss and Swedish authorities. The Australian government was asked to relocate the German families to another camp due to the unbearable harsh hot weather

in the Bourke Camp²⁰.

The internment of civilians was a forceful process. Official documentation from the war, including media reports, demonstrates that these camps were officially called 'concentration camps' and the detainees were named as either 'prisoners of war' or 'internees'. In official correspondence, however, the term 'internment camps' was also used interchangeably with 'concentration camps' and even 'prisoner of war camp'. In the concentration camps of Rottnest Island, Torrens Island, Molonglo, Bourke, Enoggera, Langwarrin, Bruny Island, Trial Bay, Berrima and Holsworthy – for instance – selected civilians (residents, naturalized and British born subjects) were categorised as either 'prisoners' of war' or 'internees' and often referred to as non-nationals, that is, as Germans, Austro-Hungarians, Serbians, Croatians, Dalmatians, Bulgarians, Turks, Swiss, Americans, Russian, Dutch and Belgians (Fischer 1989). As Fischer recounts:

1,559 persons were recorded as a possible danger to the community, 751 were interned at their request, while the detention of 457 persons had been ordered for violations of some of the war precautions regulations mostly failing to report and not complying with parole ... 368 internees no reason had been recorded ... and few were interned for possible interference with missing text. (1989, p. 23)

As such, those imprisoned within the camp were effectively denationalised and prevented from accessing those liberal rights historically reserved for those defined as white European members of the nation-state. This preclusion was buttressed by the enforced deportation of 5276 internees at

²⁰ NAA: A11803, 1918/89/852, Prisoner of War Camp - Bourke NSW, German Division London, Correspondence, 22 July, 1918.

the end of the war; civilian naturalizations were revoked (removal of their citizenship) via processes of denationalisation (Nicholls 2007).

As civilian internees they were placed, to use Dinesh Wadiwel words, in a 'position of vulnerability' (2006 p.155). Specifically, they did not know what would occur within the camp as this is, in Mbembe's (2003) terms, a zone where everything is possible. This vulnerability stems from the *a priori* of raciality and its enmeshment in the enmity relations of this war. Raciality, as discussed in relation to Wybalenna Camp, always already produced the *necessity* to racially categorize and hierarchise lives and populations. This racial ordering constituted the desirability of white Europeans against, in da Silva's terms, the 'obliterability' and 'affectability' of black populations and of non-white diaspora especially from Asian countries. In the context of the Anglocentric racial hierarchy, from the very outset white European diaspora were expected to assimilate, even as they were constituted as racially inferior to the British subject. They were expected to participate in the colonial project of the British-based dominion. What the concentration camp does, then, is to reconfigure a hierarchical racial order that ethnicises diaspora as unassimilable, non-British, foreign 'enemies of the state'. In doing so the state externalizes these populations or denationalized them as the 'most dangerous' and 'disloyal' enemies (Saunders 2003, p. 28). For Fischer (1989, p. 33) the state through the elevation of the concentration camps, as far as German-Australian communities were concerned, 'aimed to destroy and thus neutralize, the community as an autonomously socio-cultural entity within Australian society'. The camp as a military biopolitical racial technology of violence reconfigures historical

hierarchies by producing a forceful and fearsome direct intervention that disciplines 'Aliens' and internees.

The camps operated as militarized biopolitical racial technologies of violence that asserted Anglo-British sovereignty of the state over racialised diasporic populations. Civilians were not only imprisoned within them; many were never released back into the community as they were deported after the war. Their bodies and lives in the camps, then, are ordered to carry the force of the categories that branded them as the most 'dangerous enemies'. In the camps they were exposed to the direct force of this Anglo-British sovereignty that decided not only on their freedoms and movements but also their lives and deaths. As prisoners of war, they were exposed to what Foucault (2003, p. 247) calls the biopolitical racial power of 'making live and letting die' and are predicated on what Pugliese (2013 p. 94) calls 'the hierarchisation of life, the biopolitical caesura [of the camp] [that] recalibrates and assigns [these] subjects along this hierarchy according to the exigencies of the regime that deploys it'. A recent exhibition by the Migration Heritage Centre of NSW in German Internees in World War One provides an overview of some of the differences marking life in the concentration camps:

Life in the camps was varied. Trial Bay was an elite camp and had the most privileges, Berrima was a camp for navy and merchant officers who led a regimented and self regulated life. Holsworthy was the most like a prison camp of all the camps. Internees at all the camps formed management committees, theatre and arts groups, self-education classes, restaurants and cafes. There were strikes and riots over conditions at Trial Bay and Holsworthy where the camp commandants quickly negotiated outcomes. (Thompson, 2011)

A close reading of some of the reports produced by military authorities around life in the camps, however, denotes a more insidious biopolitical racial mechanisms that shaped the lives and deaths of enemy prisoners. In 1915, at Rottnest Camp the sovereign decision by Prime Minister office to reject the complaints received from Austrian-Slavs male prisoners of war (who had previously worked in the Kalgoorie mines) established the biopolitical conditions that would see the prisoners literally left to die²¹. As biopolitically rendered subjects, they were ordered to quietly accept and live in the harsh climate conditions while living in tents, with poor sanitation, lack of cooking facilities and poor treatment from the guards²². The camp was established, as Perera (2002, p. 4) asserts, as part of a 'racialised genealogy of the prison system' whereby Prisoners of War were punished precisely by being selectively segregated and contained.

Prisoners were exposed to the violence of the sovereign right to maintain life or kill prisoners of war. In Langwarrin Camp, for example, prisoners also lived in thin tents that leaked when it rained and had to build their own accommodation. Here a prisoner of war, identified as an enemy 'German sailor, was shot and wounded by a guard on duty²³. In relation to this sovereign violence, the physical abuse and ill-treatment of internees and

²¹ NAA: A2, 1917/3501PART3, Enemy Subjects-Treatment of Prisoners of War Rottnest Island Camp, Governor General Office, Memorandum 3 March, 1915.

²² NAA: A2, 1915/4050 Rottnest Island Use of an Internment Camp, Prime Minister's Department, Report, October 1915.

²³ NAA: MP367/1, 567/3/2202 Part 1, Australian Military Forces, Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry, 10 August 1915, Captain G E Hawkes, 77th Infantry - Court of Enquiry - Torrens Island Concentration Camp pp.1-160

prisoners of war at Torrens Island Camp is documented by Captain G E Hawkes as part of maintaining 'discipline and good order' and to counteract negative comments against the British Empire. In the investigation of the flogging and whipping of two recaptured escapees, they are ethnicised as 'German internees' despite the declaration that one wasn't. One prisoner testified that he had faced the threat of being shot after his recapture:

The QNS ordered us to walk over to the Hills, to the rear of the camp. He took us over to a tree and told us to stop there. Sergeant Mackintosh told us we were going to be shot. They uncoupled us and took us over to the tree. They tied my hands to the tree above my head. They pulled my trousers down and put my shirt over my head. They gave me thirty strokes with the cat. I do not know who whipped me²⁴.

I read this statement as the evidence of 'terror formations' within the camp. As a military biopolitical racial mechanism, it demonstrates that the camp could approximate the punishment for prisoners of war to a necropolitics. After all, as discussed previously, the racial genealogy of the camp does lead back to Wybalenna Camp, as a biopolitical and necropolitical template of the Australian Camp. But the flogging experienced at Torrens Island Concentration Camp replaced the shooting of the prisoner; this suggests that this concentration camp, in contrast to the Camp at Wybalenna, was a biopolitical technology of segregation, imprisonment and punishment, performing what Wadiwel (2006) calls 'a calculated reinforcement' of disciplining and maintaining the life of the body.

In the World War One concentration camps, around 200 prisoners died

²⁴ NAA: MP367/1, 567/3/2202 Part 1, Australian Military Forces, Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry, 10 August 1915, Captain G E Hawkes, 77th Infantry - Court of Enquiry - Torrens Island Concentration Camp, p.2

largely from what were categorized by military authorities as ‘natural causes’ (it is also argued that half died of a flu epidemic). This explanation functions to normalize the ongoing occurrence of deaths and thus distances the deaths from the biopolitical mode of intervening directly on each body, their lives and deaths. This distance is shaped by a regime of disciplinary knowledge produced and circulated by the barrage of internal (its own military and state-based bureaucracy) and external (for example, visits from Swiss Consul in Charge of German interests) technologies of formal reporting systems that measures the well-being of prisoners by assessing daily routines, medical services, food quantity, housing conditions, social activities. This international reporting system that allowed visits from Swiss and Swedish authorities on behalf of the German Government, created a sense of monitoring the protection of European prisoners of war, especially prisoner of war families. Going back briefly to the letter believed to have been written by Daisy Schoeffel after her release from internment in 1919, what strikes a chord here is the raciality that informs her standpoint on the significance of the camp. Daisy’s narrative discloses that the first week she ‘lived worse than a nigger’ (sic):

The first week at Bourke was hell on Earth. I lived worse than a nigger (sic). I washed my babies under a tap in the back yard & cooked on four bricks & a bar of iron with the temperature at about 110 in the shade. Those people who had money simply bought all they wanted, bedsteads, chairs, pillows, bedding etc, but those like myself who had none had to borrow enough to get some food fit for children, & I myself could only eat very light food. I tried to wire to my father from Bourke but was not allowed; had it not been for the generosity of some of the German internees my sister & I would probably not be alive today!. (1919 reproduced in Fischer 1984, p.393)

The usage of the racially derogatory term to measure the harshness of her life in the camp becomes intelligible only within the supremacy of the

colonial framework that had constituted her white settler bodies in Australia and in Fiji. The barring of Daisy and her family from these white privileges is partly what produced the harsh conditions that also brought Daisy in proximity to death. But this proximity is not measurable by a comparison to the lives of First Nation populations in Australia or Fiji where colonial whiteness was based on the acceptance of the obliteration of these lives before, during and after the war. Significantly, the hundreds of Indigenous death at the Wybelenna did not lead to international or local actions that would remove these populations from this necropolitical camp. Fundamentally, these individuals, families and communities were not considered Prisoners of War; rather, their sovereign politics and demands were overridden by the violent imposition of settler-colonial sovereignty. Their deaths were both caused and accepted by the necropolitics of coloniality operating within the camp that rationalized these Indigenous lives in terms of a race naturally and inevitably dying out.

The deployment of technologies of defense increased throughout the war and strengthened the nation-state to operate as a security mechanism part of the imperial armed forces of the British Empire within the Pacific, Europe, Middle East; they also worked to co-ordinate nationally and intervene at all levels of the Australian population. It is useful here to provide a brief overview of the broad range of security mechanisms introduced via martial law (which were also derived from and/or connected to British military technologies):

- Judiciary Court Martials (*War Precautions Act 1914*).
- 1917 Restrictions to apply for Naturalisation and Revoking of

Naturalization for ‘any reason’ and for all ‘Aliens’ (Dutton 2002, p.93).

- State Control of Information and Communication: Censors were established in Local newspapers and Post offices; Censorship of letters sent home from soldiers at the war-front; censorship of civilians from Australia corresponding with inappropriate individuals or organizations overseas; Sedition Laws were also introduced in 1918 (Crotty & Roberts 2006; Calkins 2005; Fischer N. 2002; Scott 1936).
- Prohibition of newspapers in foreign languages.
- Special and Secret Censorship of Correspondence (Department of Defence 1918, AA).
- Compulsory Registration for all subjects categorized as ‘Aliens’ by 1915.
- Centralization of Passport as a defence mechanism: the Federal Government rather than the States takes control of passports to contain people’s movements, both entry and departures (Doulman & Lee 2008).
- Ongoing surveillance of individuals, political groups and organizations and their activities.
- Imprisonment or fining of people suspected to be advocating disloyalty or hostility to the British Empire. (Fisher N. 2002)
- 1915 Preventative Detention: Internment in ‘Concentration Camps’ for indefinite period of time of ‘enemy aliens’
- Intelligence work: Naval Intelligence and Military Intelligence were expanded. They came to be represented in the first national secret service the 1916 Counter Espionage Bureau re-named as Special Initiative Bureau in 1917; State police also developed internal state based agencies (Dutton 2002; Meaney 2009).
- Commonwealth Police force was formed under the Prime Minister Investigation Bureau in 1917 and operated in Queensland (O’Toole 2006, p. 47).
- Removal of British Nationalization and Deportation. (Nicholls 2007)

After the war, many of these laws and agencies were internalized within existing systems of law. The following examples give a sense of the war technologies that became part of liberal governmental mechanisms of security. In 1920 the *Disloyalty Regulation Act* (Cwlth) made sedition a serious offence when it was merged with the *Crimes Act 1914* (Cwlth) (Jordan 2006); state censoring and prohibition of foreign language publications is maintained by the introduction of the *Statutory Regulations of Publication of Newspapers in Foreign Languages 1921* (Cwlth); the Commonwealth Investigation Branch was established in 1919 as and Dutton (2002, pp. 105-105) explained, this was made of ‘remnants of wartime surveillance agencies’ directed at monitoring the political

activities of populations and that, as I discuss in detail in the latter sections of my thesis, became central in the development of immigration and naturalization policies in the 1920s. In World War Two, the re-deployment of the technology of the internment camp was based on the reconfiguration of *Regulation 56a* that allowed authorities to withhold the evidence used against internees and to intern anyone that was categorized as of enemy origin and association (Martinuzzi O' Brien 2006). In other words, these technologies of war became key components of future governmental mechanisms that maintained the coercive capacity to guide a subject's allegiance to the British Empire and transforming existing systems for categorizing, hierarchising, containing, and managing diasporic populations, their movements and political activities.

War technologies territorialized Australia as a racial state that was seen as part of the larger global project of the British Empire. As shown in previous chapters the modern, liberal democratic nation-state was already grounded on security technologies operating under the guise of safeguarding freedoms at all levels of life and the social. These security technologies, in the form of legislation and policies, enacted racial hierarchies, classification systems and practices of displacement, banishment, deportation and incarceration in order to defend the freedoms of the white nation-state. The war, however, enacted the urgency of securitising the function of the state as a technology in a global project²⁵ by

²⁵ The signifier of British subject hood, was partly responding to the British Nationality and Status of Aliens *Act* 1914 (Cwlth) that had conferred on any person naturalized under the Act the rights of a British

applying violent technologies that would assure political loyalty to the imperial interests operating in the Australian nation. When summing the post-war period, Henry Reynolds (2010, p. 27) notes that despite the early drives to gain independence from the Crown from the dominions of Ireland, Canada and South Africa, the Australian state's loyalty to the Empire became more rather than less pronounced. This support, however, as demonstrated during the war, was also considered as under threat by the rise of communism and other radical international movements that did not support the imperial project. For Dolman and Lee (2008, p. 82), the introduction of the *Passport Legislation Act 1920* (Cwlth) was partly due to the perception that foreigners were 'the root cause of the industrial turbulence, high unemployment and the emerging anti-imperial sentiments ... and the increasing influence of the communist ideology'. By 1917, governmental technologies enforced an array of diverse biopolitical racial mechanisms that partly worked to create and internalise (bio)political exactitude within the social and populations. In Wadiwel's (2006) words, they exerted a nuanced, exacting and intractably balanced application of force that worked to secure the Australian state's biopolitical (and necropolitical) objects of power.

Accordingly, the securitization of the national political order attempted to circumscribe virtually any new arrival. It also monitored and controlled in differential ways, let me stress, existing internal diasporic and Indigenous

subject, not only in Commonwealth but also in Great Britain and in parts of the Empire which had adopted Part II of the British Act (Year Book Commonwealth of Australia 1922, p. 1090).

populations. At this time, the introduction of the *Nationality Act* 1920 (Cwlth) seemingly clarified the terms of British subjecthood, alien and naturalized subjects, yet it actually worked to both demarcate racial differences and to internalize their political limits. Whilst Indigenous people were categorized as British subjects, their constitution as racial subjects continued to locate them at the limits of and beyond liberal rights. Significantly, in the context of the post-war liberal-security state, the Governor General could always revoke naturalization if the authorities perceived that allegiance and political loyalty had not been demonstrated.

As the *Nationality Act* s.12 states:

Where the Governor-General is satisfied that a certificate of naturalization granted by him has been obtained by false representation or fraud, or by concealment of material circumstances, or that the person to whom the certificate is granted has shown himself by act or speech to be disaffected or disloyal to His Majesty, the Governor-General shall by order revoke the certificate. (1920, s12)

The racial politics of this form of state control was also partly based on the enforcement of assimilation and absorption. In the 1920s, the colonial logic of assimilation emerged from the onto-epistemology produced by social and racial sciences, eugenics and medical disciplines. Questions about the calculability of the political merge, here, with concerns over national health, racial vitality and the management of reproduction. As Gillespie explains, the emergence of ‘public health and preventative medicine’ form part of national disciplinary and biopolitical transformation of citizens’ bodies:

[This] did not mean ... radical reform to access to hospital and other institutional care. Instead the new public health concentrated on using administrative means ... to shift from the policing functions of sanitary reform towards modifying the behaviour of individuals through education and other forms of social control. (1991, p. 32)

Although biological absorption into (British) whiteness by way of reproductive management was not supported ²⁶, administrators of Aboriginal affairs, such as Cecil Cook and A. O. Neville, and anthropologists, such as Herbert Basedow, pathologists, such as J.B Cleland, and anthropologists, such as Norman Tindale, all advocated its calculative and preventative function. Although their methods varied and even conflicted on the question of the fate of ‘full bloods,’ the reproductive management proposed by Neville and Cook gained unanimous national support from Aboriginal Administrators as a resolution on the ‘destiny of the race’ (Tatz 2003, pp. 91-92). Absorption was a necropolitical colonial technology that intervened and disciplined Indigenous lives with the intention to eliminate physical signs of ‘mixed races,’ as their biological and political (cultural) existence was claimed to be a menace and even ‘subversive’ or a threat to whiteness (Reynolds 2005, p.3).

In the chapter that follows, I work to trace the operations of a series of racialised screening and selection technologies deployed by the Australian government in the context of the interwar years in order to ensure and preserve the whiteness of the Australian state. Specifically, I will focus on the manner in which the racialised hierarch between the North and South that was internal to the Italian state was transposed to the Australian

²⁶ As Anderson Warwick (2009) and McGregor (2011) argue, after the war there was no compact agreement amongst social scientists and medical scientists over the question of Absorption. Mc Gregor also clarifies that many eugenicists of the 1930s ‘opposed it on the grounds of producing a class of low white trash’ (2011, p.11).

context and embedded within a number of immigration reports, policies and screening practices.

Chapter Five

The Assimilative Order

Post-World War One governmental practices continued to place more focus on preventing and eliminating the possibility of unassimilable politics forming by reshaping immigration plans. Essentially, post-war population policies included technologies that consolidated the insularity of white Australia by way of an immigration programme that would extend the categories of the unassimilable and not-so white bodies and enact their elimination through quota systems, total prohibition, deportation and multiple forms of restrictions. The management of the arrival of pre-defined undesirable or unfit types merges with the exclusion of the enemy of war (for example, German nationals) and restrictions of Russians and of Southern Europeans, particularly those from southern Italian regions (Ferry 1925; Lyng 1935), Malta, Greece and Albania (Cresciani 1988; Lyng 1935; Henderson 1995). The *Immigration Acts of 1920, 1924, 1925* (Cwlth), the *Statutory Regulations 1926-1933* (Cwlth), and their reliance on intelligence work by the Investigation Branches of the Attorney General Department and the *Immigration Commission 1925* of Queensland, all work to introduce national strategies that define non-assimilable subjects and to install restrictive immigrations policies:

The governor General may by proclamation prohibit ... because they are deemed unlikely to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Australian citizenship within a reasonable time after their entry. (*Immigration Act 1925, s.7*)

Throughout my in-depth reading of migration debates around the control

of arrivals from Southern Europe, it is clear that assimilation is continually evoked within a complex array of inter-connecting security technologies that perform the racial biopolitics of the *Immigration Act* by categorising, containing and prohibiting the ‘non-assimilable’. The monitoring and exclusion of the arrival of non-white migrants, the introduction of preventative medical and scientific devices that can measure whiteness, the containment of industrial disputes and political dissidence (that is, anti-state activism), the limiting of welfare provisions and monitoring of imperial political allegiance – are all produced as governmental practices of assimilation. These technologies were instrumental in defining and prohibiting what was defined as the unassimilable across a broad range of categories, including: industrial conflicts and political dissidence, non-white racial subjects, new arrivals who were seen as posing an expense for the state due to possible illness or unemployability because of their perceived inferiority, unsuitability, defectiveness or diseased status, those framed as disloyal to Her Majesty (that is, those who were seen to espouse anti-state politics) and, as I discuss in some detail below, those who were seen as unable to reproduce white heteronormative family units (Commonwealth of Australia 2 July 1925, pp. 655-688). These unassimilables were either prevented from entry to the nation or, if they were already internal to the nation, they were relentlessly monitored through a range of surveillance practices that worked to ensure, in Perera’s (2009) words, the preservation of Australia’s white, colonial-settler ‘insular imaginary’ and its British imperial filiations.

In the post-war context, the state proceeded to actively develop governmental mechanisms that would predict and identify unassimilable, non-white Southern European bodies and their related cultural/political practices. Thus the Australian state's governmentality worked bipolitically to calculate and measure and also prohibit or directly shape diasporic bodies defined as unassimilable. What circulates with the deployment of assimilation policies and practices is an anxiety to uphold the embodiment of recognisable and assimilable white categories of desirable biological and cultural practices. This is precisely what the Report of the Royal Commission in Queensland (Thomas Arthur Ferry Commissioner 1925, pp.17-18; p.23) sought to calculate in its attempt to measure new arrivals' ability be absorbed into British whiteness, signified here as a willingness not to participate in an 'economic competition of races,' that is, that would not outnumber or seemingly compete with British labour interests and that would reproduce the white heteronormative family. The Commission's Report, which I will refer to as the Ferry Report, was calling for the selection and assessment of the 'racial stock' and settlement practices of Southern European migrants and Southern Italians (Ferry Report 1925; Dewhirst 2014 pp.16-332). In keeping with this racist ideology, Prime Minister Stanley Bruce, in a speech he delivered on 25 June 1925, discussed the scientific evidence from the United States, including the work of eugenicist Henry Herbert Godda, whose application of a Terman's version of the Binet Testing to examine Eastern and Southern European migrants went on to shape Australian governmental interests in identifying and predicting unassimilable non-white populations (Commonwealth of

Australia 25 June 1925, pp. 456-461). In this case, predicting assimilability was connected to the measuring of whiteness as a physical/somatic and cultural endeavour by strict medical examinations and the monitoring and guiding of everyday lives within the social.

The Ferry Report (1925), borrowing from the US Congress Committee Report, re-writes the racial segregation of the Italian population by setting up the northern Italian diasporic populations as an established and desirable biological and cultural presence. They are posited as conforming to the industrial and social standard of the British and as those who reproduce white assimilable children. The Ferry Report proceeds to question Southern Italians' whiteness, their capacity for proper social integration and their overall assimilability; they are, moreover, situated within a larger Southern European context of racial 'offenders' or undesirables:

British gangs in Queensland head the list against all others, and the next best would be men from the north of Italy. It is worth noting these latter hailed originally from the cool mountains of Piedmont and Lombardy and are much superior to Southern Italians and the Mediterranean races generally. There is sufficient evidence to show that many of the new arrivals are of the latter type here referred to. Their behaviour in the trains in crowding out the carriages and jostling women and children is adding to the objections to foreigners generally and their standard of living obviously is very low. According to the evidence of one witness the principle offenders in this respect are Maltese, Sicilians and Greeks. (Ferry Report 1925, p. 10)

This racial hierarchy continued to be played out in the screening of Southern Italians until the 1960s. As Pugliese show immigration authorities through a violent 'scopic vigilance' of bodies and characters, focused on their perceived criminality and sexual immorality. As I

discussed in Chapter Two, white Australia's racio-scientific discourses and policies had already worked to script Southern Europeans as an inferior and a 'degenerative race' (Pugliese 2002a, p. 159). Whiteness, nevertheless, did not stand as a calculable, single, fixed, biological marker as this was 'not a racial category that necessarily inscribe[d] or colour[ed] the body *en bloc*, as a type of totalising or homogeneous thing-in-itself' (Pugliese 2002a, p.154). The impossibility of establishing absolute watertight definitions of whiteness led to the:

Failure of categorical definitions of whiteness to offer immediately recognisable 'types,' with the consequent anxiety that a certain class of prospective migrants of indeterminate racial status could possibly *pass as* whites when they were in fact Black. (Pugliese 2002a, p. 158)

Reading through the Ferry Report (1925), for example, evidences that the Royal Commission did not have clear evidence that the 'swarthier' Southern Italian subjects, especially Sicilians, were not assimilable or that they were involved *en masse* in illegal or disloyal activities. Its reliance on local viewpoints in Queensland, including from Northern Italian diaspora, were potent but clearly not enough as the Report had to rely on the US Congress Committee Report to provide evidence over the unassimilability of these racial subjects. The Royal Commission, however, responded to this 'failure' by calling for expanding screening practices that would bio-regulate their selection, arrival, and presence within certain localities and escalate their surveillance.

Conflicts about migration policies throughout the 1920s not only resulted in restrictions on male migrant workers from southern European countries including Italy, but it also sustained the increased arrival of women largely

through family reunion schemes. Notwithstanding Australian demands, it was the unification of Italy and the creation of the Italian modern nation-state and eventually the Fascist state that affected the growing movements from Italy. Gabaccia sums up the large movements of people:

Over one million applied to migrate between 1876 and 1885; over two million in the following decade; and over four million in 1896-1905. Almost six million applied for passports in the ten years before Italy entered WW1. (2000, p. 58)

These arrivals were largely coming from Italian northern regions of Piedmont, Lombardy and Veneto but increasingly also from the southern areas of Puglia, Calabria and Sicily (Cecilia 1992). What is clear in this historical context is that Australia's immigration policies strongly favoured of a form of raciality that, by the end of the nineteenth century, gave preference to female bodies categorised as of white Northern European origins. They were written within the heteronormative and gendered national text as assimilable white settlers and often as a servile class and as domestic workers (Palombo 1998). In this setting, female bodies categorised as from the southern regions were signified as a racial risk to the heteronormative reproduction and maintenance of British whiteness. In the 1920s, protection against racial degeneracy was based on perceptions that the reproduction rate of children from non-white women would supersede white capacity to reproduce. As evidenced by the New South Wales Minister for Public Health and Motherhood, fear over the reproduction of black bodies generated policies of moral and political regulation over white women's bodies:

The black races are breeding ten to one of the white races ... The only way to alter the balance in favour of the white races is to ensure that the women who are prepared to do their duty should not be penalised. (Cited in De Lepervanche 1989, p.169)

In terms of national formations, this ‘anxiety’ operated through heteronormative gendered practices that hierarchised and assigned selected white female bodies the role of reproducing the institutionalisation of whiteness and signified Southern Italian women as dubious characters. Governmental technologies of the state classified women from the southern regions not only as members of a degenerate white race, but also as mothers of children whose whiteness was questionable due to past sexual practices of racial miscegenation.

Order of Knowledge and Raciality

When considering these early arrivals of Italian women within Australia, they already occupied an inferior positioning within the colonial European imaginary as, after all, Italian-British relations had a long and well-established history. Very early discussions of populations from the Italian peninsula visibly inferiorised women as among the lower classes of Catholics. It was the early writing of British Protestant travellers in the Northern areas of Italy that grounded the long standing conflict between Protestants and Catholic by defining anti-Italian sentiments and infusing the sense of a superior British (Protestant) culture through perceptions of:

The superstition of the uneducated Italians, the severity of the convents, the relics of paganism in the Catholic rituals, these a dozen other objections caused the average Englishman to turn from Catholic Italy with disgust. (Brand cited in Chapman & Stabler 2003, p. 15)

This expression of disgust towards Catholics is embodied in the writing of Dorothy Wordsworth during a trip to Fluelen in 1791-1792, a village on the Swiss-Lombard border where she wrote on her encounters with a local

female 'beggar':

We were pestered by beggars. A wretched creature who ought to have been taken care of in a hospital was clamorous and when we gave nothing, she hobbled to an oratory by the way-side to try to force of prayer, and kneeling (not towards the virgin who was to be the mollifier of our hard hearts) with her face towards us, vociferated her payers. The sun had shone the whole morning but there had been a breeze on the lake; and I, at least was never overheated. (Cited in Chapman & Stabler 2003, p. 17)

Wordsworth's detailed observation of the poor local is already grounded in her unquestioned superior class and religious values. These perceptions carry the assumption that cultural and religious practices were inherently a reflection of people's bodies. The written observation of the sick and poor body of the beggar is correlated with the perception of (im)moral religious and gendered qualities attached to the beggar's mind and living space. These observations effectively evoke Cuvier's natural history and science of life that correlated the racial as physical/somatic features to 'perceived mental and moral qualities' according to specific geographic regions (see Pugliese 2010b, p. 30). Albeit differently, Wordsworth's travel notes correlate the beggar's female body to local social configurations of religion and morality. This is partly done in her writing by signifying the Italian location as the social configuration of poor, irrational Catholic beggars. This is signified as an inferior and degenerate space where a sub-race lives –embodied in the gendered figure of a sick female body or 'wretched' creature. Over time, as I discuss below, Italian diasporic women in Australia, especially the early arrivals, were increasingly categorised as racially inferior, and were situated as belonging to the lower classes and were thus expected to operate as 'domestic servants' in the context of Australia's racio-gendered class system.

The inferiorisation of lower classes of Italian Catholic women is also set within a developing epistemology of Europe that affiliated geo-spaces with inherent physical/somatic characteristics and moral and cultural configurations. For example, the British geographer Murray Hugh's *Encyclopedia of Geography: Comprising a Complete Description of the Earth*, published in 1839, adopted discourses that divided Europe into geo-spaces occupied by three main races the 'Slavonic, Teutonic and Romish' people. The Italians, like the French and Spanish populations are classified as part of the Romish race, which was considered to be inferior to the Teutonic people from the Central and Northern zones of Europe. The shores of Northern Italy were also imagined and associated with the Northern and Central part of Europe. In other words, they were racially linked to the 'Teutonic nations'. Additionally, as with the central regions of Italy, they were scripted as civilised geo-political spaces that had produced the cultural protégés of the Renaissance and Classical Antiquity. In stark contrast, the quality of life linked to the Southern regions is set out through cultural imaginaries of harsh and frontier zones of arrested development by references to the Spanish occupation and populations defined as of 'mixed-blood' descent (that is, borne out of inter-racial sexual relations). The latter, especially, becomes linked to moralistic and sexualised imaginings of southern Italian female bodies. This knowledge production diversifies populations by the creation of a taxonomic vocabulary that, as Douglas (2008, p. 40) notes, moves from 'varieties' of geographies and human kinds to include a more Kantian distinction based on generative (including reproductive) 'heritability' as the main 'difference

between races and varieties'.

Imagaries of inferior conditions of existence were postulated to prevail in the Southern regions of Italy in the seventeenth century. A division between conceptions of the North and South is invariably discussed in much travel writing of the period. Descriptions of conditions of routes available to travellers are affiliated to the racial ancestry of populations from these zones:

[Travellers] routes were standardised early in the seventeenth century, a tour being in the form of a circuit, entering via Mt Cenis pass and leading from Milan and Florence to Rome and returning up to Eastern side of the peninsula to Venice and, when political conditions allowed, the Brenner- or vice versa. Thence to Rome the route was notable only for its discomfort, as the Road south from Rome to Naples was fearful from bandits ... Naples ... became the site of many of the more scabrous stories about Italy; Italian and Spanish blood mixing the worst possible effects. (Hale 1996, pp. 25-26)

In this sense, going to Naples is treated here as entering an unknown country and, as Pugliese suggests, as though entering a 'terra incognita' that is unknown and discovered by travellers:

Up until and immediately after the moment of unification, Northern Italians viewed the South as a type of terra incognita. Knowledge of the South was largely gathered from the accounts and travelogues of European travelers who ventured into the nether regions of the peninsula and returned to tell their tales. (2008, p. 34)

The Italian South is positioned in these travelogues as operating in externality to laws, morality and in violence enacted by populations defined as degenerate 'racial hybrids' born from inter-racial sexual relations. On the very eve of Italian unification, the travel writing of James Gibbs, a Catholic poet and physician who travelled from Naples to Messina in 1859, also re-imagines this city as an 'intolerable' southern space, contaminated by the inter-racial sexual relations with foreigners.

Messina is described as:

Very nasty, smells intolerably bad, looks as if it was but a half-built town, fit only for the inhabitants, whose language, with their manners, consists one half of heathen Greeks, and the other half barbarous Spanish, somewhat italianised ... learning or the polite arts have scarce ever been heard of. (Gibbs as cited in Chaney 1998, pp. 18-19)

Southern Italians in these accounts are perceived, in da Silva's terms, as affectable and miscegenated populations generated by their inferior cultural, religious, sexual and geospatial domains. In the nineteenth century, the 'science of man' developed in the work of Cesare Lombroso (1841-1936), Guglielmo Ferrero (1871-1942), Alfredo Niceforo (1876-1960), Giuseppe Sergi (1841-1936) and Enrico Ferri (1856-1929), especially, expanded these British-based narratives of a North/South divide. The new racial sciences contributed to existing European onto-epistemological knowledge by affiliating southern populations to 'blood mixing' relations with Greeks, Romans, Normans, African and Arabs. The so-called 'Southernists' effectively argued that inter-racial sexual relations had given shape to 'a region that is a priori condemned to perpetual inferiority' (Guglielmo 2010, p. 83). This perception of the inter-raciality of southern populations is one that will come to mark women from southern regions migrating to Australia in terms of their capacity to contribute to the heteronormative white nation.

These scattered but also consistent threads of knowledge formation on the North and South are solidified with the unification of Italy and the creation of a liberal monarchist nation-state whose formation was supported by Britain. The benefits of nation building and national unity were even

preached by educated British middle-class women (this also included First-Wave feminists informed by Mary Wollstonecraft's writings) who travelled to southern Italy, especially after the 1860s, 'as women who sought to assist in the development of the Italian nation, and the turning of its people, particularly women, into citizens' (O'Connor 2003, p. 253). From 1861, the state is grounded on the institutionalization of a hegemonic form of northern sovereignty and its alliance with selected southern interests that from the very outset operated as technologies for invasion and colonial occupation (Verdicchio 1997) that effectively quashed the southern population's demand for self-government/s or pre-existing demands for sovereignties and land redistribution.

In discussing the unification as part of a northern colonial mechanism, Martucci articulates the outrage at the northern violence exercised throughout the southern regions. This violence is compared to the colonial practices deployed in other colonized countries:

Pietro Calà d'Ulloa, counsellor of the supreme court of Naples ... tried to solicit European public opinion by glossing a long catalogue of northern abuses in terms of past and contemporary colonial practices: 'did not the English do the same things in India, the French in Algeria, did not the Spanish act with the same violent dexterity against the barbaric natives in Mexico and Peru? (2007, pp. 294-295)

A re-reading of Gramsci is useful here as he notes that the unification process was never based on creating equal relations:

Unity had not been created on a basis of equality, but as hegemony of the North over the South in a city-country territorial relation; in other words the North was a 'parasite' which enriched itself at the expense of the south, that industrial development was dependent on the impoverishment of Southern agriculture (1999, p.233).

The unification in effect becomes part of a mechanism of colonial

appropriation of economic resources. It asserts a hegemonic form of sovereign power that violently transforms existing political demands through exclusive strategic alliances.

The North's violent imposition of violent colonial practices in order to subdue and control the South worked to fuel the proliferation of opposition to the state in the form of *brigantaggio*. The North effectively recoded brigandage in terms of criminal opposition to the new modern state. As I will discuss below, criminalisation became a primary form of onto-epistemological embodiment of southerners upheld by racial scientists, such as Lombroso, who supported and participated in the colonial occupation of the South. This was also reproduced in the racial discourses deployed by the Australian state in its hierarchical classification of Southern Italian diasporic subjects.

After the northern occupation of southern Italy, the proliferation of opposition from brigands came to include armed bands of counter-national groups of women and men. On occasion, they were also lead by the ex-employers of the Bourbons that reigned within the zones of:

Calabria, Apulia, Campania, Molise and Sicily - rebels [that] formed large bands, often with hundreds of members, hid out in mountains and caves, and attempted to unite peasants in armed resistance against the state and the new class of landowners who expropriated peasant lands for non payment of taxes. They resisted the draft, intimidated tax collectors, and occupied land. (Guglielmo 2010, p. 33)

For the *brigantessa* ('female brigands') as Romano (2007, para 10) argues, it matures the drama of poverty and deprivation and the breakdown of familiar relations. This is the drama of 'desperate women who overturn a

stereotyped role of resignation and subjection ... and who actively participate in the peasant revolt' (2007, para 10). The correspondence of northern Italian soldiers and officials located in the South reproduces this racio-gendered vision of southern Italian women as lawless, immoral, vindictive, violent and murderess. Women from specific southern regions were represented as inherently violent; for example, women from Molise were classified as 'backwards murderous women' that were said to 'tie gentlemen from the testicles and ... pull them like that in the streets' (quoted in Petraccone 2000, p. 28). The *brigantesse* were not conceived as self-determined political figures but, rather, the official reports repeatedly racially inferiorised them as criminal and tied them to heteronormative relations with male 'briganti' (Romano 2007). A closer look at known visual images of the bodies of the women that were captured and killed, however, also indicates the ways their raciality was partly produced by their sexualisation as immoral subjects. Raciality de-legitimized their sovereign political demands and externalized them as criminals. This generated a racial profile of southern female bodies that also came to frame them, in the Australian context as I discuss below, as untrustworthy and disloyal political subjects that created unassimilable children and communities.

Immigration Technology

This onto-epistemology of raciality that hierarchised the European and Italian population by the end of the nineteenth century had been produced in Australia. Biopolitical immigration technologies gave preference to the

arrival of diasporic female bodies categorized as of white Northern origins. Despite the fact that these women were internalised as legal subjects or as ‘proper subjects,’ they were still compelled to embody the raciality assigned to them: in the context of hegemonic white citizenship, they were compelled to conform to assimilative racial categories. These bodies were written within the heteronormative and gendered national text as assimilable reproducers of white children. They were also classed as belonging to the servile order of domestic workers (Palombo 1998).

In Queensland the violent deportation of South Sea Islanders was partly driven by the sponsoring of carefully selected female bodies from Piedmont as it was thought they would make good white domestic servants. In Clause 8 of the original Agreement for *Man and Wife* the duties of domestic servants implied ‘making herself generally useful’ in the plantations (cited in Douglass 1995, p. 308).²⁷ Even earlier in NSW a Board of Inquiry was established in 1881 to consider the circumstances, character, skills and intentions of a group of Italian ‘refugees’; the Board argued that these ‘moral and sober people’ were from ‘Treviso in the North of Italy’ and they were categorised as ‘labourers’. The Ferry Report of 1925 hierarchised and valued the achievements of those ethnicised as Northern Italians, but in this process it invisibilised women’s labour and locked their categorisation within the heteronormative confines of

²⁷ This Inquiry, however, not only ignored the women explanations that they were not ‘domestic servants’ but allowed them to remain in NSW under the condition that they would ‘disperse’ or assimilate by working as ‘domestic workers’ for English employers (Italian Immigration Inquiry Board Report 1881).

marriage and motherhood. The latter was especially prized for reproducing assimilable white children, as they were reported as regularly attending local schools and manifesting assimilative citizenship (Ferry Report 1925, p. 23). This is also in line with the gendered dimension of labour history in Australia that had seen the institutionalisation of the protection of the rights of white male ‘workers or breadwinners wages’ by refusing to recognize women’s labour and allowing equal wages²⁸. What emerged was a raciality that gendered diasporic female bodies within the pre-established, racial North/South divide of Italy and that enforced assimilative bio-politicised economic relations that ethnicised women as foreign sources of domestic labour.

This ‘biopolitical economism’ foregrounded the assimilation of diasporic women as ethnicised labourers. A closer analysis demonstrates that a ranking system, created by what Rey Chow (2002, p.32) calls ‘bio-politicised economic relations,’ circumscribed both southern and northern diasporic women’s lives. Before discussing the specificities of these lives it is relevant here to reconsider how, after all, the modern liberal state has always been guided by what Foucault terms a form of ‘governmental reason’. This is articulated with the fundamental principle of its limitation, firstly by its anchorage to the market as a ‘mechanism of exchange’ and, secondly, by the ‘utility’ of public authorities: ‘So we have exchange on

²⁸ De Martini, a Piedmontese living in North Queensland, narrates how in the 1930s women lost the right to work for the gangs of cane cutters: ‘the unions ... prohibited women to cook for the gangs. A male member of the gang had to do it ... Thus taking away from excellent women chiefs the honour of cooking’ (my translation Panarello 1986, p. 21).

the side of the market and utility on the side of the public authorities. Exchange for wealth and utility for the public authorities. This is how governmental reason articulates the fundamental principle of its self-limitation' (Foucault 2010, p. 44).

Exchange and utility are the interests that impose limits to governmental reason. Drawing from the principles of exchange, biopolitical economism is at the basis of a modern, racial form of governmentality that produces the limits for diasporic women's citizenship. On the one hand, state regulation of the arrival of those racially constituted as Southern Europeans favours the prevalence of 'white' British labor within certain industries and locations (for example, the sugar industry in North Queensland). On the other hand, the Ferry Report of 1925 and the *Amendments to Immigration Act* (Cwlth) throughout the 1920s question the homogenising effects of using the racial category of Southern Europeans. More precisely, they re-direct the limits of governmental reason by evoking a pre-existing European-based racial hierarchy that differentiates the skills of workers from the northern regions. These contrasting strategies are part of technologies produced by and responding to a biopolitical economism that is always already partly constituted by a raciality that participates in the regularisation of the demand and supply of labour ethnicised as foreign; as Chow (2002, p. 21) effectively sums it up: there is a continual 'presence of an interested' buyer.

Moreover, this preference for Northern populations is subsumed by the gendering of the ethnicisation of labour produced by the operations of

biopolitical economism. The regularisation of new arrivals deployed by technologies of gender intervened in ‘the very humanity attributed to these diasporic female bodies,’ not by resolving their embodiment of racial differences or the North/South divide but rather by subsuming it within what Chow (2002, p. 32, p. viii) calls a ‘capitalist economism’s ways of hailing, disciplining and rewarding identities constituted by certain forms of labour’. Following Chow, the commodification of diasporic female bodies produces their ethnicisation as labourers in ways that I would argue redefines the limits of a North/South divide. Chow explains that in the ethnicisation of labour:

The ethnic as such stands in modernity as the site of a foreignness that is produced from within privileged societies and is at once defined by and constitutive of that society’s hierarchical divisions of labor. A laborer becomes ethnicized because she is commodified in specific ways, because she has to pay for her living by performing certain kinds of work, while these kinds of work, despite being generated from within that society, continue to reduce the one who performs them to the position of the outsider, the ethnic. (Chow 2002, p.35)

In the context of the regime of biopolitical economism, all diasporic women, irrespective of their location within the North/South divide, were constituted as foreign ‘ethnics’ in the very process of their labour. I would add, however, that this ethnicisation is possible precisely because historically, as discussed above, both Northern and Southern women had, in different ways, already been signified as inferior racial bodies and lower classes of servants. So the economic hailing or interpellation already assumes their inferiority and continues to constitute them as foreign diasporic subjects within the context of white Anglocentric Australia.

The following extracts from life narratives provide an overview of a biopolitical economism that operated within the harsh and violent social settings of colonial and racial spaces. These extracts show how technologies of gender encapsulated diasporic female bodies within a regime of biopolitical economism that was crucial in the building of the white nation, even as it enabled these women to survive poverty, support children and maintain their businesses or farms. In the mapping of colonial and racial spaces, I also do not wish to negate the class divisions exemplified by the duties conducted for an Italian business class and middle class. For example, in the biography *Amelia*, after arriving from Liguria Amelia worked as a domestic worker for an entrepreneurial Italian family (Triaca, 1985). Within this regime of ‘necessity’, the biopolitical economism of hard work is also always produced within a colonial framework that dispossessed First Nation People and created the conditions for these women, categorised as either white or not-so-white settlers, to participate in this process, create property ownership and in various ways benefit from the processes of ongoing colonial dispossession.

In what follows, I proceed to examine the heterogeneity of the ways female bodies were hailed into performing ‘hard work’ and the benefits they consequently drew from this regime. In ‘Emma: A Recipe for Life’ (Ciccatosto and Bosworth 1998, p. 53) we also have the life narrative of Emma, a migrant from the southern region of Abruzzo who, like her neighbour from the regions of Calabria, continually worked on her own farm, including ‘labouring in the fields, to keep them going’. Maria, who

arrived from Sicily, also owned and worked on her own farm at Tully in Queensland while she brought up her children:

I tried my best. My mother and my sister helped my father. We all worked like men trying to keep going. The cane drills had to be planted by hand, the weeds had to be dug out and all of the farm work done as well as keep the house going. We even cut cane ... during the crushing. It was weeks before the blisters stopped coming up on my hands. (Fresta 1995, p. 44)

In the same North Queensland context, the life narrative of Caterina, a proxy bride from Sicily, conveys the harshness of losing her husband and bringing up five children alone. She worked for others on their farms by planting and picking strawberries (Wardrop 1996, p. 38). In the life narrative of Lucia, who migrated from the region of Campania to reunite with her husband in Roseville, New South Wales, her life was restricted by the continual demands of having to work within the home and her family fruit shop:

Lucia's life in Australia was very different to her life in Raviscanina. She became totally dependent on her husband and her children, her life split between home and the fruit shop, rarely going out alone not even to shop for meat and groceries. (Drago 1997, p. 14)

Antonia Mezzini in Port Pirie (South Australia), originating from the town of Molfetta, also recounts that there was no local paid work and that she performed duties at home to support her mother in a family with 'five children and we all had jobs to do' (Interviews 2002). Bianca's (Loh 1980, p. 39) oral history reconstructs her mum's life as a labourer in rural Victoria as a single parent, prior to and during World War Two, by listing the types of duties they had to perform: 'Mum always worked to keep the house going ... it was tough, tough on mum'. She explains that in order to support her family after her partner was interned she:

Went from house to house doing ironing and she got a bike to get around. She was a good gardener and grew her own veggie, and we had chooks and a cow. She had a scythe and she'd do an acre of grass with that around the house, she used to put it all in a heap in the corner of the yard for the cow in the winter-time. (Loh 1980, p. 39)

Henderson (1993, p. 21) sums up Rita's recollection of her life while living in Victoria after migrating from the region of Friuli: 'the weekend Rita married she finished work in her brother's shop at midnight on Saturday, had Sunday off while the wedding took place and started work in her husband's shop that week. She does not remember any holiday in between'. Carmelina Meoli, a migrant from Tuscany, in the objection to her internment in War World Two explained that she did not have many acquaintances in Gordonvale that could vouch for her political loyalty to the state precisely because prior to the war she had to constantly work on her own farm (Objection by M.C. Meoli 1/9/42 AAQ). In Peter Dalseno's (1994, p. 45) autobiography, he recalls his mother Irma's life in domestic servitude in Queensland as signifying gendered servitude: 'the doubtful protection for herself and her son was inscribed on the key of her servitude – to the man's rainments, his mouth, and his loins'. In 'Sotto La Croce Del Sud' (Galassi, 1991 pp. 166-168), the biopoliticised hailing is recounted by the Maranesi sisters whose grandmother from Lombardy 'used to go and fetch water with horses. She was a cook looking after forty men who worked in the forest' (p.168). Mrs Angelina Prandolini not only self-identified as a 'home maker' but morally rejected the value of women working outside home or taking care of other people's children (1991, p.167). What is evidenced by these narratives is not that the North/South divide did not define women's lives but that, as labourers, they are ethnicised by a biopolitical economism that produces the 'necessity' to live

and a 'promise of (modern) salvation' from further forms of inferiorisation (Chow 2002, p. 29) by performing 'hard work'. The benefits created by biopolitical economism as either white and not-so-white settlers varied according to their specific social settings but were still based on the dispossession of First Nation people and participation as 'ethnicised laborer' in a colonial project. Effectively the larger regime of biopolitical economism functioned to complicate the binarised categories of the North/South in order effectively to continue to reproduce complex gendered and ethnicised subject positions.

This is not to say that the southern question disappeared in Australia. On the contrary, it continued to inform Anglo-Australian perceptions and policies with regard to Southern Italian women. In effect, the arrival of women from the southern regions did not go unnoticed. Their arrival is locked within the heteronormativity of raciality that limits sexual relations (miscegenation) and family formation. What emerges is a raciality that writes women sexuality within the violence of a North/South divide of Italy and of Europe (as Southern Europeans). They are constituted not only as threatening existing racial borders within Australia but effectively as having already disrupted an existing European-based racial order (da Silva 2007, p. 224). John Lyng (1935, p. 93) categorically implicates racial miscegenation in his narrative of an 'impoverished southern Italian blood':

In Southern Italy and Sicily the small strain of Nordic blood infused by the Normans in the 11th century has been out-bred, and in its place the once pure Mediterranean blood has been impoverished by an infusion of inferior African and Asiatic blood. (1935, p.93)

This 'infusion' postulates questions over the physical and cultural whiteness of southerners and ultimately it raises concerns over their assimilability and that of their children. Lyng (1935) and Thomas Ferry (1925 p.23) both define the 'second generation of the sturdy pioneers from Piedmont and Lombardy ... as true Australians'. Lyng (1935, p. 107), however, clearly argues that the more recent 'children of southern Europe promise to be the same'. This 'promise,' which is in line with the technologies of assimilation and absorption also enforced on Aboriginal populations, is partly resolved by both Lyng and Commissioner Ferry by the proposition to support 'intermarriage' with British men. Lyng describes this as 'another great factor in the process of assimilation' as it was considered that 'unions between Italian women with British husbands,' although low in numbers, were successful (Lyng 1935, p. 108). The tropical scientist and medical officer Cilento (as cited Anderson 2006, p. 160) however, also argued that intermarriages were to be racially selective. They should only include Northerners and exclude the Mediterraneans and Sicilians so to reproduce a 'higher type' of white race. This implied that the reproduction of white children was to be based on the elimination of women and men from the southern regions of Italy, especially Sicilians.

The spatialisation of diaporic women, as originating from an inferior geopolitical space, produces their ethnicisation as the foreign sexual body. The biopolitics of the North/South divide is evoked by sexual categories that, in da Silva's (2013, p. 47) words, 'hold violence in the subject of

affectability produced by the biopolitical and disciplinary apparatuses that deploy them'. Historically, they come to be intermittently constituted as racially unassimilable, sexually immoral and irresponsible mothers. As Pugliese (2002b) indicates, by the 1960s Australian immigration officials were still constitutive of the ethnicisation of women from Sicily as responsible for reproducing dubious, dark, hybrid bodies. He cites these officials, as they write:

In the 50s and 60s the only thing whiter than soap powder was the White Australian Policy ... Most people think it applied only in Asia and Africa but this is not so. It was alive and well in Europe and America. When I was in Rome in the early 1960s I was told that our people in Sicily were having some problems. Many of our migrants were honest farming folk who had got an all-Australian suntan working in the fields. However there were a few whose mothers had clearly dallied with gentlemen of dubious racial origin from across the water in North Africa. (Cited in Pugliese 2002b, p. 160-161)

I would add that the longevity of this racial regime also announces the ways biopolitical technologies had established the predictability of the 'unassimilable'. This categorisation of women, such as the Sicilians of 'dubious racial origins,' in effect renders visible the ways their selection is always already ethnicised due to the fact they have been typed as belonging to an unassimilable population group. Their whiteness is placed into question: Sicilian women and their children are always already embodied as breaching racial borders precisely because they stand as embodiments of relations with North African men.

What transpires here is that immigration technologies were informed by a European onto-epistemology of raciality that figured southern women, especially Sicilian and Calabrians, with racial and sexual genetic traits that made them prone to sexual precocity and to commit crime. Lombroso's

racial sciences, as explored up by Pugliese (2002b, p. 157), ‘had a significant influence in the USA, UK and Australia’. It is worthwhile noting that Lombroso had long shown his support for the unification of Italy and its northern administrators. Lombroso not only served as a medical doctor in the military campaign to quell peasant resistance in Calabria from 1859 to 1863. His writings also code the continual unrest in the South as displays of ‘revolts’. For Lombroso, ‘revolts’ are distinguished from political revolutions and display the inherent criminal and a ‘fighting spirit’ produced by a degenerate race linked to ‘racial miscegenation’. Lombroso focus on an inherent violent criminality is also followed up in his book *Crimes, its Causes and Remedies* (1911). Here Lombroso creates a racial typology of Europe that measures, orders and hierarchises lives.

In the book co-written with Guglielmo Ferrero on *Female Offenders* (1895, p. 113), Lombroso consolidated his view on women’s sexual inferiority and criminality. More specifically, Lombroso argues that offenders ‘from the [Southern] country districts and especially [from] the Islands’ embodied the same racial ‘primordial genetic and physiological characteristics’ of men and of non-European women racialised as ‘Negro woman, Indian Woman, Hottentont African woman, Abyssinian Woman, and Australian Aboriginal Woman’ (1895, p.113). The shared characteristics for Lombroso (1895, p. 113) enhance female bodies capacity to commit the worst and highest number of crimes. Women’s physiological and genetic characteristics are carefully crafted in this text in

ways that southern female subjects embody:

[Sexual] precocity and a minor degree of differentiation from the male – this lesser differentiation manifesting itself in the stature, cranium, brain, and in the muscular strength which she possesses to a degree so far in advance of the modern female. (1895, p. 113)

Lombroso characterises Southern Italian women as ‘Primordial female subjects’ who were ‘inferior’, ‘non-modern females’, criminals, ‘less intelligent’, ‘sexually precocious’, ‘non-feminine’ and overall unnaturally ‘masculine’ female body. In this setting, female bodies affiliated with the northern regions are homogeneously referred to as ‘modern’, assume a status of superiority when contrasted to the characterisation of non-European women. In this context, the Northern European woman, who is not the focus of Lombroso’s (1895) study, is naturalised as the superior European subject.

The violence generated by the moral panic of the ‘Olive Peril’ as it unfolded in 1920s Australia created terror for diasporic women. The biographical narrative of *Savage Cows and Cabbage Leaves* (Alafaci 1999) based on research and interviews, re-imagines the life of Carmela, Alafaci’s aunty, who arrived in Australia in 1927 at the age of four. My interest lies especially in Maria Barbaro’s (Carmela’s mother) whose life was also shaped by assimilative technologies. Her life narrative projects the way assimilation operated as a bio-technology of racial violence that was produced by the state and shared with white citizens in ways that terrorized racialised and ethnicised Italian female bodies:

For minoritised ethnic groups, assimilation demanded that they divest themselves of any cultural and linguistic practices unacceptable to the model of a monocultural, Anglocentric Australia. In practice, assimilation translated to forms of violence against minorities both at the systematic

level of the state, whose institutions and services were designed solely for the benefit of its English speaking subjects, and at the level of daily life, where NESB subjects were discriminated against and often publicly upbraided or assaulted for speaking a language other than English in public spaces- or indeed simply for their embodied, corporeal differences from the Anglocentric norm. (Perera and Pugliese 1998, p. 49)

In this biography, this racialised violence is lived and felt by Maria when, as a newly arrived migrant who spoke little English, she went to have her second child in a public hospital. Here she could not access any language services as the policy of assimilation would not permit the availability of those services; instead, she is already ethnicised as an unassimilable Southern Italian mother who is difficult and over protective:

Maria cries. She does not like this place. She knows her English is poor but everybody yells at her. Do they think that this makes it easier for her to understand? And why won't they let her family in to see her? She cannot understand this ... The nurses think she is a very difficult patient; over protective, you know! But they let her be because she will be gone in a few days. They just hope that there aren't too many more 'Eyetalians' out there having babies. (Alafaci 1999, p. 42)

But the point remains in this text that no one explained to Maria the procedures, and instead of talking to her rather they 'yell[ed]' at her. The hospital and the nurses are part of a biopolitical configuration that regulates diasporic women motherhood by intervening directly on their bodies and that of their children. Assimilation in effect assumed control over the two lives by imposing 10 days of parenting classes on how to 'bath, feed and care' and all in the English language. But these are small details when considering that Maria's doctor demands that she offer her child up for adoption and the fact that nobody in the hospital believes her story. As the book recounts (p.47): 'you let me keep him and then you go. You already have one child. You have more soon! Give him to me,

please'. This is a moment of terror in which the racialised-sexualised body is contained and threatened by a medical institution.

The Depression Years

Prior and during the Depression years, biopolitical economic interests transformed citizens lives. Exchange relations between British imperial capital and heterogeneous governmental interests re-defined the limits of state governmentality. The state's reliance on 'London funds' was protected by the forceful demand and introduction of the so-called *Premier's Plan* (1930-1931) that generated drastic inequity and changes and reduction in the living standards²⁹ of white citizens. This was met with strong and violent opposition that came close to producing an armed 'civil war' (Knightley 2001). Within the violence of a forceful biopolitical economism that was to reshape everyday living, an arsenal of raciality internalized the legal-juridico protection of the sovereignty and supremacy of British/Anglo-Australia workers. This was grounded on the coding of non-British diaspora, including Southern Italians, as inferior and untrustworthy workers and as unsassimilable foreigners. In this climate, the racial panic generated by the specter of the 'Olive Peril' consolidated the perception of an economic struggle that embodied Italian diaspora and

²⁹ The Premier's Plan saw the introduction of a 10% reduction in wages, increased taxation, reduction in interests paid to governmental bonds, reduction by 20% of Government expenditure, new Arbitration system based on 'industry capacity to pay rule', stoppage of migration programs with Britain, cut in defence, localized protection of supremacy of British-Australian workers (Clarke 2002, p. 124; Groenewegen & McFarlane 1990).

workers as a non-white foreign menace to the sovereignty of the superior working lives and standards of white Anglo-Australians.

The ‘Olive Peril,’ as part of an arsenal of white raciality, generated a national anxiety over the immunisation of the sovereign economic well-being and lives of white Australia. In 1924, as noted by an Italian journalist Filippo Scacchi during his visit to Australia, this exerted an insular imaginary of a white Australia:

Why all this bitter feeling against the Italians? I will explain – in order to keep Australia ‘white’. Keep Australia white! Is the true catchword of this crusade. In fact we are not ‘white’ we are ‘olive’. Olive skinned influx, the invasion of the ‘olive skins’ is how a large Melbourne evening paper refers to the announcement of an inquiry by the Queensland Government into Italian immigration in the northern districts. And at another congress, of Australian women, a well known speaker, after exhorting Australian housewives not to purchase fruit of the Italian vendors, even at lower prices, laments that after so much done to preserve Australia ‘white’ against the menace of the Asiatic, ‘olive’ immigrants continue to establish themselves in the country. (1924 cited in Andreoni 2003, p. 85)

During the Depression years the infamous caricature of an Italian male worker³⁰ on the front page of the Brisbane newspaper the *Truth*, signified a non-white foreign menace. This re-evoked existing fears against the ‘black scourge’ of South Sea Islanders and the ‘Yellow Peril’ of Chinese migrants (Andreoni 2003, p. 85) that, as I demonstrated in Chapter Two were defined as necessitating the introduction of the *Deportation Act and Immigration Restriction Act* (Cwlth). Similarly, the Olive Peril generated a racialised violence that calls to eliminate the presence of Italian diasporic populations.

Henderson (1995 p.38) shows that in the inter-war period, Italians in North Queensland were continually accused of industrial breaches, including taking 'unfair advantage of fellow workers by working outside industrial arbitration awards'. In this context, Henderson (1995, p.39) argues that the Australian Workers Union implemented a dual policy of 'prosecution and education'. The Ferry Report (1925, p. 18) itself had already evoked the Olive Peril when it had professed the superior qualities of established white Northern Italians and British workers. The Report distinguished these workers from the 'swarthy' Southern Italians who were massified with other Southern Europeans as working for lower wages and downgrading the conditions of white workers. Following the Ferry Report and *Amendments to Immigration Act 1925* (Cwlth), the intake of Italian nationals was eventually reduced to 1,500 in 1929 and by 1930 all Southern Europeans were prohibited from entering the country. Only close dependent relatives or persons with considerable financial resources' were allowed to migrate at this time (Iacovino 1983, p. 10). In 1930 the Queensland Cane Growers Association and the Australian Workers Union also backed the British Preference League demand for a 'Gentlemen's Agreement'. This stipulated that 75% of cane cutting jobs were to be reserved for 'Britishers' or British Australian born subjects (Cresciani 1988, p. 167; Douglass 1995, pp. 168-193; Henderson 1995, p.33). This agreement in effect internalised within the law the Olive Peril against the Italian diasporic population.

Alafaci's (1999) narrative mobilizes the confusing, everyday racial, gendered diasporic relations that were produced by the Olive Peril. Maria Barbaro's feelings of isolation and desire for opening communication with other women informed her decision to allow an unknown British-Australian woman in the house one afternoon. Unknowingly, this visitor was not there for friendship; rather, she was attempting to obtain information on the spatial layout of Maria's house:

While Maria was scrubbing the floor, a woman in a nearby house knocked at the front door, smiled, and asked Maria if she could see her baby. After nearly two years of being ignored! Maria, of course, was pleased to show off both her beautiful children, and as Carmino was asleep the women went quietly into the bedroom at the front of the house. The neighbor said Carmino was beautiful, commented on his curly locks ... The visitor then asked how many other people lived in the house and how they all fitted in. She seemed to think that nine borders would take up a lot more space, and Maria thought she would have to show her upstairs bedrooms to prove that they were quite comfortable. What a strange person, Maria thought ... Then suddenly, the visitor didn't want to talk anymore. She said she had to go back home and left quickly. (Alafaci 1999, pp. 70-71)

It took few days for Maria to connect the visit to the bombing of her house that night. Although there were no deaths, Maria's baby was injured, the house was damaged and terror was created.

Effectively, the biopolitical economism of the Depression, working in tandem with the racial panic of the Olive Peril, had enabled the exercise of racist violence that saw Maria Barbaro's boarding house bombed. As reported in the *Argus* on 10 October 1928:

Antonio Barbaro, his wife and his two children ... were awakened by the explosion as it rocked the house and stripped the walls of plaster. None was seriously injured, but the baby girl was cut on the side of the head ... One of the Italian volunteer who occupied rooms ... was almost struck by a fragment of the bomb ... the detective interviewed several persons, and ... they are satisfied that the bomb was intended to injure three volunteers labourers living in the house. Barbaro, the tenant is not employed on the waterfront and had no connection to the strike. (reproduced in Alafaci

1999, p. 76)

Maria Barbaro had been earning money by running this boarding house in Melbourne that provided lodging largely for Calabrian men.³¹ Amongst these residents there were three ‘volunteers labourers’ who were the targets of the bombing. At this time, a dispute involving members of the Wharf Labourers’ Union, the Waterside Workers Federation, the hiring of free workers (non-unionised labour) and the Federal Government had seen heated strikes against the formal introduction of the Transport Workers’ Bill which was perceived to protect free workers (Alafaci 1999, pp. 62-70). The dispute legitimated the exercise of racist violence within sections of organised labour directed at Italian diaspora perceived to be affiliated with the non-unionised free workers: the goal was to work on their elimination by violent killings.

Under licence of this regime of racist violence, sections of organised Australian workers exercised a ‘right to kill’. Alafaci’s biography recounts through historical research and oral interviews the racial perception of non-unionised diasporic workers and the terror that this created:

So many of the newly arrived Italians do not go ‘on strike’. Neither do many of the Australians. But the Italians are easier to single out. They are mostly dark, they speak differently, and they all save their money because they say that their families in Italy would starve if they stopped sending money home. The Australian volunteers say their families will also starve if they do not work, but it is easier to blame the new comers, and some are beaten. It is their fault. After all if they weren’t here, there would be more jobs for ‘real’ Australians, the unionist thinks. Even Prime Minister Bruce said that ‘Australia’ is 98% British and would remain that way’ so there is little hope of acceptance. (1999, p. 67)

³¹For further discussion on migrant women’s work in boarding houses see Gabaccia 1984; Cetti 1984.

This category of ‘Australian’ workers exercised a sovereign ‘right to kill’ that, in Mbembe’s (2003, p. 31) words, was ‘not the sole monopoly of the state’ but, rather, was configured by a ‘heteronomous organisation of territorial rights and claims’. In this case, necropolitics is part of a violent demand for the physical elimination of Italian diaspora defined as ‘free workers’ by attempting to kill three non-unionised diasporic laborers who were residing at Maria’s boarding house. This necropolitics is also directly responding to a biopolitical economism governmentalised by the state support for ‘free workers’. The bombing of Maria’s house received a relative large and positive coverage from the media in newspapers like the *Argus*, *Sun* and the *Truth* which historically had not always been on the side of identified Southern Italian migrants. The government also openly expressed ‘horror’ and called the event a ‘cold blooded attack on innocent Italians’ and even the Labour Minister of the time offered a ‘reward for the capture of the bombers’ (from *Sun News-Pictorial* 1928 cited in Alafaci 1999, pp. 75-81). This response was envisaged within the imaginary of a responsible state that protects populations. But, in this case, the ‘sense of horror’ unleashed by this racist violence operated as a form of immunisation for the state’s sovereignty in the context of the larger governmental regime of biopolitical economism that in fact worked to generate these very conflicts and killings.

Peter Dalseno’s (1994) book creates a movement between various assemblages of racial violence directed at the Italian diaspora and generated by the Olive Peril. In his autobiography *Sugar Tears and*

Eyeties (1994), the Olive Peril is part of an arsenal of racial violence that informed the attacks on Italian diaspora in Queensland. The disclosure of ‘factual’ events drawn from various life narratives is told through a third person narrative and by fictionalising names, places and parts of events in ways that introduce the racial violence that has shaped the lives of Peter and his mother Irma, who in Queensland from Venice in the early 1920s. The complexities of the pre-existing North/South divide that constituted Italian diaspora merge with historical narratives of the local configuration of the Olive Peril in Australia. The ethnicisation of diasporic bodies as ‘foreigners’ is shown here to open all Italian diasporic subjects to racial surveillance and violence. As conflicts against Southern Europeans intensify, the evidencing of racial differences at the level of the body is not always clearly discernable or attainable. In the racial spatiality of Ingham, the southern and northern bodies of Adolfo (identified as a southern employer from Stromboli) and Irma (a domestic worker from Bologna) are attacked in the street by a Britisher who whipped them and called them ‘dagos’ precisely because they were both ‘recognised ... as foreigners’ (Dalseno 1994, p. 90). In the vicious attack Irma was injured:

A large weal traversed her shoulder and culminated in a cut under her throat. She was visibly distressed, partly as a result of the agony of the wound and partly as a result of her wounded sensibilities. She could hardly contain her scorn. (Dalseno 1994, p.90)

In this instance, Irma’s scorn imagines this violence as a lack of ‘civility’ that is attached to ‘the penal colony’. This ‘scorning’ brings back the violence to the biopolitical state and its connection to the territorialisation of racial violence. But, as I discuss below, I would argue that this account also points to the onto-epistemology that limits the radicality of this

autobiography as it affiliates the events to a state-based colonial order perceived to be produced by an inferiorised and criminalised class of British convicts.

The racial terror that is documented in Dalseno's (1994) narrative is also affiliated with the bio-criminalisation of the Southern Italian diaspora. This 'bio-criminalisation' is one that Lyn Henderson (1995 p.36) has also shown to parallel the ongoing attacks against Italian diasporic labour in the inter-war period. In Ingham in particular, where there was a higher concentration of Italian diaspora, conviction rates were disproportionately high, a factor that for Henderson demonstrates that the legal-justice system tried to promote assimilation by means of prosecution (1995, p.38). Within this process of criminalization, however, continual references to Calabrian and Sicilian criminal syndicates were made. In the racial spatialization of Ingham by Dalseno's (1994, p. 89) text the 'whispers' over sporadic activities of an Italian organisation – '*The Mano Nera*' or the '*Black Hand Gang*' perceived to be associated with 'Southern Italian regions of Calabria and Sicily' – enables locals, under police approval, to arm themselves in self-defence. From an historical viewpoint, the fear of the *Mano Nera* signifies traces of the historical evocation of the criminalisation of Southern Italians as deployed by the criminologist Lombroso and others. As discussed above, Lombroso's racial sciences generated the pre-given bio-criminality of Southern Italians as he argued that:

It is apparent, then that these crimes are most frequent in the provinces where the population is predominantly Semitic (Sicily, Sardinia, Calabria)

or purely Latin (Latium Abruzzo) as compared with those where the population Teutonic, Ligurian, Celtic (Lombardy, Liguria, Piedmont), or Slavic (Venetia) ... It is then, to the African and oriental elements (the Greeks excepted) that Italy owes the frequency and homicide in Calabria, Sicily and Sardinia; while the occurrence of a small number, as in Lombardy is due to the large Teutonic element in the population. The effect of race is clearly to be seen in certain localities whose inhabitants differ ethnically from the surrounding population, and where the relative frequency and infrequency of crime coincides with the racial difference. (1911, p. 28)

Significantly, this part of the narrative on the *Mano Nera* in Dalseno's text is told through the lenses of the character of Adolfo, identified as a southerner from Stromboli. Adolfo on the one hand, confirms that there is no link between this organization and the southern regions of Italy and, on the other, also confesses his own fear of Southern Italians. I would argue that Adolfo, as a southern character, comes to perform what Chow (2002 p. 115) calls an 'ethnic confession,' as his telling of the 'truth' about the *Mano Nera* and Southern subjects is always implicated in a racial biopolitical interpellation. This actually reconfirms his perceptions of racial differences between Northern and Southern Italian diaspora and the Southerner's alleged inferiority and criminality. Thus Adolfo's confession to Irma of holding a gun for self-defence deploys a racial biopolitical imaginary that argues that even though southerners are 'so much talented,' as populations, however, they always and already embody 'cowardly instincts' that necessitate the use of firearms for self-protection. As Adolfo explains, 'wherever there is corruption, prostitution, graft or a man found clutching his disemboweled body, you find the handiwork of a Southerner' (Dalseno 1994, p. 89). In this sense, then, Dalseno's autobiographical text, as a seemingly emancipatory project that wants to disclose factual and untold migrant histories, is still framed by the writing of a European onto-

epistemological framework. This narrative does not shift the racial and class-based typifications of Southern Italians as living in externality to law, morals and civil society.

The racial violence that was deployed against Southern Italians and diasporic women perceived to be unassimilable took a number of forms. In all cases, biopolitical governmental mechanisms through policies and social intervention territorialized *a priori* of raciality that distinguished southerners and women at the somatic level of the body, economically, in terms of labour relations, at the familiar and reproductive levels and in ways that consolidated a white nation. These mechanisms become technologies of violence that in their insistence in transforming lives and eliminating dangers have exposed Italian diasporic populations to necropolitical practices and violent attacks. In the chapter that follows, I proceed to examine the intensification of the racial panics generated by the looming world war and, once again, the various pieces of legislation that worked to control Indigenous and diasporic politics circulating within the social through the medium of the newspaper.

Chapter Six:

Political Heterogeneities and White Sovereignty

Indigenous and Diasporic Newspapers in the Context of the Security State

This chapter examines the operation of the securitized state in the context of 1920s-30s Australia. It focuses on laws that regulated the availability and circulation of Aboriginal and diasporic politics within the social through newspapers like *The Australian Abo Call* (1938), the *Italo-Australian* (1922-1939), *Il Giornale Italiano* (1932-1939), *Il Risveglio* (1927) and *La Riscossa* (1930-32). Governmental technologies like the state-based *NSW Newspaper Act 1898 (NSW)* and the federal-based *Newspapers in Foreign Languages Regulations Act 1921 (Cwlth)* are part of security mechanisms that not only protected, but fundamentally enhanced white national and imperial political sovereign interests by way of regulating the existence of these newspapers. This brings especially into focus the Australian liberal state's political affiliations with Italian Fascism and its alignment with Fascism's active opposition to communism and anarchism. This political alignment effectively visibilizes the Australian liberal state's sovereign endorsement of a politics that it had long known to be forcefully violent. But which it only ended up condemning when British imperial relations were questioned and turned as enemy politics and used to intern civilian internees during World War Two. The analysis of these newspapers, however, most importantly allows a focus on the varied political demands always circulating at the social

level. This doing reiterates the ways Indigenous and diasporic sovereign politics and related heterogeneous political sovereign demands worked to modify, transform, oppose, subvert but also to sustain national sovereign politics and its insular imaginary of a white nation.

After World War One, in the volatile context of the 1920s and 1930s, the modern liberal state was defined by a system of law that would sustain and enhance Western governments' capacity to intervene in political formations they perceived to be a threat to its existence. As discussed in Chapter Three, a number of laws, including immigration and naturalisation laws, not only re-inscribed the Australian state's ongoing support for British global imperial sovereignty – its utilities and exchange values – but, fundamentally, worked to enforce assimilation, political loyalty and allegiance of the population to both the Australian state and the British Empire. In immunitarian terms, as Esposito (2009) argues, state sovereignty is perceived by its relation to the internalization of political threats and threatening populations that may hinder its preservation. Sovereign immunity is defined by the constant monitoring and keeping inchoate or ineffective political formations always defined as a potential threat. In the colonial and imperial framework of Australia, the social-scientific *a priori* of raciality is re-figured in the deployment of the political signifiers of racial and cultural differences that constitute those political bodies that are categorized as outside the ground of moral and political determination (da Silva 2009, p. 219). When in World War One the Australian Prime Minister, William Hughes, declared the necessity of

deploying martial law as a set of racial biopolitical and necropolitical mechanisms, this worked, as I demonstrated in my previous chapter, to legitimate, enable and preserve the state to expand the right to kill and banish ethnicised populations to internment camps. An arsenal of racial and cultural differences was deployed in order to constitute national ‘alien enemies’ that, in Pugliese’s words, were seen as the ‘embodiments of violence ... out-laws situated beyond due processes of law’ (Pugliese 2013, p. 18). This calling for self-preservation is justified, as da Silva (2009, p. 224) stresses, by the pre-figured European social-scientific onto-epistemology of raciality that had already situated Aboriginal populations within ‘the realm of *necessitas*’, that is, within a zone of affectability and conflict. Here they became targets of the violence of the rational state and its laws, that, in contradistinction, created and protected the ‘ethical life’ of the white ‘transparent ‘I’ of Europe’, in this case, the British-Australian subject. The justification of self-preservation was written in the modern state by the social-scientific arsenal of raciality that figured privileged white subjects and constituted its resultant assimilable and unassimilable population and political bodies and practices. This arsenal of whiteness was deployed through such laws and policies such as the White Australian Policy and by a number of *Immigration Restriction Acts* targeting amongst others Southern Europeans.

In the inter-war years, the Australian state maintained and expanded the biopolitical capacity to calculate the dangers of the ‘relations of force’ that for Foucault (2003, p. 16; p. 44) could form unitary ‘political powers’.

Although self-preservation, as Da Silva (2009, p. 219) explains, is meant to include the protection of universal, democratic and liberal freedoms, this is always predefined by the ‘particularities’ of racial differences as signified by ‘*necessitas*’ to act forcefully to preserve state sovereign (self-) determination. In this sense, state sovereignty is determined by the ‘necessity’ to calculate, register, monitor, allow and disallow (racial) political powers which are always already pre-defined as a potential threat in the form of criminals, dangerous and disloyal, enemies of the white colonial nation and the imperial global order. This perception is announced and legitimated by the juridico-legal system that formalizes mechanisms to track configurations of racial political powers within the social. In this context, this chapter analyses the governmental tracking of cultural productions in the 1930s that circulated within Indigenous and diasporic populations, especially newspapers and a range of non-state based organizations and their activities. The Australian Government, under the guise of deterring the political danger of Aboriginal anti-colonial politics, communism and, from the mid-1930s, anarchism and various forms of Fascism, deployed biopolitical technologies of social vigilance that would monitor and intervene in the circulation of the political. As I discuss below, this state vigilance worked to encompass the broad spectrum of citizen-based groups, including those that supported or opposed the liberal state. Everyday governmental security mechanisms, however, were further enhanced by state-based security intelligence work that set up systems for monitoring, collecting, categorizing and hierarchizing the level of danger imposed by internal political groups and

associations. It is my contention that by the mid-1930s, in keeping with the re-configuration of colonial European alliances and a growing oppositional shift toward the treatment of Nazi Germany and its allies, the ‘*calculability*’ of political powers at the level of indigenous and diasporic population was always ready to be transformed into a form of incalculable threat by the authorities. It is the perception of an incalculable nature of threat that generated fear with regard to suspect (racial and otherwise) populations and that provided the grounds to introduce internment camps and mass detention of civilian internees. As I discuss in the final chapter, the internment of racialised political groups operated as a form of ethnic cleansing that attempted to control and eliminate all forms of political difference and dissent that were perceived as threats to the liberal security state (Dreyfus & Rabinow 1982, p. 221).

Oppositional politics

As demonstrated in the opening chapters, the Australian settler-colonial state was effectively always investigating the politics enacted within Indigenous cultural productions. First Nations people were under close surveillance under the all-encompassing regime of protectionist policies. In this environment, the Aboriginal newspaper *The Australian Abo Call* was published from April to September 1938, edited by a John Thomas Patten one hundred years after *The Flinders Chronicle* (1836) had ceased to exist. His grandson John Patten recounts that John Thomas Patten:

was born on March 28, 1905, at Cummeragunja, an Aboriginal reserve situated near Moama on the New South Wales side of the Murray River. He was born the eldest of six children to John James Patten, a blacksmith and noted police tracker from Coranderrk, Victoria and his wife Christina Mary (nee Middleton), a local farmer’s daughter. (Patten 2009)

Patten became the co-founder and first President of the Aboriginal Progressive Association (APA) and used the newspaper to form an autonomous Aboriginal political 'movement for great progress' and equal rights ('New Hope for Old Australians', May 1938 p.1; 'The Abo Call in Queensland', June 1938 p.4).

This newspaper assumed a national advocacy role and created an autonomous zone of contestation over the racial biopolitical and necropolitical intervention in Indigenous lives and sovereignties. Heather Goodall sums up that this was widely distributed and that it published reports from First Nation people living in various parts of Australia:

The Abo Call was an extremely important vehicle for the movement, distributed far more widely than its organizers could travel and enabling contact with Aboriginal people in the Northern Territory and in remote areas of Queensland. After the first edition, much of it was devoted to readers' letters and their reports of news items. These pages opened up the slogan 'full citizen's rights' to reveal the range of issues which it in fact represented...Direct conflict with whites over school segregationism pressure on reserve lands, the refusal to allow ... control [of] their own family endowment payments ... denial of access to alcohol ... were all raised alongside personal accounts of conflict with the police and the Protection Board. (Goodall 2008, p.289)

This newspaper ensured that Indigenous voices had a space in which to share news and to enter into a dialogue with the liberal state and other bodies including media. It was committed to operating as an independent site for Indigenous-based news that, as Patten (April 1938 p. 1) wrote in the first edition, would be from 'the point of view of the Aborigines themselves' and that had 'nothing to do with missionaries, or anthropologists, or with anybody who looks down at Aborigines as an 'inferior race'' ('To All Aborigines' 1938, p. 1). This notion of

independence, as Shane Thomas Williams (2007, p. 46) argues, was one that his great grandfather Hugh Anderson had been committed to since the late nineteenth century and that he shared with others, including with ‘Uncle Jack Patten’ on his traditional lands of Salt Pan Creek in the 1920s³². For Williams the idea of independence was linked to cultural autonomy, a core political value and expression of cultural sovereignty that operated with two other core values of collectivism and spirituality:

Autonomy is the collective and spiritual expression of our right to cultural sovereignty, land rights and native title, social justice, and treaty. It engenders our social/collective and cultural/spiritual pride.

Most often our autonomy is expressed through the assertion of self-determination, but also self-management, empowerment, sovereignty, independence and so on. These are not catchy cause phrases; they exemplify the subsidiary values we hold in regard to autonomy. (Williams 2007, p.40)

In this sense, *The Australian Abo Call* worked to spatialise autonomous First Nation imaginaries that configured Aboriginal people as ‘knowers’ rather than as needy students of white masters, as subjects rather than as the objects of white epistemologies (Moreton-Ronbinson 2004b, p. 75). This created a contestation of the European ontologies and epistemologies that worked to constitute First Nation people’s lives as subaltern.

The Abo Call operated within a citizenship-rights political framework. It

³² As Thomas Williams explains, his great grandfather Williams Hugh Anderson was born at Rushworth Diggings which lies on the border of the traditional lands of the Ngurelban (Ngooraialum) and the Bangerang peoples of mid-west Victoria, and Ellen Anderson born at Five Islands, Wollongong, NSW, which is located in the traditional lands of the Dharawal (Williams 2007, p. vi). Williams argues that Jack Patten spent quite a bit of time with his family at their traditional land at Salt Creek where it is known that they spent quiet a bit of time talking politics (2007, p. 46).

called for political autonomy by demanding ‘Equal opportunity and Full citizenship’ rights for Aboriginal populations. This agentic political imaginary demanded, in Heiss’s (2003 p. 48) words, ‘full citizenship rights for Aborigines, Aboriginal representation in Parliament and [for] the abolition of the NSW Aborigines Protection Board’. These demands, however, were always shown to be contending with ‘the analytics of raciality’ that had grounded racial differences and delimited Aboriginal people’s legal rights. Patten’s writing in the first edition in fact interpellated Aboriginal readers through highlighting and rejecting racial violence: ‘we are not an inferior race, we have merely been refused the chance of an education that whites receive and we raise our voice to ask for Education, Equal opportunity, and Full Citizen Rights’ (‘To All Aborigines’ April 1938, p. 11).

The newspaper’s configuration of demands of citizens’ rights, as indicated here, was also responding to an arsenal of raciality that had produced inferiorizing knowledge and the negation of Aboriginal rights by the state and its juridical apparatus. These demands contended directly or indirectly with what Moreton-Robinson (2004a, pp. 77-78; 2004b, p. 2) has theorized as the ontological and epistemological ‘a priori’ of whiteness. This a priori had been universalised and normativised by state sovereignty and its governmental institutions. It was also legitimated juridically by formalizing whiteness’s exclusive and superior claim to true humanity and the possessive logic of sovereignty. This is especially evident in an array of powerful articles that responded to public denials of massacres against

First Nation people. The first of this series entitled 'Massacres' argued:

We have definite evidence, which will be published in future numbers of *The Abo Call*, that massacres occurred in almost every district and that the blacks were shot down and poisoned like dingoes. Why are white people such hypocrites as to deny they have treated us badly? ('Massacres' April 1938, p. 4)

By introducing detailed published histories of known massacres³³ in the April, May, June and September editions, *The Australian Abo Call* newspaper introduced that which, to use da Silva's words (2007, p. xx), 'the force of reason' had tried 'to obliterate' altogether, that is, Indigenous self-determination.

The powerful critiques of the state and the juridical staged by Indigenous people in the context of *The Abo Call* does not signify that they were curtailing their demands for the law to produce 'rights' for First Nation populations. Neither is the paper ignoring the '*a priori*' of raciality that produced and was enacted by the force of law and that positioned First Nation people as inferior or as sub-humans that could be killed. On the

³³ The newspaper, for example produced direct responses to other media such as the Sydney Morning Herald that 'had denied Aborigines were massacred' in the early days. Following this line, the May, June and September editions of the paper published a series of histories of massacres based on extracts from Judge Therry's book *Reminiscences of Thirty Years Residence in New South Wales and Victoria* (1863), member of Parliament William Henry Suttor's book *Australian Stories Re-told, and Sketches of Country Life* (1877) and inspector of schools and historian James Bonwick *The White Wild Man & the Blacks of Victoria* (1863); ('Massacre at Myall Creek' May, 1938 p. 3; 'The Massacres at Bathurst' June 1938, p. 3 and 'Massacres in Victoria' September, 1938, p. 3). These articles reproduced extracts from white authorities themselves as counter-evidence of the massacres at Myall Creek, Bathurst and in Victoria produced by white sovereign subjects occurred during colonization thus responding to the attempts of denying any wrong doing ('Massacre at Myall Creek' May 1938, p. 3).

contrary, in the first edition of the newspaper introduced the *Policy for Aborigines* in order to configure social and political imaginaries committed to establishing equal decision-making powers over Aboriginal Affairs and the eradication of the racial biopolitical and necropolitical technologies adopted under Protectionist policies. This significant intervention is worth quoting in full:

The following ten points embraces a LONG RANGE POLICY FOR ABORIGINES, endorsed by our Association.

1. We respectfully request that there should be a National Policy for Aborigines. We advocate Commonwealth Government control of all Aboriginal affairs.
2. We suggest the appointment of a Commonwealth Ministry for Aboriginal Affairs; the Minister to have full Cabinet rank.
3. We suggest the appointment of an Administrative Head of the proposed Department of Aboriginal Affairs, the Administrator to be advised by an Advisory Board, consisting of six persons, three of whom at least should be of Aboriginal blood, to be nominated by the Aborigines Progressive Association.
4. The aim of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs should be to raise all Aborigines throughout the Commonwealth to full Citizen Status and civil equality with the whites in Australia. In particular, and without delay, all Aborigines should be entitled:
 - (a) To receive the same educational opportunities as white people.
 - (b) To receive the benefits of labor legislation, including Arbitration Court Awards, on an equality with white workers.
 - (c) To receive the full benefits of workers' compensation and insurance.
 - (d) To receive the benefits of old-age and invalid pensions, whether living in Aboriginal settlements or not.
 - (e) To own land and property, and to be allowed to save money in personal banking accounts, and to come under the same laws regarding intestacy and transmission of property as the white population.
 - (f) To receive wages in cash, and not by orders, issue of rations, or apprenticeship systems.
5. We recommend that Aborigines and Half-castes should come under the same marriage laws as white people, and should be free to marry partners of their choice, irrespective of color.
6. We recommend that Aborigines should be entitled to the same privileges regarding housing as are white workers.
7. We recommend that a special policy of Land Settlement for Aborigines should be put into operation, whereby Aborigines who desire to settle on the land should be given the same encouragement as that given to Immigrants or Soldier Settlers, with expert tuition in agriculture, and financial assistance to enable such settlers to become ultimately self-supporting.
8. In regard to uncivilized and semi-civilized Aborigines, we suggest that patrol officers, nurses, and teachers, both men and women, of Aboriginal

blood, should be specially trained by the Commonwealth Government as Aboriginal Officers, to bring the wild people into contact with civilization.

9. We recommend that all Aboriginal and Half-caste women should be entitled to maternity and free hospital treatment during confinement, and that there should be no discrimination against Aboriginal women, who should be entitled to clinical instructions on baby welfare, similar to that given to white nations.

10. While opposing a policy of segregation, we urge that, during a period of transition, the present Aboriginal Reserves should be retained as a sanctuary for aged or incompetent Aborigines who may be unfitted to take their place in the white community, owing to the past policy or neglect. ('Our Ten Points' April 1938, p. 1)

This extensive list included demands for political self-determination at national and local levels, including reserves, provision of citizenship status, rights to education, equal pay and benefits for work, old-age pension, property rights, maternity rights and more. The repeated reference to this National Policy for Aborigines in the newspaper denotes the sense of political urgency in reconfiguring the law and stopping governmental (bio-political) interventions ('Calling all Aborigines Straight Talk' June 1938, p.1). To add to this list of demands, the newspaper issued a call for a Royal Commission on the treatment of Aboriginal people by reserve managers who were described to 'have literally power of life and death over the Aborigines' ('Royal Commission Urgently Needed' May 1938, p. 2).

Loss of political autonomy

It is precisely because the juridical was part of a racial arsenal that legitimated the biopolitical governmentality of Aboriginal lives (through the Protection Acts and Protection Boards) that configurations of political autonomy or self-determination would have always received intense state scrutiny. Within three months of its inception, the newspaper was visited

by the police and in June 1938 the paper received a letter from the Registrar General calling Jack Patten ‘to enter into recognizances,’ the ‘amount of recognizances being \$300 pounds together with two or three sureties for like amount’ (‘The Abo Call: Difficulties Overcome’ June 1938, p.2). This recognizances law was enacted under the state-based *Newspaper Act 1898* (NSW), a colonial act first established in 1820s that carried the authority to disable the publication of the newspaper unless the publishers, printers and editors had paid the fee and ‘recorded their obligations’ (that is, entered recognizance) before the Supreme Court. As it was stated in the *Newspaper Act 1898* (NSW):

- (1) No person shall print or publish for sale any newspaper until he [sic] has entered into a recognizance before the persons hereinafter mentioned, together with two or three sufficient sureties, to the satisfaction of the person taking such recognizance (every editor, printer, or publisher of any such newspaper in the sum of three hundred pounds and his sureties in a like sum in the whole), conditioned that such editor, printer, or publisher shall pay to Her Majesty every such fine or penalty as may at any time be imposed upon or adjudged against him by reason of any conviction for printing or publishing any blasphemous or seditious libel at any time after entering into such recognizance.
- (2) Every such recognizance entered into in respect of a newspaper to be printed and published in the city or district of Sydney shall be taken before one of the Judges of the Supreme Court.
- (3) Every such recognizance entered into in respect of a newspaper to be printed and published in any part of New South Wales other than the city or district of Sydney shall be entered into before the police magistrate of the district in which such newspaper is to be printed and published, and shall be forthwith transmitted by such police magistrate to the prothonotary of the Supreme Court or to one of the clerks in the said Court authorised in that behalf by the said prothonotary that the same may be duly registered and recorded in the said Court.
- (4) Whosoever prints or publishes any newspaper without having first entered into such recognizance with such sureties shall for every such offence forfeit the sum of twenty pounds. (*Newspaper Act 1898* (NSW))

This law was clearly part of the Australian state’s colonial racial arsenal: by enforcing the registration of the newspaper, it effectively rendered it accountable to white (colonial) sovereignty. This not only allowed or disallowed its existence but, by enforcing its registration, it also

internalized state interests. In this sense, the law operated as a micro-security mechanism that immunized sovereign politics by controlling that which came to circulate within the social. By so doing it monitored and rendered the newspaper and its politics known and open to further juridical and state-based interventions. In this instance, the life and autonomy of the newspaper not only came under police scrutiny, but its existence was rendered dependent on the ability to pay a high fee so as to enter in recognizance with the judiciary.

Situated within the context of the Australian state's juridical policing of Indigenous political texts and activism, the very possibility of circulating as an autonomous Aboriginal newspaper was practically curtailed by the *Australian Abo Call's* inability to fulfill legal financial obligation. This newspaper was not financially or commercially viable and it did not have the funds to pay these fees; consequently, it was forced to close down. Crucially, this paper served an Indigenous readership who were often unable to pay for copies of the newspaper's edition, thus making it impossible for the newspaper to pay the 'recognizance' fee. Patten compared the forcefulness of the *Newspaper Act 1898* (NSW) to a 'knock-out blow' used against the poor or, as in this case, against Aboriginal people:

This [demand] was almost a knock-out blow for *The Abo Call* and shows that, under our existing Australian press laws, since the year 1898, the poor man has no hope of starting a newspaper or practicing 'freedom of the press'. The Aborigines of Australia certainly are unable to put up £300 recognizance for a newspaper. ('The Abo Call: Difficulties Overcome' June, 1938 p. 2)

In order to resist this forceful and violent juridical ‘blow’, the newspaper at first relinquished its publishing autonomy by negotiating for the fee to be paid by the the Publicist Publishing Company and for the company to become the legal publisher of the paper. This company, controlled by J. Miles became the legal publisher of the paper. This was, however, a temporary arrangement that did not clear the paper’s debts. Moreover, this partnership was criticised by the co-founder of the APA, William Ferguson, who questioned the political interests of the publishing company and its direct association to the right wing organization Australia First Movement (AFM) founded by W. J. Miles (see Van Toorn 2000, p. 27; Heiss & Minter 2008, p. 49, Goodall 2008). In strategic terms, the relinquishing of publishing rights did not mean that Patten allowed political interference in the content of the paper, as he still managed to maintain editorial independence throughout the *Australian Abo Call* remaining publications (Goodall 2008, p.288). Irrespective of this relationship, within a few months *The Australian Abo Call* closed down. Patten wrote in September of 1938 that this was due to financial and membership-based pressures:

Until such time as the Aborigines Progressive Association is on a stronger footing, numerically and financially, it will not be possible to conduct our propaganda by means of a monthly newspaper. It is intended, however, to continue the propaganda by means of a series of pamphlets and booklets, the first of which, to be entitled THE CASE FOR THE ABORIGINES, by J. T. Patten, is now in preparation and will be published shortly. (The Australian Abo Call, September 1938 p. 4)

Although Patten claimed that this closure was temporary, *The Abo Call* was not re-opened. The newspaper itself became the victim of the forceful ‘unitary power’ of the colonial sovereign, via the exercise of the state’s

judicial apparatus; this colonial sovereign power engulfed and obliterated *The Abo Call* political determination by barring its capacity to circulate in the social (Foucault 2003, pp. 43-44).

Diasporic Cultural Productions

At the same time that the long established *NSW Newspaper Act* 1898 conducted the closure of *The Abo Call*, diasporic newspapers were also subjected to direct forms of surveillance. After World War One, the state maintained and expanded the biopolitical capacity of martial law to calculate the dangers of the 'relations of force' that could form 'unitary political powers' (Foucault 2003, p.16; p. 44). The production and reading of diasporic and transnational newspapers in the post-War World One period was regulated by the *Publication of Newspapers in Foreign Languages Regulations Act* 1921 (Cwlth) that replaced the restrictions of martial law. This also extended laws that were already regulating the importing of foreign publications by directing attention to internal diasporic and transnational political publications (Heath 2001, pp. 69-70). During the actual course of World War Two, however, the ranking of the political threats perceived to be posed by these newspapers was marked by the ethnicisation of political differences. Under their categorization as 'foreign,' they were ethnicized as a potential internal threat operating internally and that necessitated direct state approval and surveillance. As the Statutory Rule forcefully stated:

2. Any person who, without the consent in writing of the Prime Minister or of some person thereto authorized by the Prime Minister, publishes, wholly or mainly in a foreign language, any newspaper or periodical shall be guilty of an offence. Penalty: 100 pounds or imprisonment for six months or both.

3. The consent of the Prime Minister or a person thereto authorized by the Prime Minister to publish a newspaper or periodical in foreign language may be subject to such conditions as the Prime Minister determines.

4. Without limiting the effect of the last preceding regulation, the consent to the publication of a newspaper or periodical in a foreign language may, at the discretion of the Prime Minister or a person thereto authorized by him, be subject to the condition that there be published, in a column parallel to that containing the matter published in the foreign language, a translation in the English language of that matter.

5. Where the Prime Minister is satisfied that any newspaper or periodical has been, or is about to be, published in contravention of these Regulations, he may authorize such a persons as he thinks fit to enter, if need be, by force, any premises, and to sieze any copies of the newspaper or periodical found thereon, and also any other type of plant used, or capable of being used, for the printing or reproduction of the newspaper, and to deal with any articles so seized in such manner as the Prime Minister directs. (Statutory Rule, *Publication of Newspapers in Foreign Languages Regulations Act 1921*)

As a federal law, this regulation legitimated total sovereign control over ethnicised diasporic newspapers by allocating the Prime Minister, or a person authorized by the Prime Minister, the ultimate power to allow or disallow their circulation and/or to stipulate the conditions of their existence or withdrawal from the public domain. This law normalized the censorship regime also produced by martial law, as it effectively conferred total authority to make decisions over these publications to the state sovereign.

Martial law, in other words, legitimated the establishment of a forceful sovereign intervention. This could deploy whatever surveillance powers considered necessary to track ethnicised newspapers and their respective associations within the social domain. This law, however, did not ban all newspapers in foreign languages as, after all, this censorship regime was avowedly operating under the guise of defending liberal, modern

freedoms: rather, it transformed newspapers into technologies of governmentality operating as part of governmental interests. As Miller and Rose argue (cited in Inda 2005, p. 9) the newspapers were transformed so they ‘could shape, normalize and instrumentalize the conduct, thought and aspirations of others in order to achieve the [state’s] objectives’. In the case of fascist diasporic newspapers, specifically, *Italo-Australian* and *Il Giornale Italiano*, Australian state sovereignty affiliated itself with Italian Fascist interests and made them part of liberal governmental calculations during the Abyssinian war. *Il Giornale Italiano*, however, did become a key focus of Commonwealth Investigation Branches and signalled a shift in intelligence concerns over Italian Fascism. On the other hand, as I demonstrate below, anti-fascist Italian diasporic newspapers such as *La Riscossa*, *Il Risveglio* and *L’Avanguardia Libertaria* were subject to surveillance, closure and the editors threatened with deportation. These outcomes were partly driven by the incessant complaints from Italian Fascists in Australia who called on the state’s regulatory powers. The Commonwealth Investigation branches, however, did not uniformly agree on the level of threat that anti-fascist newspaper posed. The papers were never proven to be ‘communist’ but were treated as creating political and industrial unrest and, therefore, as disloyal to the Australian state. It is in the context of protecting governmental colonial sovereign interests, including the British Empire, that the *Statutory Rule, Publication of Newspapers in Foreign Languages Regulations Act 1921* (Cwlth) became a mechanism of security that would censor and ban radical left

newspapers, even while consenting to the circulation of fascist publications – right up to the mid-1930s.

In the 1920s, as Italian-Australian diasporic culture began to increase its visibility within the social sphere through various forms of cultural activities, newspapers and publications. This same historical and social context saw the growth and consolidation of Italian Fascism and anti-fascism in Australia. The Italian-Australian Fascist newspapers of the period have all been identified as largely sympathizers of Fascism; they include: the '*Italo-Australian*' (1922), the *Italian Bulletin of Australia* (1922), *Corriere degli Italiani* (1928), *Il Littorio* (1928), *l'Eco d'Australia* (1928) and *Il Giornale Italiano* (1932) (Cresciani 1988; Tosco 2002; Venturini 2007). Situated in this context, I will focus on two Fascist newspapers, *The Italo Australian* and *Il Giornale Italiano*, which reached a large readership around Australia and run until the declaration of World War Two. Most importantly for this thesis, these newspapers produced and circulated anti-liberal Fascist politics, which were increasingly questioned by intelligence authorities but which were still supported by the sovereign state (Tosco 2002, p. 219). The papers operated, I would argue, as transnational, diasporic cultural texts that, while producing support for Italian Fascism, also signified Italian-Australian diasporic local political relations (Tosco 2002; Cresciani 1980; Venturini 2007). The publishing of *The Italo-Australian* newspaper was followed by the establishment of pro-fascist diasporic associations, including the Dante Alighieri Society (1925), *La Rinascenza* (1925), the Italo-Australian Association and

various sociocultural clubs (Cresciani 1980, p. 10). Formally, however, it was not until 1927 that the National Fascist Party (NFP) branches were established as earlier attempts to establish local branches in 1923 were short lived in Sydney³⁴ and Adelaide. In order to clarify the production and reception of Italian Fascist politics, especially when considering the virtual totalising state control over transnational and diasporic newspapers, I want to pause here to consider firstly how Fascism, as a heterogeneous political force, was circulating within the larger social context in ways that effectively deterred state intervention until the mid-1930s.

Fascism in Australia

Political affiliations in the liberal democratic state, as shown in Chapters Three and Four, are always kept under scrutiny. They and are also always limited by the calculative regime of governmentality and its apparatuses of securitisation and surveillance. Its positioning of Italian diasporic bodies within a racial biopolitical economism (as discussed in Chapter Four), the racial violence of labour disputes, the evocation of the North/South divide of the Ferry Report (1925), the prohibitions within immigration and naturalization laws, and the prosecution of communists – all worked to justify ongoing surveillance over the formation of diasporic politics. In the context of this regime of surveillance and political control, the early formations of Italian Fascist associations in 1923 were also opposed by the Victorian Labour Conference, that demanded that Fascists be expelled and

³⁴ Cresciani suggests that ‘uncorroborated evidence shows that an unofficial Fascist branch was formed in Adelaide on 15 November’. This had a short life as the official PNF section was opened in 1927 (Cresciani 1980, p. 12).

their supporters be prevented from landing in Australia (Cresciani 1980, p. 12). Whilst there was this opposition to Italian Fascism in certain quarters, in the 1920s, under Hughes's leadership, many members of the Australian Government viewed Italian Fascism in a positive light, even as it proceeded to monitor it and collect relevant intelligence on its activities. Major-General Ramaciotti, for over seven years, informed the Australia government on the political developments in Italy (Cresciani 1980, p. 16). As Cresciani amply demonstrates, although Ramaciotti noted the negative events, his reports are also marked by an admiration for the power and forcefulness embodied by Fascism. In Ramaciotti's second report (1927 cited in Cresciani 1980, p.16), Mussolini is defined as 'a strong leader, fearless and ambitious to restore the glories of Rome' and who has set up Fascist patriotism 'at constant white heat [within] methods...may not be all we wish, but it has saved Italy from chaos'. For Cresciani (1980, pp. 16-17) this admiration influenced both the Hughes and Bruce Governments 'ignor[ing] most [of the] disturbing references' and accepting the dubious reassurances made by Fascists. In this sense, Australian governmental authorities legitimated a Fascist politics of force and violence as a necessary security political mechanism necessary to create order.

Rather than ignoring references to Fascist violence, the liberal sovereign authorities calculated upon the consolidation of what Edward Said (1983) terms 'affiliative and filiative' relations with Italian Fascist politics and the totalitarian state. Italian Fascism was a new and modern political transnational affiliation that offered a nationalist and (para)militarized

masculinity that re-configured established filiative relations. Said (1983, p. 24) used the term 'filiative relations' to foreground the way critical literary theory binds a text to the world by re-producing (filiative) naturalized Eurocentric model of humanities based on excluding that which is defined as non-literary. According to Said (1983, p. 24), it is for the critic to recognize when affiliation 'reproduces filiations and sometimes makes its own forms'. What I am pointing out here is that the violence that was constitutive of Italian Fascism was also already part of the onto-epistemology that established Australia as a colony of the British imperial and liberal racial state. The Saidian notion of filiation between these two seemingly opposed political formations (Liberalism and Fascism) is evidenced in the deployment of a white heteronormative (colonial) sovereign governmentality that postulates and differentiates the political self-determining 'I' (the European subject) from the 'subject of *necessitas*' (the coloured subaltern). In the Italian context, this can be seen within the racialised geography of its North African colonies of Somalia (1891), Abyssinia (1895-1896; 1935-1941), Libya (1911-1947) and black colonial subjects. In the Australian context, this can be seen in the context of the white colonial-settler governments control and attempted subjugation of its Indigenous subjects. As discussed in Chapter Three, Australia governmentality was always already defending the white social body by way of internal or external wars and by way of racial policies. This is also evidenced by the ways in which Australian state sovereignty enacted a racial biopolitics that, throughout the 1920s and from the mid

1930s, ethnicized and exposed Italian diaspora to forceful state and social scrutiny.

The admiration for Italian Fascism as a political self-determining force circulated within British-Australian transnational and diasporic political groups and associations. Although formal branches of the Italian PNF were not opened until 1927 in Australia, interestingly British-Australian groups were already established by 1923 under the name of *I Fascisti* in Melbourne and Hobart (Cresciani 1980 p.15) and the *Australian Command British Fascists* in Adelaide. These British-Australian groups are early transnational signifiers of filiative relations with rightist politics in Britain itself, which was also filiated with an Italian Fascist ethos³⁵. By focusing on this British political filiation³⁶, I am not arguing that British-Australian diasporic political formations did not actually connect at some point with Italian-Australian diasporic Fascism. In fact in the article 'I Fascisti' from *The Age* in 1925, they are shown to be operating in Australia as British Fascists in affinity with Italian fascist nationalist and para-militarized masculinity:

We are British Fascists but we are impressed by the spirit which animated the Fascists in Italy, and which enabled them to overcome the Bolshevik menace, though they had to meet tremendous odds. That spirit arose from the determination that every man owed a duty to his country. In Italy this spirit was a patriotism amounting to a religion and rising above consideration of party and creed. (1925 cited in Venturini 2007, p. 495)

³⁵ For a detailed history of early Fascist formation in Britain see Tim Linehan (2000).

³⁶ By 1923, the first British-based Fascist association had adopted the Italian name of *British Fascisti* and operated as a nationalist, Imperialist and anti-communist movement that admired Mussolini's coup and the para-militarization of white masculinity that Fascism performed.

The Australian-British formation clearly celebrates Fascists mythologizing of 'a spirit' embodied by a 'New Man' that was militarized, physically virile and with hyper-nationalist sentiments (Gentile 1994, pp. 71-72; Gori, 2004). This Fascist political imaginary posits a mysoginist racial masculinity based on the rejection of liberal, democratic bourgeois values. It focussed on generating a nationally unified Italian race by obliterating Italian feminist aspirations and the restoration of sexual differences by way of what De Grazia (1992 p. 25) coins the 'neo-paternalistic politics' of the pre-war period. This was a Catholic, 'anti-emancipationist', misogynist and patriarchal form of politics (Bellassai 2005) that was also part of imperial and colonial aspirations.

This filiation between the ethos of Italian Fascism and the British/Australian Fascists includes support for an imperial, racial heternormative and gendered biopolitics. This is based on the national unification of the population and is derived from eugenicist concerns. Such concerns since the time of Federation were focused on generating a unified white population in Australia. Cilento in Queensland was arguing for the generation a 'white race' based on Northern European filiations (Anderson 2006 p. 160; Giuliani 2010 p. 135). Similarly, under Fascist eugenicists, there is a move away from Nicole Pende's proposed '*Razza Italiana*' based on the fusion of the different '*stirpe*' to instead create a Mediterranean race of pure Aryan origins and equal to the British. The Mediterranean race was scripted by the Fascists as a white Italian race of

‘Aryan origins’ (Forgacs 2014, p. 110)³⁷ that could be distinguished from the somatic/ physical features and morality attributed to Indigenous inhabitants of Italian African colonies, Jews and Arabs, (Forgacs 2014, p. 108). By 1938 ten Fascist racial scientists effectively attempted to debunk the notion that there were any African origins with relation to the emergence of the ‘Mediterranean race’:

It is necessary to make clear distinctions between the Mediterranean peoples of Europe (westerners) on the one hand and the Orientals on the other. Those theories that claim an African origin for certain European peoples and that include the Semitic and Hamitic peoples in a common Mediterranean race are therefore to be considered dangerous, since they establish relationships and ideological sympathies that are absolutely unacceptable. (Forgacs 2014, p. 107)

The Fascist Race Manifesto, and the ‘ensuing decree laws for the defence of the Italian race’, restricted employment and sexual inter-relations of Jews and Italians and, in a similar fashion to Australia, it introduced in the colonies a segregationist approach and anti-miscegenation laws. What is operating in this filiation then is a European onto-epistemology underpinned by a racialised social-scientific knowledge; its aim being to create a homogenised people in the context of a racially unified nation. What is evidenced in the comparison between Italian Fascism and British-

³⁷ Fascist eugenicists like Corrado Gini, Giovanni Marra, Nicola Pende and Giuseppe Sergi generated the nationalization of populations by asserting a ‘new Italian’ race based on the myth of an ancient Roman or Italic race. Racial scientists and eugenicists like Sergi, however, had also linked the Mediterraneans and the Aryans’ origins to a Eurafrican species. Nicefero’s thought had also asserted that the racial filiation with African populations only operated with the Mediterraneans of the southern regions of Italy, thus asserting as Lombroso had also done, that these populations racial inferiority was based on these filiative origins in Eastern Africa and overall by the absence of an Aryan race. By the mid-1930s Fascism’s Imperial project enforced the re-shaping of the ‘Italian race’ to become a ‘white’ colonial race detached from any African origins (Cassata 2011; Forgacs 2014; Gilette 2002; Di Ulderico 2004).

Australian Fascist organisations is that both shared racialised heteronormative ideologies that, despite differences, were actually congruent along a number of key lines.

In the late 1920s, Australian society was marked by violent political clashes that came close to producing an armed 'civil war' (Knightley 2001, p. 141). The inter-war period witnessed a proliferation of a broad range of white British-Australian rightist, Fascist and quasi-Fascist associations including paramilitary associations, both urban and rural. Venturini (2007, p. 468) argues that these bodies legitimated their exercise of political violence in parallel to the state by declaring that they were working to eliminate the threat of communism. These associations drew from Italian Fascist propaganda on Mussolini's ascendancy to power and the glorification of the earlier years of the *Fasci di Combattimento*. More specifically, legitimations were taken from their re-incarnation as the *Partito Nazionale Fascista* (PNF, 1921) in Italy and the para-military armed *Squadristo* of the early 1920s³⁸ that came to be perceived as the enforcer of a necessary national order and authority within both urban and rural settings. The violent terrorizing actions of the *squadristi* against communists, anarchists, unionized and organized labor and Slavic-resistance were mythologised as nationalist, disciplined efforts by army

³⁸ In Trieste and Venezia Giulia in April-May 1920 violence was directed against Slavs resistance and Communists. The military officers would lead each squad and as Adrian Lyttelton (2004, p. 44) argues '...each group leader was assigned the task of surveillance and defence of one zone of the city which had been divided into districts opportunely based on military criteria...with an information service, health service and transport service'.

leaders who trained Italian patriotic male citizens³⁹. Venturini has listed and categorized some of these Australian associations under the following rightist divisions:

Filo Fascist: Australian Fascists; Australian First Movement; Literary Radical Nationalists; The Publicist Magazine;

Of the Extreme Right: Citizens' League of South Australia; New Guard; Social Credit Movement;

Of the Conservative Right: British Empire Union; Citizens' Defence Brigade; Civic Patrol; Constitutional Association; Emergency Committee of South Australia; Essential Services Volunteers; King and Empire Alliance; Khaki Legion; Old Guard; Queensland Vigilantes; Sane Democracy League; X Force; White Army; Who's for Australia League and other ethno specific organisations (Venturini 2007, p. 468).

A range of state officials, members of bureaucracy and the Australian Defence Force were involved with some of these associations to the point that, when in 1918, there was direct state support for introducing the Australian Protective League (APA) as the volunteer body of the official secret service, then known as the Special Investigation Bureau⁴⁰ (Fischer

³⁹ Lyttelton argues that military disciplinary tactics changed over time, especially as the movement grew into urban and rural formations including fascist unions run by labor strategists and with Fascism entering liberal national politics (Lyttelton 2004).

⁴⁰ The APA was established in 1918, with the initial help of Acting W.A. Prime Minister Watt and Herbert Brooke the retiring President of the Victorian Chambers of Manufactures (Meaney 2009, pp. 231-233). After helping to set up the Australian Protection League, the Director of Military Intelligence E.L.Piesse and businessman Herbert Brookes, were

2011, p. 142; Venturini 2007). It must be added here that the Australian First Movement that was also linked to the *New Guard* was part of an organization that also became linked to German Nazism after 1933 (Bird 2014). This list effectively confirms that Fascism and rightist politics was clearly operative at both official Australian government party levels and at micro-social levels of non-government associations.

The level and types of ideological filiation with Italian Fascism per se varied amongst these various bodies and organisations. More broadly, the financial backing of Italian Fascism provided a transnational model for collaboration in Australia between financial elites, heterogeneous rightist political interests and the militarization of selected white male civilians ready to operate in parallel to the state's authority or even in attempts to overthrow it. Venturini (2007) provides a vivid description of Australian miners, industrialists, bankers, high military officials, state bureaucrats, ex- and future Prime Ministers, judges and lawyers, politicians and elite Anglophilic interests as involved in the financing and decision making concerns using rightist organizations and underground forms of paramilitary armed groups similar to the '*squadristi*'. Like their British counterparts, one key link was in the 'boardrooms of the Anglophile financial elites':

disagreeing precisely on the level of state sovereign control that the Intelligence Chief would have over the voluntary army (Meaney 2009, pp. 230). This was derived from an existing citizens quasi-paramilitary association in the U.S (Fischer. 2011, p.142) that since 1917 set up intelligence units as part of 'anti-radical force' at the micro-social level. Fisher recounts the abuses of power of the units and the lack of distinction between 'labour bashing from espionage'.

since the events in Australia were part of London-Centered financial oligarchy's 1920-30s drive to install Fascist regimes wherever needed. Melbourne was the mining, manufacturing and financial capital of the country, the power of the Bank of NSW in Sydney notwithstanding. The city's most important firms were also London-centered, Anglo-Australian entities. "Two mining groups dominated manufacturing development ...These were Anglo-Australian groups in which British capital predominated. The first was an alliance of lead zinc interests which became known as Collins House, the second the iron and steel manufacturer Broken Hill Proprietary. (Venturini, 2007 p. 472)

Venturini provides a long list of company directors, general managers and public officials involved in the administrative running and financing of rightist and paramilitary groups (Venturini 2007, pp. 474-476). Associates of the notorious Collins House in Melbourne were known to be high profile members of the pro-British League of National Security and the All for Australian League which were 'voluntary [national] organizations, intersecting and serving as fronts for secretive military forces, led by a directing class'. Venturini (2007, p. 476) recalls the filiation between the underground paramilitary organization of the White Army and the League of National Security against union actions. He also argues that they had support from within the police of Victoria. In a similar form to the *squadrismo* attacks on unionized labor, these paramilitary armies, working with the police, violently attempted to weaken unions and organized labour demands. What must also be noted here, as Douglas suggests, is that the League of National Security was a national body that, like Italian Fascism,

was also ready to bring down the liberal nation state (May 7, Douglas 2004).

Italian Diasporic Newspapers

Having established some of the political affinities between Italian Fascism and Australian political formations, I will now return to the discussion of Italian-Australian Fascist and anti-Fascist newspapers to introduce how the *Publication of Newspapers in Foreign Languages Act* regulated the circulation of diasporic politics. This discussion reveals how such regulation of this circulation became a mechanism of governmentality linked to securitizing political loyalty to state sovereignty and to the larger transnational interests of a British imperial order in Europe during a re-alignment of imperial European interests. The increased visibility of Italian Fascism in the 1930s lead to the increased surveillance of all Italian diasporic subjects, culminating, in the Australian context, as I discuss below, in World War Two internments.

The *Italo-Australian* was established on 9th August 1922 in Sydney as a weekly bi-lingual newspaper. Although aware of the newspaper, authorities did not place it under surveillance until the late 1930s. My analysis of this newspaper allows a broad grasp of the diasporic politics that the state legitimated, and focuses on the way the newspaper's Fascist values operated in compliance with Australia's treatment of Italian diaspora. This analysis exposes the Australian liberal democratic state's own proto-Fascist values. From its inception, this newspaper was seen as a

diasporic and transnational project seemingly involved in the self-preservation of Italian migrants over the question of the 'Olive Peril' during the Ferry Report whilst also providing in its editorials strong approval for the violent rise of the Italian Fascist state. Cresciani sums its objectives:

Many Italians abroad welcomed Mussolini because they believed that in the future their interests would be protected better by this 'man of the people' who had himself been a migrant and who had already manifested his concern for their welfare. (Cresciani 1980, p. 1)

Its owner was Lubrano, a wealthy businessman interested in reaching Italian communities so to advertise products of the Italian companies that he represented (Jupp, 2001, p. 503). Lumbrano worked over the years with a number of male editors including Antonio Folli first, followed by A.P. Rimoldi, Porfirio Scotto, Eustacchio Del Pin, Franco Battistessa and Fortunato la Rosa (Briani, 1977). For Tosco (2002) and Cresciani (1980), narratives of migrant discontent over their departures were deployed to undermine the support for the liberal Italian state, based on a constitutional monarchy. This narrative imagined a new Fascist order that opposed the disorder created by liberalism, socialism, communism, and other radical groups also active in Australia. Cresciani writes:

The first Italian newspaper to appear during the Fascists' bid for power ... began publishing in Sydney on 9 August 1922. Its owner, Francesco Lubrano and its editor, Antonio Folli showed from the first issue where the sympathies lay. This weekly, together with the monthly Italian bulletin of Australia, the official organ of the Italian Chamber of Commerce in Australia...where, between 1922 and the end of 1924, the principal - if not the only -channels through which Fascism was made known to Italians in Australia. In every issue they gave ample and sympathetic cover to the history and the doctrine of the movement and reprinted editorials from Italian papers favourable to Fascism or articles from foreign papers praising it. (Cresciani 1980, pp. 5-6)

Amedeo Tosco underscores the scale of the paper's support for the Fascist regime:

[the] political point of view [of] *L'Italo-Australian* from its first edition shows the inclination to stand beside Fascism and to emphasize its virtues and that from its second edition this is ready to distort the truth on the 'violent activities of the *fascio* in Italy' (Tosco 2002, p. 305)

Overall, from its inception, the newspaper was clearly marked as a (tran) nationalist and patriotic Fascist project, involved in a strategic political affirmation of a diasporic embodiment.

This newspaper worked to normalise the violence of Fascism to its readership. The transnational and diasporic Fascism informing this newspaper legitimated the violent and militarized masculine authority of Italian Fascism. It re-imagined Fascism as a technology transforming disorder into what was normativised as a new national order. In a series of articles published between 1923 and 1925, Mussolini's forceful attacks on liberalism and its introduction of a totalitarian state are re-defined within a transnational re-imaging of Fascist politics as a sovereign, self-determining enactment of universal and 'natural law'. The newspaper treats Fascism as a universal sovereign politics and a duty when it notes that 'the world was tired of liberty' and that Fascism 'would put aside the dead body of liberty'. It also distinguishes Fascist authority from liberalism as the total military force and self-determining power that can, in the paper's words, 'direct ... with a strong hand' Italy's destiny. It is Fascist nationalism that is rendered here as a forceful 'natural law' with the 'strongest revolt[ing] against the deficiency and defeatism' that had prevailed before its leadership ('*Liberta e Liberalismo*' 1923, p. 1; 'The Herald's Criticism of

Mussolini 1925 p. 1'; 'Mr A. M. Pooley Again', 1925 p. 1). This produces a totalitarian biopower that grants the sovereign 'right to kill' not only to the state but to 'a whole series of individuals' (Foucault 2003, p. 259). In this case, the individuals who are given this right to kill are the *squadristi* defined by Mussolini as the militia of the nation (Gentile 1994, p. 68).

The paper rewrites the international and national outcry against the murder of socialist Cesare Matteotti⁴¹ as a 'global' attack from 'Moscow'. The outcry is represented as an attack from socialists in Europe against Italian Fascism, 'its history and its ideals' ('After the drama: The external enemies and internal cowards' 1924, p. 1). This article, in effect, worked to validate Fascism's 'right to kill' its enemies even prior to its formal ascendancy to the seat of state. A similar re-writing of the murder was produced by yet another Fascist newspaper a month later, which argued that this murder was a political plot against 'motherland' to destabilize Mussolini and his regime. It argued that 'there were no other choices: to support Fascism in its totality or the social and political ruins: the fall of Mussolini, that according to the *Italo-Australian*, signified chaos and communism' (September 13, 1924 cited in Tosco 2002, p. 122). These articles are shaped by, but also re-define, transnational and diasporic narratives with political imaginaries that from the early 1920s were transforming violent and organized political interventions by Fascist

⁴¹ Cesare Matteotti was the leader of the United Socialist Party that openly opposed and attacked Mussolini. He was kidnapped and killed on June 1924 by Fascist militia. The parties in opposition to Mussolini's government withdrew from the parliament in a protest, called the Aventine Secession which it is argued strengthened Mussolini's determination to use more force to wipe out all his opponents.

squads against liberal opposition, organized labour and left wing organizers into a 'necessity' for the creation and preservation of the 'self-determination' of the Fascist regime.

The newspaper can be seen to operate as a (trans)national and diasporic technology directed at migrant populations, that proposed to create a unified Italian Fascist collective abroad. The deployment of an ethno-(trans)nationalist Fascist masculinity within the newspaper (always transnational and diasporic), acted as a regulatory technology that addressed readers as members of the Fascist Italian brotherhood. This ethno-(trans)nationalism, with diasporic relations, bridges the distance between the Italian state and diaspora by an imaginary re-configuration of dispersed migrants as unified 'Italian' 'co-nationals,' immunized by the process of unification by the Fascist nation into a Fascist diasporic collective. In fact, in the very first edition of the newspaper the usage of the Italian language interpellates the Italian diaspora as part of an ethnic (trans)national and diasporic brotherhood whose interests will be defended or protected by Fascism:

From this first edition we take the opportunity to send a brotherly welcome to all the co-nationals that are living on the lands of Australia; what brings us together is our Nation and this communion facilitates our task, that is chiefly one of harmony, of brotherhood. ('Programma' 1922, p. 1. My translation)

We believe today in the necessity of an Italian voice that would defend all Italians living in Australia when required. And it is today more than ever that it is necessary to protect our interests as today Italian immigration in Australia has taken noticeable and important proportions and is continuously growing. ('Programma' 1922, p. 1. My translation)

The paper thus introduces an ethnic (trans)nationalism that, when imbued in phrases like 'we believe', 'our interests' and 'all Italians living in

Australia,' evokes a process of self-ethnicisation. This process sets up Italian diaspora as an ethnic national identity that can, by living in unity with a Fascist 'national brotherhood' be offered a defence against dangers.

The shaping of a unified Fascist Italian race is constituted as instrumental for defending diasporic interests. The newspaper instituted a racial typification of a superior Italian Fascist 'new Italian' diaspora that is equal to the British race. This is imagined as embodying (physically and mentally) a commitment to colonial whiteness as a sovereign race that triumph over non-whiteness. This commitment was part of a post-unification radical nationalism that had been recalibrated by the racial biopolitics of Fascism and its imperialist project. This Fascist raciality instituted the globality of a particular, unified and superior 'Italian race' that was re-defined transnationally and diasporically as offering security or defence from the biopolitical racialisation of migrant bodies as defined by the 'Olive Peril' and the Ferry Report (1925, p. 1).

It is at this point that one can also identify more clearly the way the *Italo-Australian* newspaper welcomed the final findings of the Ferry Report. It signaled an agreement with the way the state deployed racial differences to identify desirable migrants. In the newspaper this agreement was constituted by re-calibrating racial differences and hierarchizing Italian migrants as one 'cultured, clever, industrious' white race. By discussing a superior Italian white race, the newspaper effaced the way the Report violently identified diasporic bodies from the southern regions as

unassimilable. The newspaper in effect endorsed the Ferry Report's racial hierarchy that had distinguished the unsuitability of Greeks, Maltese and other Southern Europeans. In the article titled 'The Royal Commission Report' on 13 June 1925, it reported the following:

All Italians ... will welcome the Report from Mr T. A Ferry ... We do not dispute that, from the Australia's point of view Italians are aliens. But there are aliens and aliens. It is not right for a cultured, clever, industrious, thrifty and scientific race like Italians to be grouped together with all the other races other than British as "alien" when the word is used in conjunction with migration to Australia. Without wishing to wound the feelings of such people as the Greeks, Maltese and others, we declare (and facts support us) that Italians are a superior people and are suitable for settlement in Australia. Italians settling in Australia become Australians. Mr Ferry's report is valuable if only because it distinguishes between the different races. (1925, p. 1)

This response, then, effectively defines a superior white, Italian race that is willing to support existing white sovereign relations including the demand for assimilation. In this case, racial differences were strategically effaced and specifically the newspaper ignored the way in which the Report classified and racialised subjects from Italy's Southern regions as inferior and as unassimilable. The category of Italian race is re-calibrated as superior to Greeks and Maltese migrants only by effacing the actual racist violence experienced by Southern Italians in the Australian context of the period.

Fascist Women and the *Fascio Femminile*

The political filiation between Fascism and the liberal state was also re-signified by a Fascist imaginary that effaced the racial sexual violence shaping diasporic women's bodies. What is striking about Fascism during the 1920s and 1930s is that it not only limited the radicalization of

organized labour, but it also enacted a masculinist and anti-emancipationist politics that rejected altogether the presence of women's working bodies (De Grazia 1992; Saraceno 1996, Willson 1996). Furthermore, as I have shown above, given that assimilation was re-envisioned by the newspaper as the union of two superior equal races, it invisibilized the racial sexual violence that disciplined and regulated diasporic Southern Italian female bodies. The anti-emancipationist Fascist politics circulating within the newspaper re-imagined diasporic female bodies within the Fascist 'restoration' of racial, sexual and gender hierarchies (Spinazze 2006).⁴² These hierarchies, as espoused by the *Fascio Femminile*, attempted to situate female bodies within a racial heteronormative and gendered economy oriented to generating and reproducing a healthy, superior and exemplary Italian race. This fascist ideology effectively recoded the

⁴² After World War One, the generation of a healthy population and decreasing birth rates became part of Church based debates and Fascism that championed in Spinazze's words anti-emancipationist and misogynist assertions over the differentiation (physical and psychological) of the female body and the necessity for distinctions in the camps of actions. The doctor and senator Nicole Pende naturalized sexual and gendered hierarchies:

We do not believe in the psychological inferiority of women. But it is undeniable that female brains are qualitatively different from those of males...women's culture is a reflection of sexual characteristics and cannot be equal to a male's culture' (cited in Spinazze 2006, p.57).

Pende argued that women's faculties were not ready for participating in scientific knowledge and education and called for the establishment of 'women's sciences, of the child, of the home and female duties' (Spinazze, 2006, p. 58). Sociologist Loffredo, called to end female emancipation and attacked feminism as antagonistic to the interests of the family and of the Italian race and argued that women were to operate under male dominance. Racial and sexual differences were deployed to typify a modern and fascist Italian woman that was maternal and a subordinate body to the regime of Fascism.

violence produced by a bio-political economism and assimilationism into a seemingly innocuous set of what it termed 'philanthropic' practices, as precisely those practices that were deemed gender appropriate for the female members of the *Fascio Femminile*.

A number of newspapers' front-page articles operated as Fascist anti-emancipationist texts ('Mussolini and Women' 1931, p. 1; 'The Women of Italy' 1932, p. 1). By embodying female bodies within a Fascist imaginary of irreducible racial and sexual differences, these articles rejected feminism's call for equality and embraced the Fascist regime's demographic campaign. In short, the Fascist regime's commitment to a demographic campaign was directed at reversing what was perceived to be an alarming decline in birth rates and threatening the biological survival of the Italian race. As discussed above, these concerns were always grounded on an onto-epistemology of raciality as deployed in the work of Italian Fascist eugenicists like Corrado Gini, Giovanni Marra, Nicola Pende and Giuseppe Sergi. This demographic campaign deployed forceful biopolitical mechanisms that would intervene in sexual and familiar relations. The biological formulation of the maternal function of female bodies as reproducers of an Italian race was governmentalised by way of welfare and health mechanisms for mother-child support. These were deployed through a range of biopolitical national technologies of gender and sexuality such as ONMI (*Opera Nazionale Maternità e Infanzia*) which was set up in 1925, child allowances, punitive legal retribution against abortion, criminalization of homosexuality 'as the enemy of the New Man', taxes on bachelors/celibacy, tax exemptions based on family sizes, fertility bonuses and Catholic moralization through the sacredness of the heteronormative family (Saraceno 1996 pp. 197-201; Passerini 1987, p. 153; Benadusi, 2012). More broadly, in 1938 as discussed above, the introduction of a Race Manifesto and the 'ensuing decree laws for the defence of the Italian race', restricted employment and sexual inter-relations and, in a similar fashion to Australia, it introduced in the colonies a segregationist approach and anti-miscegenation laws.

The Fascist demographic campaign in the *Italo-Australian* was figured as most important to women's overall biological destiny. Equality was understood as having encouraged women to enter workplaces in factories and offices where 'their physical condition[s] had been impaired by the kind of work in which they have been engaged' ('Mussolini and

Women' 1932, p. 1). One of the articles also argued that Australia was familiar with the value of a demographic campaign, as it had also been professing the value of the domestic sciences as crucial in shaping the appropriate physical and cultural sexual and gendered roles for women ('The Women of Italy' 1932, p. 1). These articles operated as Fascist anti-emancipationist technologies that sought to discipline female bodies to fulfil a biological reproductive function and to become full-time mothers. In this process, it demanded that women reject paid work and by so doing the paper effectively disavowed the analysis of diasporic Italian women as sites of an exploitative biopolitical economism. By acknowledging Australia's domestic sciences and health, these articles also inhibited a focus on the violent assimilationist eugenicist technologies that disciplined how diasporic female bodies were to be present and move within public institutions like hospitals and when and how they were to have children.

The newspaper effectively deployed gender and sexual technologies that differentiated female bodies as 'proper' and 'respectable' and members of a superior Italian race. The numerous articles and photographs of Italian national female bodies categorized as middle-class wives and mothers worked toward the creation of a white, heteronormative gendered sociality. These imaginaries are also reproduced in the accounts of the wise and patient Rachela Mussolini or the self-sacrificing Anita Garibaldi and in the usage of repetitive black and white photographs to enter accounts of recent social events that depicted white female bodies as wives with a new born or as new brides-to-be (see, for example, the following articles: '*Un profile*

di Donna Rachele' 1926, p. 1; '*Anita, l'eroina che amo e morì per Garibaldi*' 1932, p. 1; '*Una Graziosa Promessa Sposa*' 1932, p. 3). Diasporic women are evoked as fashionable cosmopolitan-bodies of the 'Fashion of the Moment' column, which advised on the latest international designs and styles available in Sydney (written in English and signed as M.S. throughout 1922, p. 2), or within the advertisements with sketches and photographs that mostly embodied middle class women of leisure. Before the establishment of the *Fascio Femminile* in the early 1920s, a number of articles and photographs also posed women's bodies as 'harmonizing' social agents. They were set up as patriotic pillars of the nation that would attend and take part in formal Italian diasporic celebrations. The newspaper instrumentalized these female bodies as performing an ethno-nationalist form of respectability and refinement especially at open events that brought together Italian diaspora with British officials to create 'racial' harmony ('*Grandiosa Manifestazione D'Italianita*' 1924, p. 4). These fascist imaginaries from the 1920s to early 1930s created concepts of embodiment modelled on notions of (self) disciplined Italian diasporic female bodies with superior racial attributes that included morality, self-sacrifice, devotion, patriotism, respect, refinement, style, virtue and decency. Viewed in this context, these accounts operated as normative technologies that figured an exemplary diasporic 'self-disciplined' white, Italian female body.

The Italo-Australian newspaper must be seen as a site that deployed female bodies as 'physical and psychological' traits that distinguished Fascist

women's actions (Spinazze 2006, p. 58). This newspaper, as an organ for Fascist propaganda, operates as a transnational and diasporic mechanism that attempted to intervene and guide diasporic populations by circulating the work of the newly established National Fascist Party (PNF) and the *Fasci Femminili* of the late 1920s. An array of related articles in the late 1920s and 1930s embodied diasporic female bodies as serving the higher causes of the Fascist nation, precisely as members of the women's committees such as the *Fascio Femminile* of the PNF. As Angela Diana's summary of the women's *Fascio* in Australia states:

The aims of the Women's *Fascio* were welfare oriented 'humanitarian and social aims of assisting the needy'. The Women's *Fascio* unitarily organized balls, charities and receptions for every Fascist celebration. From this position of power and privilege Fascist women also organized other women, often through charity, dances, children's festivals and gift giving parties. The educated women also taught Italian children with imported books from Fascist Italy. (Diana 1988, p. 76)

In the Australian context, the women's branches had been set up in Sydney and Melbourne in 1927, in Adelaide (1928), Port Pirie (1929), Fremantle and Perth (1934), at Wiluna and Gwalia, and possibly at Babinda in Queensland⁴³. As part of Fascist technologies of gender and sexuality, their activities were hierarchized as subordinate arms of the PNF and were differentiated from male activities categorized as 'political' (De Grazia 1992; Spackman, 1995). The following activities were instrumental Fascist

⁴³ The Northern Command investigations in 1941 on women's activities within the *Fascio* reiterated that there was an organizing women's committee that 'made the arrangement for entertainment' within the Babinda Fascist Club, but it had no evidence of an established formal Women's *Fascio*, AA Vic: MP 508/1, 255/702/1346 Australian Military Forces Northern Command, Internment Of Women-Fascio Women's Section, Brisbane, 22, July 194; A document held by the Northern Military Forces has a document titled '*List of women who applied for membership in the women's Fascio, Babinda*' 23, October 1941 AA Qld: BP242/1, Q26188 Catherina Grimaz also Costababer and Mrs Gaspari.

technologies that bounded women and children to fascism and to the Italian regime through an emphasis on 'social' intervention:

- 1-create popular support for the Fascist Regime abroad
 - 2-raise funds and resources for the Regime and Fascist aims
 - 3-protect the interests of Italians abroad
 - 4-encourage the maintenance of the '*Italianita*' of the immigrants and their children
 - 5-keep Italians united
 - 6-combat anti-Fascist ideas.
- (Cresciani 1980, p. 11; Palombo, 2004)

In line with this list, the newspaper's display of activities conducted by the *Fasci Femminili* was instrumental to inserting Fascist in diasporic women's lives. Its Fascist educational programs, functions and reunions were re-imagined as social events that supported and protected the diasporic communities at a time when their lives were being threatened ('*Riunione Del Fascio Femminile di Sydney*' 1933, p. 3; '*L'Opera del Fascio Femminile*' 1936, p. 3).

At a time when state technologies of assimilation were forcefully demanding cultural obliteration, the *Fasci Femminili* were shown in the paper to be advocating and celebrating the superiority of Italian culture. In 1936, the opening of the Sydney school by the *Fasci Femminile* was advertised in the newspaper as encouraging maintenance of '*Italianita*' by way of the '*Scuola del Fascio*' (School of the *Fascio*)⁴⁴. The school was positioned as through a Fascist imaginary as devoted to reading and writing in Italian, singing, conducting physical exercises and to publicly reward children for their achievements. Italo-Australian members of GILE

⁴⁴ AA Qld: BP242/1, Q30565, Italian General File, CIB, Report Of Commonwealth Investigation Officer –Italian Organization 26 July 1939, p.10.

(Italian Youth of the Littorio) were also shown as attending excursions and as performing at various Fascist functions and parades dedicated to the regime (*‘Scuola Emigrazione e Fascismo’* 1928, p. 6; *‘La Scuola Del Fascio di Sydney’* 1933, p. 3). Moreover, the social care of Italian diaspora is embodied in the representation of members of the Sydney *Fascio Femminil* as ‘tireless’ organizers of philanthropic events. Represented as organizers of elegant balls and debuts, diasporic female bodies are constituted as performing exemplary high moral purposes, such as humanitarian and charity work or the philanthropic duties conducted during the depression years on behalf of the *Opera Assistenziale Del Fascio*, represented as providing assistance to Italians in need (*‘Splendida Riuscita del Ballo Littorio’* 1932, p. 3). These activities are paralleled by the embodiment of women as collecting gold and wedding rings and as organizing the commemoration of the March to Rome in celebration of the invasion of Ethiopia. These articles deployed and naturalized the analytics of raciality that grounds Fascism, its Imperial and colonial project. By embodying these women as exemplary Fascist female bodies that advocated for the Italian diaspora and supported the regime, the newspaper re-imagined diasporic Italians as ‘the self-determined “I,”’ part of a white Italian colonising race.

***Il Giornale Italiano* and Commonwealth Investigation Branches**

In mapping the expansive ideological functions that these diasporic newspapers served, I now want to shift my focus to *Il Giornale Italiano*, more specifically, its involvement in the Abyssinian war. The

Investigative Branches unit was critically preoccupied with the operations of this diasporic newspaper from 1936 to 1939. The Investigative Branch unit was eventually mobilized by the Australian Government in order to assist it in establishing its support for the Fascist war in Abyssinia—precisely in order to further its concern and thus to secure the British Empire. The *Giornale Italiano* enjoyed a circulation of about 8,000 copies per week and reached some of the 35,000 members of the Italian community. In the mid-1930s this paper was produced in Sydney and printed in Melbourne as part of what Tosco calls a ‘new Fascism’ that moves from the notion of a ‘national-state,’ as a unified historical, moral and political formation, to an ‘imperial community,’ that brings a new civilization, a ‘Fascist civility’ (Gentile 1994, p. 94; Tosco, 2002). The *Giornale Italiano* effectively distinguished itself from other papers by drawing on direct international Italian Fascist sources after the Italian Ministry for Foreign Affairs commissioned a journalist in Rome, Gogliardo Paoloni, to write for it (Pascoe 1987, p. 202; Cresciani, 1980, p. 71). This newspaper became largely concerned with Italian imperial expansion and, from February 1936, it especially intensified its support for the invasion of Abyssinia by producing bi-weekly editions.

In April 8 1936, the occupation of Ethiopia made front-page news. With the headline stating ‘One after the other the defense of the Abyssinian resistance has crumbled,’ followed by the sub-heading: ‘Juda’s lion, Hailie Selassi withdraws defeated abandoning on the battle ground seven thousands dead, numerous casualties, prisoners and a large booty’ (1936,

p. 1). The newspaper continued incessant support for the Fascist regime's colonial invasion. In this article, the battle of the Hashanti River is constituted by deploying racial differences as a 'political symbolic weapon' (da Silva 2007, p. 32) that produce a modern, Mediterranean Aryan race represented here by the victorious 'Italian' soldiers, with superior mechanical artillery and military airplanes, 'dropping bombs and firing bullets' and 'magnanimously' securing civilian lives. They are racially differentiated from the physicality and morality attributed to Hailie Selassi and 'his Imperial Guards' who, in contradistinction, are represented as black armies who were 'militarily obsolete' and as 'savages', 'fanatics' 'disrespectful of life' (April 8 1936, p. 1). This re-imagining of the battle at the Hashanti River as an ongoing 'game' between a barbaric African and Italian civilization interpellated the readership of the Italian diaspora not only as spectators of the battle, but as part of what it termed the 'jubilant Italians' abroad vicariously engaged in these Fascist battles and victories.

The occupation of Abyssinia in fact generated significant interest and support from Italian-Australians. Cresciani argues that despite internal political differences, the invasion to Abyssinia received diasporic support as it was perceived as providing a vindication to the racial inferiorization of Italians as Southern Europeans (1980, p. 75) and, specifically, Southern Italians. This support is visibilized by the thousands of names that had donated to the invasion and were listed in the *Italo-Australian* and that included a high percentage of women (Diana 1988, p. 77). Significantly, as Venturini also notes, the most fervent defender of the invasion was the:

Catholic spokesman, most notably ... Archbishop Duhig. His stance became contro[versial] when in 19 October he drew comparison between Ethiopia and pre-1788 Australia and argued that those who were so piously outraged by Italy's activities by Italy's activities might ask themselves about Australian treatment of Aborigines. (Venturini 2007, p. 589)

This imperial imaginary of course negates the fact that the Italian diaspora was actually already part of the larger colonial-settler population that was contributed to the dispossession of and violence against Indigenous populations. What is brought into focus here is the manner in which colonial sovereign relations with Indigenous populations were controlled by white Australia's settler-colonial sovereignty in ways that altogether rejected any notion of another sovereign colonizer (for example, the Italian colonizer) within Australia and demanded the effacement of national/racial differences by assimilation (Cresciani 1982). In the wake of the disastrous first Italo-Abyssinian war in 1895-1896, conducted under Minister Crispi, the 1935-1936 invasion was represented as a new modern, mechanized war with Italian male soldiers returning to the African frontier as a 'far cry from the stereotypes of the past' (Finaldi 2009, p. 24).

Scholars estimate that between 350,000 to 760,000 Abyssinians were killed in this war (Bartikowski, 2006). Moreover, the very battle of the Hashanti river discussed above is one of several battles where the Italian military planes used chemical weapons, more precisely sulphur mustard gas. It is estimated that around 15,000 casualties were killed by the use of this chemical weapon (Grip & Hart 2009, p. 2). Furthermore, historians have documented how, even once the battle was over, the Italian forces conducted a number of massacres (Pankhurst 1999, p. 83). This violence

was well recorded and reported during its occurrence, as both Abyssinia and Italy were members of the League of Nations. Pankhurst sums up the events:

The Ethiopian Minister of Foreign Affairs supplied the League of Nations with irrefutable information on Fascist war crimes, including the use of poison gas and the bombing of Red Cross hospitals and ambulances, from within a few hours of the Italian invasion on 3 October 1935 to 10 April of the following year. Further charges were made by Emperor Haylä Sellasé, to the League's General Assembly on 30 June. Later, on 17 March 1937, he requested the League's Secretary-General to appoint an Inquiry Commission to investigate crimes committed in Ethiopia. Such appeals made a deep public impression, but the League took no official action on the matter. (Pankhurst 1999, p. 84)

As discussed above, the Australian government, for British imperial reasons, actually adopted a pro-occupation stance, and supported the ongoing circulation of the Italian diasporic newspaper *Il Giornale Italiano* throughout the conflict. This is evidence of the Australian state's support for the occupation. This newspaper was of particular significance precisely because it operated as a (trans)national technology connected to the Italian authorities from which it sourced recent Italian articles. Viewed within the existing European imperial framework of either liberal democratic or Fascist states, despite Abyssinia's membership to the League of Nation, the invasion, the killings and the denial of an inquiry demonstrate how Abyssinia was positioned within a racialised and colonial onto-epistemology. It effectively scripted Abyssinia as a geo-political zone of affectability in which, following da Silva's (2009, p. 212) terms, its people counted as 'no bodies'. This colonial and racial onto-epistemology was inextricably tied to larger, transnational formations of imperial biopolitics; situated within this imperial transnational frame, the very circulation of *Il Giornale Italiano* can be seen to operate as part of

technology of governmentality that, regardless of existing formal agreements at the level of the League of Nations, signals British imperial support of Fascism during and after the war. By this I am not referring to the content of the newspaper per se, which clearly attacked the British allies decision to support the League. In fact, in 1935 there was a secret attempt by the UK and France to resolve the occupation by proposing a partition of Abyssinia, by which two-thirds would be handed over to Italy (Waters 2012). Britain and Australia could have actively supported Abyssinians by taking actions against Italy's invasion and violent killings during and after the event. They did not. The circulation of the Italian diasporic newspaper that clearly supported the occupation is not accidental; rather, it must be seen as a signal of the Australian government's support for the invasion.

As I proceed to discuss in the next chapter, the support for Fascism went as far as to influence the state regulation of left Italian-Australian diasporic newspapers which were completely closed down by 1932. However, by 1936, there was also a turn within security mechanisms as intelligence work expands to assess, monitor and control Italian Fascist associations. This was based precisely on growing fears about the power and influence of the Italian Fascist regime as it was articulated by Britain and locally by a number of key government authorities. Italian-Australian Fascists. From the late 1930s, Italian-Australian Fascists were seen to pose a real risk to the self-preservation of the British Empire and the Australian liberal democratic state's sovereignty. By the time World War Two was declared,

governmental authorities had built an extensive archive of intelligence work on the Italian-Australian diaspora that would be improved and used further to intern and securitise the nation-state from the risk posed by its internal enemy aliens. It is the Australian state's practices of internment that I proceed to discuss in my final chapter.

Chapter Seven

The Political Tide Turns: The Australian Surveillance-Security State and the Biopolitics of Internment

In the course of this chapter, I document the way the inter-war period participated in the creation of surveillance archives on the Italian-Australian diaspora and their political activities. I demonstrate how this period of surveillance became such that it enabled the censoring and attempted thwarting of the diasporic Left in the context of the public domain of political newspapers. This process of censoring was produced by the collaboration between Australian state authorities with Italian Fascism. This problematic collaboration, I argue, has effectively been buried in the archives of the Australian state. Notwithstanding this collaboration between the Australian Government and diasporic Fascist organizations, eventually Fascism, after mid-1930s, was also became a target of secret and intensive intelligence work. These mechanisms of surveillance set the pace for creating the militarised biopolitical technologies that would be used during the course of World War Two, including the re-introduction of the internment camp. This final chapter focuses on the internment of Italian female subjects and it situates this process of internment in the context of the mesh of racialised and gendered relations of power that inscribed the Australian-nation state in that period.

In the 1930s, with the occupation of Abyssinia, and the ongoing focus on the Italian anti-fascist movement and communist activists and the visible organizing of Italian consuls to gain popular support for Fascism, there was a growing perception of political disloyalty to the Australian state and the British Empire within the ranks of the Italian diaspora. These collective events worked to generate a turn of the political tide: Italian-Australian Fascism was now framed as very real threat to the security of the Australian nation-state. The Commonwealth Investigation Branches (CIB), as part of a national mechanism of security, increased surveillance of the Fascist organisations in Australia. Despite the Australian Government's significantly muted responses to the occupation and massacres in Abyssinia and its support for *Il Giornale Italiano*, Venturini argues that at this time there is a stronger perception of political disloyalty and that:

to be a Fascist, or to be suspected of being a Fascist was tantamount to certain disloyalty in the event of war ... Some R.S.L members found it easier to brand all Italian immigrants as potential subversives. The theme of the 'alien' in our midst grew stronger. (Venturini 2007, p. 588)

By the 1930s, the newspaper *Il Giornale Italiano*, after attacking the editors of another paper, was described by the Brisbane authorities as a 'poisonous paper endeavouring to stir up trouble between the Italians and the Australians' and stated that they had already reported it with the view to suppress the paper⁴⁵. An order was received from the Prime Minister's Office to carefully monitor the paper⁴⁶. After 1935, and in the wake of the

⁴⁵ AA: A3671/1, C1822 Part1, La Rivista Italiana, il Giornale Italiano. Recent articles on Abyssinia and Italian colonisation May –June 1936, CIB Correspondence Brisbane 14 June, 1933.

⁴⁶ AA: A3671/1, C1822 Part1, CIB Sydney, August 1933

Abyssinian war, surveillance of the content of the newspaper intensified, especially with regard to the political responses to the British support for the League.⁴⁷

On 11 May 1936, the Inspector of Melbourne Investigation Branch' report on an article with the headline, 'The Decalogue for Italian Parents Abroad,' narrativized it as an anti-assimilationist article that taught Italian-Australian children to speak Italian and remain Italian in spirit. In the same report it also drew attention to a local police report on the violent effects created by diasporic celebrations of the victory in Abyssinia. The report represented the celebration as worsening divisions within the Italian diasporic community and it suggested that the article was breaching the *Newspaper in Foreign Languages Regulation*:

[The article] is a direct [form of] propaganda and an exhortation to Italians to retain Italian national sentiments within their families- even presumably if born in this country and thus natural born British subjects ... I ... suggest that the matter in the paper be given consideration in the light of the authority to publish given under the '*Newspaper in Foreign Languages Regulation*'.⁴⁸

Effectively, the Investigation Branches now decided that Fascism was impacting on the assimilation and political loyalty of the Italian diaspora, and they increasingly began to formulate the figure of an ethnicised, disloyal Fascist 'enemy alien'. In this sense, Derrida's words are useful here when he argues that there is considerable power in state creation of an

⁴⁷ See, for example, AA: A3671/1, C1822 Part 1 CIB Melbourne, reproduced 21 December 1935, 'Hoare Goes Away 8 January, 1936'; translated 2 June 1936 'Good Italian, Good Australian 27 May 1936'; Translated 5 May 1936 'Message by the Royal COUNSUL, Cav. Uff. E. Anzilotti 13 May, 1936'.

⁴⁸ NAA: AB671/1, C1822 Part1, CIB Melbourne, Correspondence 11 May 1936

archive: 'there is no political power without control of the archive, if not memory. Effective democratization can always be measured by this essential criterion: the participation in and access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation' (1995, footnote n.1 p. 11).

The archive in this case is embodied by the creation of investigative files that become part of establishing the hegemonic order of the state. These files are also always already part of an onto-epistemology of raciality and its command. In Derrida's reading of Freud, the archive is constituted by multiple and different drives: drives for conservation (that is, the return to lived origins), destruction (that is, death, aggression, destruction drive) and filiations (that is, institutional relations through bodies such as the law) (1995, pp. 58-59). In this sense, what interest me here is how the creation of files and their readings become part of securing a white liberal sovereign order and its political filiations. Some of this intelligence work was in fact passed on to the Department of Foreign Affairs, as this department was in charge of releasing permits for publishing newspapers in foreign languages. Significantly, the Department of Foreign Affairs did not act on the warning issued by this report; this, in effect, allowed the ongoing circulation of Fascist politics amongst diasporic groups for a certain period. This again evidences the government's ongoing sympathies with the Fascist movement at this time.

The spread of Fascism must also be situated within the context of an Italian-Australian anti-fascist diasporic movement that was, from the mid-

1920s and onwards, was, in contradistinction, severely curtailed by governmental authorities. In fact, Italian Fascist authorities supported the liberal state in implementing these restrictions against left political formations. A newspaper such as *Il Risveglio* (1927) was part of a newly established anti-fascist League in Sydney and was replaced by *La Riscossa* (1929-1931) in Melbourne, as part of the anarchist Matteotti Club. The *L'Avanguardia Libertaria* (1930-1932) was also formed after there was a split in the *Matteotti Club* (Cresciani 1999). These newspapers were largely anarchist publications with input from communists and leftists as part of an anti-fascist organizing. I provide here an overview of *Il Risveglio*, which had set the political tone for the other two publications. Anarchists Francesco Carmagnola published it in Sydney with Isidoro Bertazzon and the communist Giovanni Terribile Antico (Cresciani 1999; Faber 2009, pp. 5-6) as part of the newly formed *Lega Anti-Fascista* (1926) (Anti-Fascist League). These papers did not support Italian or British imperialism and in fact, by the time the Abyssinian war started, the Australian authorities had already banned them. As an anarchist newspaper, *Il Risveglio* introduced local readers to the violence exercised by Fascism in Italy and to the complicity of the Italian consular authorities in Australia (for example, see the article by Isidoro Bertazzon 'The Vile Fascist Lies' 1 August 1927)⁴⁹. The later theme was intensified in *La Riscossa* with front page articles that were calling for the rejection of unelected representatives of the Italian Fascist Government in Australia

⁴⁹ NAA: A432, 1929/578 PART 4, Italian Newspaper *Il Risveglio*, Director Investigation Branchm, Melbourne, Translation of 'The Vile Fascist Lies' August 1927, p. 4.

(for example see: 'Comrades of North Queensland' 20 April 1930, p. 1; '*Gli Antifascisti di Ingham, N.Q., Non Permettono ai Consoli di fare La Propaganda Fascista*' ['The Antifascist of Ingham, N.Q. Do not Allow Consuls to do propaganda' my translation], 15 March 1932, p. 1). The anti-fascism of *Il Risveglio* visibilized the illegitimacy of Mussolini's dictatorship, and the violent actions of the *Squadristi* and their killings and persecution of organised labor, leftist politicians and activists.

When considering its intervention on everyday cultural practices, the newspaper produced a non-normative space. More precisely it worked to institute what Heckert and Cleminson (2011, p. 4) name as an anarchist 'ethics of freedom in resistance to everyday forms of governmentality and normalisation' as linked to religion, marriage and gender equality. This called for, for example, the dismantling of religious guidance and asked readers, including women, not to trust priests and to (self-) educate themselves so as to free their minds from corrupted knowledge ('*La Menzogna di Dio*, 'God's Lie'] 1 August 1927, p. 2). The paper interpellated readers by guiding them to become educated and to take actions, tear down and dismantle the influence of religion; in other words, the newspaper was advocating a form of resistance to religious dogma. This exhortation to resist and fight for freedom and liberty, including against capitalism and monarchy, intensified in Bertazzon's newspaper *L'Avanguardia Libertaria* that, in December 1930, called on its readers to take up an armed struggle in 'The Problem of Action' (15 December, 1930 n.p. cited in Faber 2009 p. 11).

The paper published articles that confirmed anarchist relations with questions over women's equality and emancipation and their economic condition (Moya 2002, p. 195). This intervention, however, remained abstracted from diasporic women's actual embodiments. A form of masculinist anarchism was reproduced by this newspaper that re-imagined a unified and universal gendered female body postulated as oppressed (chained, enslaved and so on) by materialist social economic conditions and by the Catholic, capitalist and political restrictive legal framings of marriage and the family (Moya 2002, p. 195). The re-printing in *Il Risveglio* of Max Nordau's writing on 'Free Love' introduces and calls for opposition to normative marriages as defined by bourgeois values and laws. Nordau's article embodies female prostitutes as performing an honest economic form of survival through a comparison with what it defines as wives lost in the calculative and dishonest domestic and sexual exchanges of the marriage contract ('Free Love' 1 August 1927).⁵⁰ The article envisages 'different relations of power' that would free sexual relations from the state, capitalism, religion, law or restrictive moral values (Heckert & Cleminson 2011, p. 3). *La Riscossa* continued with similar themes with Celestino Lalli's writings, where women were embodied within the anarchists' support for the emancipation of the family and in the provision of equality:

⁵⁰ NAA: A432, 1929/578 PART 4, Director Investigation Branch Melbourne
Italian Newspaper *il Risveglio*, Translation of 'Free Love' August 1927, p. 10.

We want the family to be emancipated from any prejudice and violence ... we do not want marriage to be contaminated by a deceitful promise of love ... we do not want the woman to live under the tyranny of man and of the civil and ecclesiastical law...We can achieve this when the economic conditions have mutated so that the woman can be elevated socially, morally and intellectually at the same level as the man (*Religione, La Patria, La Famiglia and Gli Anarchici*, 15 December 1930, p. 2 my translation)

This newspaper, then, opposed Fascism's rejection of equality and anti-emancipationist politics and proposed the demolition of 'economic dependency' to shift gendered inequality. These articles' emphases on dismantling and tearing down institutions, laws and values, however, remained critically abstracted from women's everyday relations in Australia including the biopolitical economism that differentiated their labor. In this sense, the newspaper positioned anarchism as freeing women from political, religious and capitalist aims, but it actually failed to visibly connect these concerns to the material lives of diasporic women.

The newspaper *Il Risveglio* commented on the conflicts in the canefields of North Queensland. Immediately after his arrival in 1922, as Cresciani (1999) notes, Carmagnola went to work in the canfields of Ingham in North Queensland until he eventually returned to Sydney. Carmagnola, in *Il Risveglio*, discussed the growing violence against Italian-Australian diasporic workers that, as discussed above, were accused of undercutting existing conditions and competing unfairly against British organized labor. For Carmagnola ('Workers of Queensland' 1 August 1927 n.p.)⁵¹, the

⁵¹ NAA: A432, 1929/578 PART 4, Director Investigation Branch Melbourne Italian Newspaper *il Risveglio*, Translation of 'Workers of Queensland' August 1927, pp. 1-3)

problem between Australian and Italian cane cutters was ‘racial hatred’ as ‘inculcated through faulty education’ that worked to divide workers (Faber 2009, p. 10). The anarchist imaginary of the article sets very clear distinctions between the interests of an undesirable category of Italian farmers and Italian workers. The article directed workers to question their conditions and to unite with the Australian in the struggle against the capitalist enemy and stated:

Why are we Italians looked upon so favourably by employers all over the world? Because we are ignorant and because we allow ourselves to be exploited more than others. To work then. Oh! Comrade workers of North Queensland! Let us destroy in ourselves that brutal egoism which renders us slaves to ourselves. Let us free ourselves of prejudices and superstitions and let us unite ourselves with the Australian workers in the struggle against the masters who oppress and exploit us. Let us remember the words of that great one [Marx] who said that the emancipation of the proletariat cannot but be the work of the workers themselves. (‘Workers of Queensland’ 1 August 1927 n.p.)

Racial hatred or violence is understood here as an object of capitalist ideology that one can give up and dismantle in order to produce a collectivity of united workers. Similar to the way in which the paper had directed readers to tear down and free themselves from the chains of priests and marriages, this article advocates that Italian workers can free themselves of racial hatred. By uniting all workers, it reasons, there will not be Italian or Australian workers but only the collective workers of the world (see also Lalli, C. ‘*Religione, Patria, La Famiglia e Gli Anarchici*,’ 1930 p. 2).

The call to eliminate racial differences in Carmagnola’s article, however, effaces altogether racial violence. Firstly, its discussion of getting rid of ‘our’ prejudice, meaning racial hatred held by ‘us Italians’ towards

Australians workers, dismisses altogether the violent raciality that scripted southern Italian bodies as non-assimilable workers. It also reveals the effaced racial embodiment of Carmagnola and the other editors of this paper who, as subjects that embodied the category of white northern Italian male migrants from Veneto, were already defined as occupying a white masculinity that deemed them as assimilable to British-Australians norms (precisely as argued in the Ferry Report 1925, p. 14). What I am suggesting is that the elimination of racial differences here in effect means the annihilation of the racial ‘others,’ in da Silva’s terms ‘the affectable Life’, in the process of securing and reproducing the self-determining subjects of whiteness, namely the white male European worker (da Silva, 2007).

This form of anarchism is still reliant on an epistemology of raciality that produces the biopolitical racial enemy. If we accept Foucault’s (2003, p. 262) argument that ‘the most racist forms of socialism were, therefore, Blanquism of course, and then the Commune, and then Anarchism,’ we can begin to consider a workers’ struggle that is still based on the deployment of racial enemies. Newman provides a critical correlation between Foucault’s discussion and the matrix of war and anarchism that serves to clarify the raciality of Carmagnola’s workers:

There are really two points being made ... Firstly, because militant forms of socialism including anarchism are animated by the war matrix, the idea of struggle which is central to them inevitably brings up the figure of the race enemy. While I am not convinced at all of this claim, it does perhaps raise the question whether anarchism is able to transcend the logic of militancy; whether it can go beyond the logic friend/enemy political matrix essential ... to Carl Schmitt ... Secondly, the war matrix is inevitably mobile, and was articulated not only by radical and egalitarians ... but also

by reactionary nobility in France ... so we must also understand its dangers and unpredictability. (Newman 2012, pp. 46-47)

Carmagnola's category of workers is always ready to struggle but this may not be a radical form of militancy as it is defined against an implicit racial enemy. In the colonial context of Queensland, the universal notion of a workers' struggle is actually predicated on the enmity relations produced by a biopolitical racial caesura in the population. In this context, the struggle of anarchist militant workers in the 1930s was figured within a racial biopolitical caesura that had already internalized and differentiated the 'right' to be occupying the colony as northern Italian male workers, to kill and dispossess Indigenous populations so to create an economic productive colonial order, to eliminate by deportation the indentured South Sea Islander workers. All of this worked to produce a white colony with white European settlers that systematically excluded non-European workers from Asian countries, while also restricted Southern European workers and biopoliticised women's labor. In other words, the anarchist workers' struggle was locked within biopolitical racial relations that worked hand-in-hand with capitalist divisions of labour. *Il Risveglio* effectively celebrated a 'self-determined white male European worker', his politics, economics and morals, his struggles precisely by effacing the manner in which this privileged subject was grounded on the subordination of Indigenous, non-European, Southern Italian workers and women.

In this racialised workers' context, it is important to pause and ponder over the political understanding of the Southern Question within the Italian-Australian left. Gramsci's essay on the *Southern Question* (1926) by the

mid-1930s had already been released but it is unclear when this came to circulate amongst Italian-Australians, especially given the legal restrictions imposed on the importing of Communist literature in the 1930s. What can be discerned from the scattered traces of a politics on the Southern Question within the Italian-Australian diaspora is the activist work of the President of the Italian Communist Party (PCI) in Australia: Cristofaro Matteo. Cristofaro migrated from the southern region of the Puglie and became an active underground promoter and distributor of communist literature in Australia from the exiled PCI in Paris (Cresciani 1980, p. 121). Although this is not clearly defined, as Cresciani noted in a private exchange on Cristofaro's activism this was informed by an awareness of

the conditions of exploitation and under-privilege suffered by Southern women and men. He suffered in his own skin this exploitation in Australia when, in the early 1930s, he worked for two years in Gippsland without pay, sleeping on straw in a barn, and receiving in exchange only some meagre meals. (Cresciani, July 13 2009; email correspondence)

Cristofaro collaborated with Carmagnola's anti-fascist activism but did not follow his anarchism and was amongst a group of left activists that, after the closure of the Matteotti Club, established a thriving anti-fascist center, *La Casa D'Italia*, where imported communist literature also abounded. In order to safeguard its existence, this meeting space maintained a closed membership (only the founding members). But as a meeting space, it was also open to 'all progressive, liberal, Italians migrated to Australia'. One of its aims was 'to promote friendship between the Italian and Australian people in the interest of peace and mutual respect' (Cresciani 1980, p.128). In this sense, this space was set out as a zone of relief from normative racial relations and politics.

The politics circulating within *Il Risveglio*, *La Riscossa* and *L'Avanguardia Libertaria* was kept under constant surveillance from the Australian authorities. These newspapers became the subject of intensive investigations and creation of files, and by 1932 they were all shut down through the combined collaboration of Australian government authorities and Italian consul officials. Here we have the archives being ordered and created, in Derrida's (1995, p. 50) words as, the 'totalizing assemblage'. The archive is ordered by a 'death drive' that re-asserts state political sovereignty by creating files that act to eliminate political opposition to a white liberal sovereign politics; as Derrida warns:

There is no archive fever without the threat of this death drive, this aggression and destruction drive. This threat is *in-finite*, it sweeps away the logic of finitude and the simple factual limits, the transcendental aesthetics, one might say, the spatio-temporal conditions of conservation. Let us rather say that it abuses them. Such an abuse opens the ethico-political dimension of the problem. There is not one *mal d'archive*, one limit or one suffering of memory among others: enlisting the in-finite, archive fever verges on radical evil. (1995, p. 19)

This 'death drive' is created by the inter-governmental collaboration between Fascist and liberal parties to annihilate anarchist politics. This state-based form of collaboration with Italian Fascist authorities operated as a mechanism of security that worked to re-territorialize sovereign

interests in both Australia and Italy against the circulation of the sort of anti-imperial politics espoused by the diasporic newspapers of the left. In 1927 the Italian Consular-General Grossardi had written that Italian-Australian anti-fascist activities were subversive, violent and criminal in nature and demanded their closure precisely because they opposed the sovereignty of the Italian Fascist state. *Il Risveglio* was then posited in the investigative file as of ‘extremist character,’ ‘inciting class warfare, Bolshevism, anarchy, violence and political murders’ (1927 cited in Cresciani 1980, p. 102). The Attorney General’s Department collected and supported this condemnation of the newspaper, declaring that the paper had not been registered and recommended recourse to the *Newspapers In Foreign Languages Regulations Act* (1921) (Cmwlth) with the aim of shutting it down.⁵²

The Director of Commonwealth Investigative Branches in Canberra, alerting the Department of External Affairs that the Matteotti Club in Melbourne was publishing short-lived newspapers, followed this attempted annihilation by intelligence mechanisms. In 1929 by law, this did not require state approval:

The opinion in Melbourne as to the effect of these publications, so far as the Italian community is concerned, is that their effect is negligible ... but it is most undesirable that an alien should be permitted to flout the law as Bertazzon has done. Secondly some official protection from scurrilous publications should be afforded to an officially accredited representative of Foreign Power.⁵³

⁵² NAA: A432, 1929/578 PART 4, Attorney General Department, Minute Paper, Canberra 22, June 1927.

⁵³ NAA: A367, B18220, Italian Publications, CIB Director, Correspondence Canberra 4 December, 1929.

This letter worked to alert the authorities to the way the Italian-Australian publishers had found a loophole by which to evade legal regulation and surveillance. It also evidenced the manner in which the Australian state was, by default, protecting the interests of a 'foreign power'. The validity of this 'collaboration' was questioned in 1930, when both *La Riscossa* and *L'Avanguardia Libertaria* were being investigated in relation to a meeting at the Matteotti Club. The response from the Inspector of the Melbourne Investigative Branch answers by raising questions over the level of interference from Fascist authorities:

[that this was an] 'orderly [meeting] ... to which exception could not be taken, except perhaps by Italian Fascists, whose ideals of liberty may not be in accordance with those prevailing in this Commonwealth. (NAA: A367, C1822R CIB, Melbourne 24 June, 1930) ⁵⁴

A reading of the multiple files created on Carmagnola, between 1927 to 1945 by the CIB, indicates that this record was not copied into subsequent files. The response, however, not only pointed to the legality of the activities within the Matteotti Club, it more specifically brought to light the tacit support of Fascism within the Australian Commonwealth.

Between December 1931 and 1932, however, there were a number of events that led to the closure of both newspapers. Carmagnola, in December 1931, is accused of physically attacking the Consul Mario Melano.⁵⁵ The more conservative Lyons Government took action and, by February 1932, in light of the Italian Consul's increasing demands to the

⁵⁴ NAA: A367, C1822R *L'Avanguardia Libertaria*, *La Riscossa*, CIB Publication of Newspaper in Foreign Languages in Australia, Melbourne 24 June, 1930.

⁵⁵ NAA: A432, 1932/363 Carmagnola, Francesco, Queensland Police, Townsville, Inspector's Report, 16 January, 1932, pp. 1-3.

authorities to close these newspapers down as ‘communistic’ literature, they were banned (Faber 2009, p. 9). Investigative branches then produced a new archive of investigative files that, in Derrida’s words, ‘state[d] the law: they recall[ed] the law and call[ed] on to impose the law’ (Derrida 1995, p. 10) in order to close down the newspaper. A letter from the Consul General for Italy pointed to the recent introduction of a ban on newspapers of a ‘communistic nature’ and argued that *La Riscossa* and *L’Avanguardia* should be included in the ban (Grossardi, 8 February 1932, reproduced in Cresciani 1988, p. 146). The Investigative Branches and the police, working under state instructions, moved to ascertain the communist nature of these newspapers and its editors. What is clear when reading these files is that they could only find ‘inconclusive’ definitions with regard to the seemingly subversive politics being espoused by these newspapers. This ‘inconclusiveness,’ however, becomes in practice the very reason to ban these newspapers on the pretext that they are purportedly espousing ‘communistic’ political filiations. A certain Inspector R. Brown in a report on Carmagnola’s politics, confirmed that he was not a Communist but that he was connected to subjects that Italian authorities may consider Communists: ‘he is holding strong anti-fascist views, but he has not come under notice as a Communist, although the Italian anti-Fascists contain a number of members who in Italy might be considered Communist’.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ NAA: A 367, C4023, F. Carmagnola, Inspector S.Browne CIB Melbourne, 29 January 1932, n.p.

The Director of the Commonwealth Investigative Branches in Canberra, however, racialised Carmagnola as disloyal alien. He was identified as ‘a source of trouble,’ ‘of extremist tendency’ with Communist friends, and supported the revocation of his naturalization under the Nationality Act. But the report could not confirm his ‘Communism’⁵⁷. Despite the ‘inconclusive’ evidence, in 1932 these newspapers were shut down. Most importantly, it was the Lyons Government that eliminated *La Riscossa* and *L’Avanguardia Liberale*; this is the same government that in 1935-36 permitted the circulation of the Fascist *Il Giornale Italiano* during the Abyssinian war. Effectively, by the time the Abyssinia war started, in Australia, opposition to Fascism had been significantly weakened by the ongoing collaboration between a number of key Australian Government authorities and Italian Fascist authorities. It is also clear from these reports, however, that some intelligence authorities were questioning the support for Fascist authorities from within Australian Government bodies. The concerted actions by the Australian government to censor and stop anti-fascist movements did not stop anti-fascism per se; rather, the anti-fascist movements shifted from operating within an alliance between leftists and anarchists to one that was Communist-based and that involved the CPA and Italian Communist Party (Cresciani 1980).

By the mid-1930s, however, Australian intelligence authorities increased the surveillance of Fascist activities as the worrying activities of the Italian Fascist state began to ring alarm bells in the light of the British Intelligence

⁵⁷ NAA A432: 1932/363 Carmagnola Francesco, Attorney General Department, CIB Canberra, Memorandum, 1 March, 1932 p.2

Services unequivocally declaring that 'Italian Fascism [was] more dangerous than the Nazi movement' (Cresciani 1980, p. 78). This move signalled both a national and transnational shift away from the support of Italian Fascism. A key Australian military official, Major Jones, also stated that Fascism posed an internal danger:

Whilst the Italian Fascist organization is perhaps run on less methodical lines than its German counterpart, it is obvious that it does provide the Italian Government with ready-made machinery for dangerous actions in British countries in an emergency. If less methodical in detail, the Italian Regime has the advantage of being more mature. (Major Jones cited in Cresciani 1980, p.78)

In 1936, a report entitled 'A Summary Of Italian Fascist Activities and Propaganda in Australia' was released. This report drew a division between Fascist and anti-Fascist Italian diasporic populations in order to assemble and measure if and how the growth of Italian Fascism fostered national allegiance to Italy and if it produced disloyalty and anti-British sentiments amongst the Australian diasporic community. In this sense, this is the re-formation of the archive as a way of calculating the binding 'filiations' of Fascist politics in Australia. As Derrida (1995, p. 59; p. 33) argues, this operates as a 'consignation' to an allegiance for the Italian Fascist state and its sovereignty. This filing then categorizes and establishes the level of threat or danger posed by the filiations of Fascist activities in Australia. This military surveillance, however, contrary to the open and public criminalization of left politics, was to occur in absolute secrecy as Major Jones 'instructed all his branches and the Directors of Military and Naval Intelligence to increase, in the utmost secrecy, the surveillance of Fascist activities' (Cresciani 1980 p. 78). In what follows, I

proceed to map the textual production of Italian-Australian Fascist activities, and the levels of danger that they were perceived as posing by the Australian authorities in the specific context of Italian-Australian Fascist women precisely as a way of introducing the final section of this chapter on the internment of women of Italian origins.

The 1936 report 'A Summary Of Italian Fascist Activities and Propaganda in Australia' called into question the political loyalty of diasporic subjects. The report conveys the state sovereign power to assess Fascist 'filiations' by assembling and rendering legible the content of speeches and documents released during the Abyssinian war, producing a detailed inventory of state-by-state Fascist branches and associations and the nature of their activities, committee structures and lists of their members, the functions of Italian schools and youth activities, the press and their connection to the Italian authorities. This filing is part of what Derrida calls the power of 'consignation':

By consignation, we do not only mean, in the ordinary sense of the word, the act of assigning residence or of entrusting so as to put into reserve (to consign, to deposit), in a place and on a substrate, but here the act of consigning through gathering together signs. It is not only the traditional consignation, that is, the written proof, but what all consignation begins by presupposing. Consignation aims to coordinate a single corpus, in a system or a synchrony in which all the elements articulate the unity of an ideal configuration. In an archive, there should not be any absolute dissociation, any heterogeneity or secret which could separate (*secernere*), or partition, in an absolute manner. The archontic principle of the archive is also a principle of consignation, that is, of gathering together. (1995, p. 10)

In this Derridean sense, this Report is consigned to the articulation of an ideal political configuration, a single white sovereign corpus. I say 'ideal' because the Report works to efface the filiations between state liberalism

and Italian Fascism in Australia. The narrative of the Report is consigned to the re-configuration of a totalizing and unitary racial narrative that presupposes a single national, disloyal Fascist enemy.

The analysis of the *Casa D' Italia* in Sydney, re-typifies in the Report the Australian government's legal concern with 'loyalty' and 'assimilation' of diasporic populations and by so doing effaces the sovereign state political filiations with Italian Fascism. More precisely this writing consigns the articulation of diasporic political and cultural allegiance to foreign nations as undermining the security of the state. It underscores the danger of 'grouping under one roof ... all Italian associations' because this works to 'strengthen ... the national spirit, maintaining the use of Italian language,' and thereby undermining Anglo-Australian dominance and national unity (Report reproduced in Cresciani 1988, p. 187). This concern then evidences the operations of a racial arsenal that asserts a totalizing Anglo-Australian fear of the alien other and its presupposition of a single 'enemy' of the state. This fear interlocks with what Perera has called Australia's 'insular imaginary' of Anglocentric whiteness, a technology that effectively effaces pre-existing relations and reterritorializes the racial political repertoires available to the sovereign state and that works to constitute its single and unitary geopolitical horizon (Perera 2009, p. 31). The danger, as outlined by this Report, is signified as the 'bringing together of diasporic populations' and in its way of 'retard[ing] Italians from assimilating [to] Australia customs, ideals and so on' (Report reproduced in Cresciani 1988, p. 186).

As a technology of governmental surveillance and consequent control, the Report measured and assessed how members of the *Fascio Femminile* stood to be politically dangerous female bodies. The report, in its view of Italian-Australian Fascist women, effectively reproduces the same racial heteronormative gendered political order enacted by Italian Fascism; the women's activities, according to the report, are limited to organizing 'social events', including 'raising money ... and maintaining contact with Italian women and our own people on friendly and business terms' (Report reproduced in Cresciani 1988, p. 185). The nature of these 'social activities,' however, remains unspecified until they are affiliated with children; it is at this junction that the report scripts Fascist female bodies as politically dangerous and disloyal.

The Report's key concern resides on the capacity of Italian-Australian Fascist diasporic female bodies to produce adequately compliant and assimilable progeny. This is precisely in line with the assimilationist demands of the Ferry Report. In other words, diasporic, politically active female bodies are signified to be Italian women enemies of the Australian state. They are positioned as potentially dangerous Fascist teachers of children and youth that will instil Fascist doctrines and anti-British sentiments that could work to undermine the sovereignty and unity of the nation:

There exists an Italian school run by Miss Gatti at which Italian children attend after usual State school hours, where only Italian is spoken and Fascist doctrines fostered ... Whilst the object of [GILE] scheme is to maintain the Italianita of these British born children it is not possible to say to what extent [the children] are affected by the Fascist propaganda to

which they are obviously subjected ... [the] result is to cause a large number of nominally British subjects to retain another allegiance.⁵⁸

This military narrative then sets up a racial heteronormative and gendered truth or understanding of the intersection of Italian Fascism with female bodies as capable of producing dangerous political national affiliations with regard to the children of the nation.

After the release of the 1936 Summary Report, the Commonwealth, following further advice from Britain, escalated its systems of surveillance. The appointment of a committee consisting of representatives of the CIB, the Department of the Interior and External Affairs and the Army and Navy Intelligence was deployed to intensify the investigation of Italian activities in Australia (Cresciani 1980, p. 78). Cresciani also shows that a system of espionage from the Italian consulates was uncovered at this time (Cresciani 1980, p. 80).⁵⁹ The Australian nation-state proceeded intensely to surveil Italian-Australians, monitoring virtually all aspects of their political and cultural activities. Couched in biopolitical terms, there was an intensification of technologies of surveillance and intelligence that worked to make the Italian-Australian population more visible, knowable, and open to interventions in the interest of the state. In this sense, by the time Italy declared war on Britain and France on 10 June 1940, the Australian state had already mobilized an array of securitising and

⁵⁹ In a painstakingly detailed analysis of the Italian espionage system and its relation to Australia, Cresciani notes that the Archivio Centrale dello Stato holds 233 records of Italian migrants in Australia including 230 men and three women.

racialising technologies aimed at its own self-preservation while also serving to defend Anglo-imperial relations and to take them into a new world war.

In 1939, following the outbreak of war, the *National Security Act* (1939) was formally approved by the Her Majesty. As part of the British Commonwealth and Empire, Australia participated as an ally of Britain in the ‘war existing between His Majesty and the King of Germany’ (National Security, 1939). Within the ordering of securitizing sovereignty and self-preservation, martial law is re-instated under the guise of ‘[S]ecuring the public safety and the Defence of the Commonwealth and Territories of the Commonwealth’ (National Security 1939). The following long summary by Davis Day shows how Australian support for the British Commonwealth and Empire escalated fears and anxieties over securitizing national and transnational British imperial borders:

During the 1920s and 1930s, following the end of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and despite the evidence of Britain’s relative decline as a world power, Australia still looked overwhelmingly to Britain to protect it against any future Japanese invasion. Under the agreed system of Imperial defence, Britain was committed to sending a fleet to Singapore in the event of Japanese forces moving Southward while Australia effectively committed to support Britain in any European war ... Australia’s nightmare ... [was] that Menzies committed Australian forces against Germany and Italy while leaving Australia poorly prepared for the possibility of Japanese invasion ... Instead ... as late 1941, Menzies continued to refuse America’s requests to establish air and other links between Australia and the US for fear that it would harm Britain commercial interest. (Day 2009, p. 132)

This sovereign anxiety, riddled with a commitment to British imperial interests that left it potentially open to foreign invasion, worked to produce a number of biopolitical interventions at the level of the individual body of

the Australian nation's non-Anglo subjects. Specifically, anxiety over the security of the nation-state produced the very political concept of 'enemy aliens' and it directly resulted in the establishment of the internment camp as a key technology of the militarised securitisation of the state.

As occurred in War World One, First Nation people were limited in the 'right to kill' as enlisted soldiers. Until 1942, the policy of recruitment was based on the existing selected preference for 'half caste' with a European parent. Sendy Togi, like others who had already been recruited for enlistment, was sent home for being 'coloured' and 'full blooded'. When an inquiry was set up, the military re-stated that 'the existing Army instructions precluded the enlistment of full blood Aborigines' (12 January 1942, reproduced in Department of Veteran's Affairs, War 1939-1945).

The state's deployment of martial law, in declaring a state of exception, effectively reconfirmed a form of dispensation or absolution from sovereign obligations. This dispensation is a form of sovereign immunity from certain liberal democratic obligations as Esposito explains:

If the members of a community are characterized by ... this law of care with regard to the other, immunity implies an exemption or repeals such a condition: immune is he [sic] who is sheltered from obligations and dangers that concern everyone else. Immune is he who breaks the circuit of social circulation placing him outside of it. [my translation] (Esposito 2002, pp. 7-8)

The introduction of the *Aliens Control Regulation (1939)* as part of martial law, effectively enabled the state to suspend the rights, citizenship or otherwise, of its targeted subjects. This suspension enabled a direct and forceful intervention over the bodies of those deemed to be 'aliens' and

‘enemy aliens’. This was part of ‘the production of the biopolitical body which, for Agamben, remains sovereignty’s ‘original duty’ (Agamben 1998, p.6). Martial law, through the *Aliens Control Regulation*, established a set of military technologies that created an effective biopolitical racial caesura in the context of the Australian population, dividing the enemy alien, regardless of the fact that they often possessed Australian citizenship, from the polity of the Anglo-Australian nation/subject. This break interlocked with pre-existing caesurae to re-introduce the differentiations between white national loyal bodies and the racial categories of ‘Aliens’ and ‘Enemy Aliens’. As in World War One, as Ilma Martinuzzi-O’Brien argues, ‘enemy aliens’ were ‘persons having enemy associations or connections,’ and it included non-naturalized, Australian-born and naturalized British subjects (Martinuzzi-O’Brien 2006, chapter 9; Neumann, April 2006). But more to the point, similarly to World War One, the deployment of the categories of ‘alien and enemy aliens’ was part of a militarised biopolitical racial mechanism that re-configured the population through a raciality that ethnicizes citizens and non-citizens as ‘foreigners’ from enemy nations and by so doing it exposed them to the enmity relations of war.

In the wake of the war, martial law took control over the bodies and lives of Italian-Australians classified as ‘Italian enemy aliens’. In World War Two, the configuration of Italian-Australians as ‘enemy aliens’ is posited by recourse to an existing onto-epistemology of raciality (da Silva 2007) that had already constituted these populations as ‘unassimilable bodies’

and opened them to technologies of violence. The militarized biopolitical ethnicisation of Italian enemy aliens was grounded on racial differences that had already marked Italian diaspora as ‘non-assimilable’ or ‘questionable’ Southern Europeans and Southern Italians. Martinuzzi-O’Brien (1992, p.93) argues that, under the call for national security, the category of ‘naturalized’ British subjects were ‘denied their rights’ and interned (2014) as their ‘naturalization’ was based on the expectation of a transformation and that it was perceived that this ‘had not taken place’. The following quote by the Director of the Security Service in 1941 is introduced by Martinuzzi to sustain this argument of a non-transformation of naturalized Italian enemy aliens:

In assessing the Australian indignation factor, it has been impracticable to draw any real distinction between the effect of propinquity to unnaturalized Italians and those who have ... acquired Australian citizenship by naturalization, the lack of distinction being the fault of the Italian themselves, in that the behavior of both classes is for practical purposes indistinguishable in most, if not all, of the places in which they are congregated. (1941 cited Martinuzzi-O’Brien 1992, p. 93)

Following on from this, Martinuzzi O’Brien argues that expectations of ‘transformation’ shaped the treatment of ‘naturalized British subjects’. Martinuzzi is not implying here that only naturalized British subjects were interned and has also argued elsewhere that nationality was synonymous with ‘race’ (2008). This analysis, however, needs more consideration as not only it limits the discussion of a failed transformation that I call ‘unassimilability’ to naturalized British subjects, but it also ignores the implications of the quote by the Director of Security Service embodying Italian populations as an ‘indistinguishable’ racial entity (1992, 2014).

The ‘unassimilability’ of enemy aliens is part of a raciality that produces what Foucault calls the biopolitical racial ‘massification’ of the Italian enemy aliens (Foucault 2003, p. 243). I am not implying that naturalized or British born subjects were not particularized by military technologies of violence. Rather I am focusing on the way Italian enemy aliens are massified and figured through racial differences as ‘non-assimilable and indistinct’ ‘enemy aliens’ irrespective of their British citizenship status (and not because of it as partly implied by Martinuzzi-O’Brien’s argument on transformation and loss of civil rights). In fact the quote above from the Director of Security evidences the configuration of a massified racial entity of ‘Italians,’ and their ‘behaviour’, that has already normativized and universalized this diaspora as ‘unassimilable’ and an ‘indistinguishable’ racial national entity. This racialised homogenization implies, as da Silva argues, that the unassimilable racial ‘enemy aliens’ is deployed as part of national security by the *a priori* of raciality under the guise of national self-preservation and not by the allocation or removal of one’s citizenship status:

the in/difference that collapses administration of justice in/to law enforcement, immediately legitimating the state's deployment of its forces of self-preservation, does not require stripping off signifiers of humanity. On the contrary, this collapsing is already inscribed in raciality, which produces humanity, the self-determined political (ethical-juridical) figure that thrives in ethical life, only because it institutes it in a relationship – with another political figure. (2009, p. 234)

Although this raciality is not discussed by Cresciani, this is nevertheless implicated (1992, p. 14, p. 16) in what he argues is the unwillingness but also inability of military authorities and police to distinguish Communist from fascist political bodies. Again, this is also implicated in the responses

from ex-internees interviewed by Spizzica's (2013, p. 70), who had self-identified as non-political subjects prior to the war, but were still interned as enemy aliens (p. 67). The 'category' of Italian enemy aliens is, then, one that is produced by a raciality that renders all 'Italian enemy aliens' as affectable racial subjects, precisely because they are already differentiated as a massified 'unassimilable', but also 'as an indistinguishable' ethnicised national body.

The state responds to this massification of the racial category of 'enemy aliens' by deploying a broad range of biopolitical technologies of surveillance and securitisation. These technologies included internments that, albeit differently, affected most members of the Italian-Australian diasporic population. These securitising technologies that worked to enforce a broad range of biopolitical interventions and controls over the nation's ethnicised bodies included: mandatory registrations; police and military monitoring; the implementation of restriction orders on daily life; control over travel or movement, invasion and searches of homes and businesses; confiscation of personal items and documents; imprisonment and internments; censoring of mail and the imposition of constant surveillance by the expansion of intelligence work and the encouragement of the populations to report suspicious social activities. Italian-Australians, now classified as enemy aliens, had to modify their living practices and embody self-surveillance. Martial law also formally prohibited enemy aliens from:

-Speaking their languages.

- Intermixing with other Italians
 - Holding views that did not support British actions in war
 - Participating or conducting public gatherings
 - Listening to radios/ or possessing a wireless
 - Owning any form of Transport
 - Owning firearms
 - Travelling to other cities and more.
- (Bosworth & Ugolini, 1992, Cresciani, 1988, Spizzica, 2013).

These restrictions imposed on diasporic communities also covered living or working in ports such as Fremantle or Cairns and near ‘railways and bridges and harbours,’ (Bosworth & Ugolini 1992, p. 75; Cresciani 1992, p. 16).

These regulations regulated every aspect of the daily lives of ‘aliens and enemy aliens’ and were applied to intern women. For example, Luigina Ganora, who worked at her hotel in the port of Cairns, had already been profiled by military authorities as a Fascist sympathizer, but was interned largely under the accusation of encouraging members of the Forces to remain longer at her hotel and extracting information: ‘This Hotel could be definitely used as a place to obtain information from drunken sailors. The crews are enticed from their ships and are encouraged to stay overnight. It would be easy for Mrs Ganora or any of other girls to extract information from drunken crew’⁶⁰. Caterina Grimaz, who was the first woman known to have been interned from Queensland and was perceived as being a Fascist leader, was interned for working as ‘an interpreter’ for Italians and

⁶⁰ NAA: C69649, A367/1, Luigina Ganora 1943-45, Investigation Branch, Canberra and Melbourne, Cairns Police Report, Luigina Ganora and Royal Hotel, 30 January, 1942 n.p.

for holding secret meetings with other Italians during the war⁶¹. These technologies, in other words, strictly regulated the conduct of all ‘aliens and enemy aliens’ and were used to announce that authorities would target any subject.

Rita Costa recounts the forceful impact created by police searches. These searches caused great disruption in the everyday order of Italian-Australian lives, working also to reinforce the ethnicisation of the diasporic body precisely as an ‘enemy alien’ body under direct state control. The searches worked to disassemble a sense of safety and security in the homes of diasporic subjects:

The police would go there; they’d rip up the mattresses off the beds and empty all wardrobes, what they were looking for no one knows; they never took the person - yet emptied the houses out. And never tidied anything up ... They just sat there ... Just why? What have we done? But they’d say, ‘Don’t worry, at least you’re home you’ve not been taken away’. (Rita Costa cited in Saunders 2000, p. 174)

The raising of the question of ‘what have we done?’ is answered by the police decision not to take away or to intern the enemy alien body. This question and its answer point to the way police searches were technologies of racial and gender violence that evidenced the state’s ultimate capacity to intervene and assume direct control over diasporic lives and ultimately to dictate who stayed and who was interned (Foucault 2003, pp. 240-241; Mbembe 2003 p.11; Agamben 1997, p. 113). The military file of Ines Gatti from Gordonvale in Queensland in fact shows that she was interned

⁶¹AA QLD: Q24188 BP242/1, Catherine Grimaz, Catterina Grimaz [nee Costaberer] [aka Costa; aka Gaspari] - Queensland investigation case file Northern Command 28, January 1942.

in 1941 precisely because she had complained during the search of her house. Her file shows that her female body was narrativized as ‘immoral’ and a ‘cunning and shrewd type’ of an Italian woman and one ‘who would be engaged in acts of subversive nature’ because Ines, according to the military narrative, had ‘resented her search’ and was alleged to have stated: ‘If you lose any [of my] papers, you watch out for yourself,’ and added ‘you will be sorry’. No other evidence was introduced to demand her internment.⁶² By intervening and disturbing the diasporic spatial order, the searches as military technologies effectively imprinted on those racialised female bodies rendered as ‘alien enemies’ the sovereign power of the Anglo-Australian state to decide over their lives and worked to produce forms of self-surveillance.

It is also relevant here to elaborate on what is at stake in Rita’s question by considering Maria La Rosa’s narrative of terror after her husband Mario was interned. Maria recounts her sensing and fearing that, as the only Italian family in the area, she was being watched by authorities and locals to the point that she felt it was safer to burn all her correspondence and even the photographs of her relatives in the army in Italy (M. La Rosa 2002 pers. conv. Brisbane 15 September). This gesture embodies type of self-annihilation, provides another answer to the very question posed by Rita Costa: ‘what have we done here?’ Maria’s gesture of burning all that resembles a connection with Italy operates as an affective embodiment of the terror created by her exposure to the violent technologies of internment

⁶² NAQ: Q30005, BP242/1, Mrs Ines Gatti- Queensland Investigation File, Investigation Branch, Brisbane, Report, 29 October 1941.

and surveillance. Terror, in Razack's (2013 p. 6) terms, is a crucial mediator in the 'birth white settler state'; in this case, it works to obliterate any difference that is positioned as dangerous to the self-preservation of the state; in effect, the burning of the photographs becomes emblematic of the annihilation of Rita's ethnic heritage and of her family's Italian filiations. This gesture also points to Maria's embodied diasporic knowledge that she did not need to do anything to be interned or placed under surveillance. In other words, the figure of the Italian female enemy alien was already always signified through a racialised gendered 'truth' that constituted her body as an alien, non-British Italian female body. In other words, her 'blood' (physical/somatic) and 'ethnicity' (culture) always and already marked her as a political disloyal Italian female body irrespective of the fact that she has not actually done anything wrong.

The figure of the 'Italian enemy alien' was further amplified by the Australian state with regard to the Southern Italian female subject. From May 1941 to June 1943, Babinda police authorities, Military Forces-Northern Command, Australian Intelligence Corps Queensland and Deputy Director of Security Queensland compiled multiple reports recommending the internment of Margherita Stellino⁶³. Each report, as a biopolitical technology of state violence, omitted and selected fragmented assemblages of her life history and produced slightly differing measurements of the risk that she posed to national security. Yet, there was an agreement amongst

⁶³ AA Qld: BP242/1, Q16936, Stellino Francesco and wife Margherita Queensland Investigation Case File, Investigation Branch, Brisbane. Range May 1941-June 43

these reports that, despite a lack of supporting evidence of disloyal activities, her internment was determined to be necessary. Technologies of racial and gender violence repeatedly wrote her body as that of a ‘bad woman’ who ‘would assist the enemy in case of an invasion’. Suspicious factors that were cited across the reports from the police and the military command were the violent death of her first husband years earlier and her racially inflected Sicilian body⁶⁴. By 1942, the Deputy Director of Security removed the reference to her husband’s death and re-assembled a history that asked for her internment on the following basis:

the woman is not popular either amongst Italians or Britishers. She is regarded as a cunning type of a person and some Italians I interviewed describe her as a bad woman but none of them was prepared to state she was disloyal. This woman is classed as a Sicilian here and most Sicilians are ostracized by Northern Italians. This woman has not been heard to make any disloyal statements and she has not closely associated with pro-Fascists

No evidence can be secured to connect Margherita ... with subversive activities or disloyal utterances but it is strongly suspected that her sentiments are with Italy ... internment again recommended⁶⁵.

This report cannot produce inarguable evidence of a disloyal subject. But, as a biopolitical technology of militarised securitisation, in Perera’s words it ‘draws upon and reworks long established and authorized national’ (Perera 2009, p. 117) and racial-sexual discourses of the ‘cunning’ Sicilian female body. The Southerner, here, as both Southern *and* female, is scripted by mobilizing all of the racialised and gendered stereotypes that attend this sort of subject in the annals of Australian immigration texts: she

⁶⁴ AA Qld: BP242/1, Q16936, Stellino Francesco and wife Margherita Deputy Director of Security for Queensland, Letter, 15 August, 1942. AA Qld: BP242/1, Q16936, Stellino Francesco and wife Margherita Military Forces Northern Command, Report Stellino Francesco, 30 May, 1941.

⁶⁵ AA Qld: BP242/1, Q16936, Stellino Francesco and wife Margherita Deputy Director of Security for Queensland, Letter, 15 August, 1942.

is scripted as cunning, deceitful and naturally prone to crime – despite the material lack of evidence. As such, she is classified as an ‘enemy alien’ and summarily dispatched to the internment camp.

The Internment Camps

In the context of World War Two, the internment camp became a key technology whereby the Australian state attempted to control its designated enemy aliens. The camp, as I have demonstrated throughout the course of my thesis, from Wybalenna to World War Two, has been a fundamental technology through which the white settler-colonial state has worked to banish and eliminate those racialised bodies it has deemed as dangerous or disposable. Caroline and Claudio Alcorso, who is an ex-internee, in accord with this thesis, have argued that the camp is an inextricable part of white Australian defence politics and security concerns that securitised a British-Australian identity and that also fulfilled British imperial interests:

The practice of internment must be seen as an amplification of a politics derived from preoccupations with defense politics and concerns over security in Australia ... From the first days of Federation, the question of national security was tied to ‘politics of white Australia’. Wars were used to preserve a British Australia, white and pure, and the tendency to define the war in racial terms was exacerbated by the entrance of Japan ... It served to provide an identity and sense of superiority to an Anglo-Australian identity. This served to define Australia as part of the British-democratic world. (My translation, Caroline and Claudio Alcorso, 1992 p63)

The politics of internment, based on securitizing the white nation, must also be seen as a technology of ‘ethnic cleansing’ (Naimark 2001) that creates the immediate mobilization and elimination of racial political enemies from the body politic of the nation.

The camp is instrumentalized as a crucial technology that works to secure the sovereignty of the white nation as it becomes part of what Aileen Moreton Robinson argues is ‘the possessive logic of white patriarchal sovereignty’ ‘that refutes and denies what it does not own: Aboriginal Sovereignty’. This logic, Moreton-Robinson argues, is:

underpinned by an excessive desire to invest in reproducing and reaffirming the nation-state ownership, control and domination. As such it is operationalised to circulate meanings about white ownership of the nation, as part of common sense knowledge, decision making and socially produced conventions. (2004a, p. 2)

The camp, then, produced biopolitical racialised prisoners classified as internal enemies of the state. The racial and ethnicised figure of the ‘enemy’ included Indigenous warriors fighting to reclaim Aboriginal sovereignties, a demand that, as Watson argues, ‘is still ‘feared as posing a threat to the security of Australians’ (2007a, p. 20). In this fraught security context, in which the very concept of colonial sovereignty is at stake, ‘alien enemies’ are also scripted as posing a danger to the state. In World War Two, the white settler-colonial state proceeded to dispatch its racialised enemies to zones of confinement and internment, precisely as it had done in the colonial war camp of Wybalenna and in other multilayered recurring formations of the camp, including those that I previously discussed in the context of World War One. The camp, in Perera’s words, must be seen as a meeting point:

the site where the prisoner of war camp meets the long term aims of colonial assimilation/annihilation in the forms of the outstation, the penal camp and the mission. This Australian camp takes varied forms, beginning with Tru-ger-nan-ner and the Bruny Islanders at Wybalena and moving across the spectrum of places where Indigenous people have been removed from their country and confined. (Perera 2002, p. 4)

Following on from Perera, the camp is not simply a recurring technology of violence because it is historically repeated. Its historical recurrence is due to the fact that, as Agamben argues, it is 'a hidden matrix and nomos of the political space in which we live' (1997, p. 107). Situated in the context of the Australian settler-colonial state, the presence of the camp was hardly 'hidden' from the subjects who were dispatched to these zones of confinement; it was, in effect, emblematic of what Irene Watson (2007a) calls the 'settled space of Empire' or the settled colony that is based on the matrix and *nomos* of securitizing the supremacy of white colonial sovereignty by marking *internal* sovereign enemies (Watson 2007a, p. 15, p. 20). In World War Two, this matrix legitimated internment of over thirty different nationalities, including civilian internees or enemy aliens as part of an anxiety and fear over their assertion of political allegiances that were seen to pose a threat to national security.

Around 7,000 civilians identified as enemy aliens were banished from their homes and incarcerated for indefinite periods in internment camps. Internment camps were established at Cowra, Hay (NSW); Holsworthy (Liverpool-NSW); Ennogerah, (Gaythorne-Queensland); Loveday (SA); Tatura (Rushworth-Victoria), Harvey, Rottnest Island (WA). A range of smaller camps and extended prisons were used for containing internees for shorter periods of time. Yet, when war was declared, Ida Marin, who was travelling in the Italian ship the *Remo* to join her husband, was declared a prisoner of war at her arrival and imprisoned for three weeks first in the ship itself and then in a hotel. (Jenkins 1993, pp. 123-126). In 1939, point no. 26 of the *National Security Regulations Act* (Cwlth) enforced the

internment of Australian born and naturalized British subjects whilst enemy aliens were interned by the authority of the military commanders under the *Aliens Control Regulations Act* (Martinuzzi-O'Brien 2006, chapter 9). These laws were enacted in order to secure the self-preservation of white sovereignty, national security and 'public safety':

the interests of the public safety, the defence of the Commonwealth or the efficient prosecution of the war [this act] order[s] any enemy alien to be detained in such place, under such conditions and for such period as this Minister, or so person authorised determines. (Alien Form 1941, Smith 2000, p. 121)

Furthermore, as Smith (2000, pp. 93-113) sums up, there were diverse views amongst state and military authorities on the actual purposes of internment that either defined this as a preventative measure, as precautionary rather than punitive technology or as a selective method restricting the most dangerous or subversive activities. Whichever understanding prevailed, however, the camp was legitimated by its assertion of 'defending' the nation-state and white settler-colonial sovereignty.

The internment of women was also underpinned by the alibi of securitising national sovereignty. The 'Commonwealth War Book,' published before the war, had set out the rules for the detention female suspects in prisons only if absolutely necessary; but in July 1940, following local and British advice, the Minister for External Affairs approved provisions for setting up internment mechanisms that would assess and investigate enemy alien women that were seen as posing a national threat:

as the Army desires to intern, G.O.Cs Commands were informed on 18th July 1940, that enemy women aliens, and those who are naturalised British subjects of enemy origin, may now be interned after full investigation and

where no other alternative form of restriction or control is considered adequate.⁶⁶

Although the military did not fully agree over these mechanisms, female bodies deemed as dangerous would be interned indefinitely ‘in view of the danger of enemy agents amongst women’⁶⁷. Biopolitical mechanisms, then, were militarized as racial and gendered ‘technologies of surveillance and control and practices of detentions and arrests’ of Italian female bodies (Rygiel 2013). The militarized biopoliticization of the body was based on the authorities’ ability to produce, deploy and know enemy aliens and internees, and it is useful here to consider Nah’s (2007, p. 53) point that ‘control on the inside [was] premised on the state’s ability to know its population. It pursues such knowledge with fanaticism; it institutes practices of documentation, categorization, and aggregation’. Ultimately, this would produce the surveillance of all enemy aliens and the internment of a few selected women. For example, although Italian enemy alien women from South Australia were not interned, women like Caterina Pasculli, whose husband was already interned, were terrorized by authorities and told that they were also facing internment (C. Pasculli, 2002 pers. conv. Port Pirie 2 March). These warnings joined Rosa’s narrative on the burning of her family documents, as they worked as biopolitical technologies that produced self-surveillance.

⁶⁶ NAA: A816, 54/301/3, Enemy Women, Department of Defence Co-ordination, Memorandum, 8 August, 1940.

⁶⁷ It was also clarified that the Cabinet was in disagreement over the view that women were less involved in organizing activities inimical to Empire as men or enemy nationality. NAA: A433, 1945/2/6095, Internment of Enemy Women, War Cabinet Minute, Melbourne, 29 August 1940.

The control of the few, however, expanded the ability of the state to intervene or act on selected female subjects. For example, female subjects would be served a detention order and remain in jails or internment camps before a review of their case would be heard. Practices of documentation and exchanges between local police, state Military Commands, Minister of External Affairs and Review Tribunals allowed the sovereign authorities to collect, measure, assess, distinguish, categorize and ultimately to decide if the female subjects were dangerous or politically loyal subjects and/or if they were to continue to be interned. These biopolitical technologies would measure and racially categorise levels of disloyalty, anti-Britishness, pro-Fascism, pro-Italianism, dangerousness, subversiveness, political enmity relations against the Commonwealth and more. What emerge are multilayered biopolitical mechanisms managing the internment of different racial categories of enemy women and populations. In this case, Italian and German ‘enemy alien’ female subjects would be subjected to selective internments whilst Japanese women were part of a mass internment of the Japanese population within Australia (Ganter 2006). As Khoo also reports, whilst 31% of Italian-Australians and 32% of German-Australians were interned, 97% of registered aliens identified as Japanese ‘enemy aliens’ were imprisoned (2003, p.17). Amongst these civilian internees there were also First Nation women. As Peta Stephenson (2007, pp.119-121) notes, those categorised as ‘Aboriginal wives’ of Japanese men ‘who by law took on foreign nationality’ and were categorized as ‘enemy aliens’.

The possibility of war alliances between First Nation People and Japanese-Australian was shaped by raciality as suspicious and dangerous to the national security of white sovereignty. A letter from Mr S McClintock to the Prime Minister John Curtin suggested that survival skills of First Nation People could be used by the Japanese to occupy Australia. He wrote of Australia's Indigenous people as 'untrustworthy' racial subjects and enemies of white sovereignty:

As the Australian Aborigines up North are wonderful bushmen- and unbeatable at finding water etc. – and as they will help anyone for a plug of tobacco and gaudy clothes, it seems to me that they should all be removed far inland from any likely enemy landing places – Darwin, Wyndham, Broome, Carnarvon etc. – as if taken by the Japanese they might prove very useful to them as guides, and in securing water etc. (1 April 1942 reproduced in *Australia at War 1939-1945*)

This 'anxiety' over the formation of enemy relations would play a part in both the refusal to enlist those racially categorised as of 'full bloods' until at least 1942 and in the incarceration of women in mixed-race marriages. As discussed in Chapter Two, mixed race sexual relations and intermarriages were already criminalised and proscribed as undesirable and dangerous to white settler sovereignty. This racial fear was reconfigured by war technologies in order to incarcerate Indigenous women, their partners and their children who were all branded as Japanese enemy aliens. Peta recalls the life of Mary Ellenor (Lena) Corpus who had married Kakio Matsumoto and after years of legal intrusion into her relationships found herself at Tatura Internment camp separated from her husband and with four young children:

Following her separation from her husband, Lena's mental health deteriorated ... She did not know why she was being held and was forced to live far from her country and extended kin. Despite recommendations

from medical officers and other authorities that Lena's mental health might improve if she were sent to Beagle Bay mission ... the Western Australia Deputy Director of Security did not permit her relocation. He argued instead, that from a security perspective her association with Japanese people, both before and after internment, should be regarded with suspicion. He went on to note that he objected in principle to the association of Asiatics and native women and urged that Lena and Kakio's case presented a good example of the inadvisability of such undesirable unions. The commission of Native Affairs in Perth concurred, advising against her relocation to Beagle Bay ... 'she would be a menace to the safety of Australia if she were sent back to the Broome area'. (2007, p. 120)

The military biopoliticization of Indigenous people and the mass internments of Japanese civilians were then interlocked by biopolitical racial technologies of violence that were constitutive of the matrix and nomos of white sovereignty.

Within the framework of internment, Italian enemy alien women were selectively interned. This 'selection' in effect kept numbers of Italian female internees lower, but it also to maximized terror, as it kept women's lives suspended in uncertainty and under constant fear of the possibility of being interned. Most of the detained female internees were imprisoned at the Tatura Camp in Victoria, where a family camp was also established. These women had to formally apply to have their children interned with them and at times they were threatened with denial, as was the case for Ganora Luigina in Cairns, whose younger daughter was not given permission to join her mother and older sister⁶⁸. It was the case (not always) that if interned women were married their husbands would have also already been interned. In this setting children were not always interned with their parents (either by parents' choice or military refusal).

⁶⁸ AA Qld:BP242/2, Q30238 . Ganora Luigina Queensland Investigative case file 1942-45 Tatura Camp, Censored Personal Letter, 19 June, 1943

The daughter of Carmela Travia, who was interned on 6 June 1942 for three months in the Fremantle prison, recalls the difficulties of not having both parents at home:

There were four of us children living at home at the time mother was taken...On 2 June 1942 after shopping in Fremantle for my mother I returned home and found three large tall strangers at our front door. My mother was with them and crying. She said 'They have come to intern me, Angela, get in touch with Father John Ryan ... The drama of war and the fear that accompanies it did not result in physical injuries or death in my family. However, the hurt received when they were interned remained with my parents until their deaths. The trauma suffered by young children left alone without support and the indignity suffered by two serving sons who had both parents interned also are hard to forge. (Angela Wayne 1992 reproduced in Bosworth 1992, pp. 112-114)

The detention of female subjects occurred largely between 1941 and 1942.

The following is a summary list of the regime of knowledge referred to by authorities for interning women:

- 1- Having been prominent active members of Italian Fascist organisations (that is, members of the Women's branches of the Women's Fascio, Inspector of Youth Fascist organizations, Workers Fascist groups; connected to House of Italy);
- 2- Wives of prominent members of the PNF;
- 3- Having membership to the PNF;
- 4- Displayed Anti-British sympathies (that is, made statements against Britain or Australia);
- 5- Pro-Italians (that is, they swore loyalty to Italy or Mussolini)
- 6- Linked to Fascist activities (donated during the Abyssinian war, were founding member of Italian organisation that became linked to Fascism such as the Italian schools);
- 7- Associated with pro-Fascists and suspected of being anti-British and pro-Fascist;
- 8- Interference with the war efforts;
- 9- Considered visible immoral bodies/ leaders or active participants in their communities;
- 10- Husband had already been interned;

In the context of the hegemonic moral values that framed government policies with regard to women, as also discussed in Chapter Two, the 'ideal' white bourgeoisie heteronormative family always expected women to be primarily home-carers. This is noted by Maddalena Carmelina Meoli

who was interned for ‘no real reason’ and could not find someone who could vouch for her loyalty to the state in her objection to her internment: she writes, ‘I feared they [her Australian neighbours] rather disliked me because I did work on the farm which is contrary to local usage’⁶⁹.

When contrasted with male internees, such as the notorious case of Francesco Fanti who was killed by Fascists in the Loveday Camp in S.A. or the internment of the anarchist Carmagnola, there is no strong evidence, according to the files that I have managed to access, that suggests women internees had been affiliated with left or radical politics (see Cresciani 2000, p. 219). The state of exception created by martial law enabled the ignoring of women’s Australian naturalization and/or birth status and by so doing it scripted these women’s bodies as contaminated by a racialised ‘blood politics’. This locked female bodies in filiations with Italy as a nation and as ethnic Italians and by so doing it racialised female subjects as ‘foreign’ Italian enemies, regardless of their Australian citizenship status (Chow 2002).

To better understand how women were interned I will now move to analyze what I have come to call the F-Files. I have uncovered 40 or so files of civilian internees. This is not the total numbers of women internees, but it represents an approximation of the total number. This next section will move to name the women in these files and discuss more

⁶⁹ AA QLD: A367/1, C69238, Meoli Maddellana Carmelinda, Investigation Branch Melbourne and Canberra Victorian Advisory Committee, Objection by M.C. Meoli, September, 1942.

selectively the content of some of these files. It is relevant here to consider the differences in state responses to internment as noted by Caroline and Claudio Alcorso as part of the politics of internment:

[E]very state could decide to respond differently. In Victoria they had chosen a realistic view: the availability of labour was important and Italians followed the law and were peaceful. In Victoria they interned only few (self) declared Fascists. In Queensland they chose to intern individuals from the numerous Italian communities of the north. But NSW was the worst ... as [authorities] were obsessed with subversive activities from foreigners (1992, p. 55).

As the internment of Italian women varied between states and was run by different commands, I will analyse these files by considering their geographical location. However, due to space limitations, I will only discuss in detail the internment cases pertaining to NSW and Victoria. I have included my summary documentation of all the other Italian-Australian females' internment files in Appendix A. I include these in an Appendix as, significantly, they have never before been brought to documentary light and I believe that they can prove invaluable to future researchers in the field.

Eastern Command: Essential Internments and National Security in NSW

There are seven names and five files of Italian civilian internees from NSW. These files do not represent the total number of internments under the Eastern Command. Internal correspondence leaves unresolved the suggestion that the Australian Military Forces was also

anticipating interning ten more women and eleven children⁷⁰. The civilian internees, however, were all interned throughout 1941. That is, at a time when Australian troops were directly fighting against Italian soldiers in Egypt and were entering Libya with the siege of Tobruk taking place from April to December 1941. The grounding element for women's internment in NSW was membership in Fascist associations and marriage or family connection to Fascist members. Kate Stassi (interned 12 June 1941) was profiled as married to an interned active member of the PNF and as the Directress of the *Fascio Femminile*. These connections were posed as signifiers of an Italian dangerous political body that required detention⁷¹. Rosina Giacosa and her daughter Iliana Giacosa (interned 8 July 1941) are discussed in the files as caught in an internal dispute between the Eastern Command and Office of External Affairs. Their silenced bodies were written within the kinship of a racial heteronormative Italian family unit signified as a dangerous site of politics⁷². Fanelli Iolanda (interned 10 July 1941), was terrorized by public and state-based scrutiny when her application to return to Italy after her husband and son had been interned was leaked to the media. Military and state

⁷⁰ AA Vic: MP: 508/1, 259/715/211, Internment of Women Report-Eastern District 3/3/1942, Internment of Women Accommodation for interned families, Dept. Of Army.

⁷¹ NAA: A367 C18000/445, Objection No.53 of 1941 - Kate STASSI - Advisory Committee No.1, Investigation Branch Melbourne and Canberra, 6 May, 1941.

⁷² AA Vic: MP508/1, 255/740/184, Giacosa Rosina Detention Order, Australian Military Forces, Eastern Command, Rosina Giacosa, 21 May 1941; AA Vic: MP508/1, 255/740/184, Giacosa Rosina Detention Order, Australian Military Forces, Eastern Command, Rosina Giacosa, Iliana Giacosa, Inez Bagnara 16 July 1941.

authorities declared Iolanda's internment (with her son) as essential as 'public morale will be adversely affected' if she were left free⁷³. Mary Josephine Merlino (interned 27 June 1941) was profiled as an active member of the *Fascio Femminile* and the Younger Set. Her activities with young boys were defined as deceptive and 'harmful'. The Review Tribunal narrated Mary's body as preparing the boys for 'war'. The Tribunal, in other words, reproduced the same fears that, as I discussed above, were also articulated in the 1936 *A Summary Of Italian Fascist Activities and Propaganda in Australia*, that accused women of creating disloyal children.⁷⁴

One of the first military applications for detention from the Eastern Command occurred on 4 April 1941 based on the dossier of Rosina Giacosa and Iliana Giacosa. This file biopoliticised their bodies by writing them within the borders of the racial heteronormative patriarchal family unit. In this file, the heteronormative unit of the 'kinship family' is deployed to consolidate homogenised and unitary shared familiar political commitment to Italian Fascism – regardless of the lack of evidence that the daughter had any Fascist leanings or affiliations. Located within the military-security complex of the biopolitical state, the Italian family unit is reconfigured as homogenised site of membership to the *Fascio* and is signified by the Eastern Command as procuring the necessity for interning

⁷³AA NSW: 367/1, C69276: Fanelli Iolanda, Australian Military Forces Eastern Command, Dossier by Sydney Police Headquarters, 5 August 1940.

⁷⁴NAA: 367/1, C69264, Merlino Mary Josephine Canberra, Investigation Branch Canberra and Melbourne, Review Tribunal 16/6/1941.

Rosina and her daughter Iliana who was 22 years old. This file then writes in what Chow warns are kinship bonds that are produced as a form of 'biopolitical warfare' that 'can be directed at the purpose of advancing one's own kin(d)' (2007 pp. 178-179). The dossier, in fact, documents and assembles a family history that records and reduces Rosina, her interned husband and her two daughters, to an homogenised membership of the *Fascio*, again despite the lack of specific evidence. The dossier binds the entire Italian family into an undifferentiated unit that shares political membership to the *Fascio-Luigi Platania* and to the Italian Youth of the Littorio (GILE); they are thereby deemed a 'dangerous' unit that necessitates internment of the entire family⁷⁵.

Ministerial authorities, however, questioned the Eastern Command's request. It was stated that 'women can be suitably interned where this course is considered essential' and that Giacosa's membership to the *Fascio* did not make this internment 'essential'. It requested that the Military authorities actually evidence the subversive or dangerous nature of the women's activities.⁷⁶ This request, indeed, went further by interlocking the urgency of producing the 'essential' evidence to the fate of transnational captured bodies of British female prisoners of war in Italy: Such action might have unpleasant consequences for Australian women in enemy territory and it was obviously desirable to avoid any kind of

⁷⁵ AA Vic: MP508/1, 255/740/184, Giacosa Rosina Detention Order, Australian Military Forces, Eastern Command, Application for Detention Order, 15 April 1941.

⁷⁶ AA Vic: MP508/1, 255/740/184, Dept. of the Army- Secretary, Minister Minute Paper, 21, May, 1941.

retaliatory action by Germany or Italy. External affairs felt that each case should be given closest scrutiny if only to enable us, if any enemy woman internment is queried through diplomatic channels ... to say clearly and definitely that the internment is warranted on security grounds⁷⁷.

The Eastern Command responded to the ministerial authorities by arguing that from a national security viewpoint the internment of Mrs Giacosa was warranted -- even at risk of a possible retaliatory internment of Australian women in Italy. Rosina Giacosa was, as a result, unequivocally defined as a threat to National Security:

[T]hose who are considered to be dangerous from a National Security point of view [are] those whose husbands were active members of the *Fascio*, and those who had close association with political activities of that organization⁷⁸.

So Rosina and her daughter Ilania were 'dangerous subjects' not for what they actually did but for their filiations to a 'kinship family' that was re-imagined as a racialised site of political danger.

Alternative *Fasci* in NSW

Kate Stassi's story as an internee cut across a number of major internment files. Categorised by the military authorities as the Directress of the *Fascio Femminile* in Sydney, she was profiled as politically disloyal, and as a Fascist leader that would cause trouble:

⁷⁷ AA Vic: MP508/1, 255/740/184, Dept. of the Army, Minister Minute Paper 21 May, 1941,

⁷⁸ AA Vic: MP508/1, 255/740/184, Dept. of the Army, Australian Military Forces Eastern Command 6 June, 1941.

[H]er release might be likely to occasion serious unrest in section of the Australian community in Sydney where her Fascist activities have been notorious⁷⁹.

The appeal by Kate Stassi to the Advisory Committee in 1941 for unconditional release worked to unsettle the biopolitical racial gendering of her body as a politically female disloyal subject. In her narrative appealing for freedom, significantly, she did not denounce Fascism per se even as she represented herself as a devoted social worker and conscientious Christian:

For many years I have been interested in benevolent and Social Work amongst Australians and the Italian communities. I have given valuable assistance to Hospitals and Prisons Authorities, I have translated for the doctors, superintendents sisters and patients. I have organised functions to raise money in order to assist the destitute in Australia and Italian cases ... I have alleviated unfortunate and distressing cases only when they seek my assistance, which is hard to refuse as some of the humble Italians are so helpless, when in trouble they have appealed to me for food, clothing and money to provide medicine for their sick children ... I am a true conscientious Christian woman.⁸⁰

This narrative deployed a Fascist female body that, as discussed above, had already been figured by Fascist technologies of race, gender and sexuality as part of the 'social' domain (Spinazze 2006, p. 58). The declaration of Kate's 'valuable assistance' to such institutions as 'Hospitals and Prisons' configured a white Italian-Australian female body that was shown to be (covertly Fascist but) loyal to the Australian nation-state and its polity.

Stassi's counter-knowledge was dismissed by authorities. The Report from the Advisory Committee that heard Kate's appeal dismissed her

⁷⁹ AA Vic: MP 1103/2, N9647, Prisoner of War/Internee: Stassi, Kate; Date of birth - 27 March 1889; Nationality – British Prisoners of War Information Bureau, 23 May 1941

⁸⁰ AAVic: A367, C18000/44 Objection No.53 of 1941 - Kate STASSI - Advisory Committee No.1, Investigation Branch Melbourne and Canberra, 6 May, 1941

narrative as with ‘no regards for the truth’. It then re-asserted a patriarchal white sovereign regime of truth:

...she is a woman of dominant personality, enamored of social prestige, and extremely fond of appearing in public in positions of prominence. Her association with the *Fascio* afforded her the opportunity of gratifying her social ambition.⁸¹

The Military Command of NSW refuted that social activities were not politically disloyal. In a military report on the activities of the Women’s *Fascio* a month later after the Review, the Eastern Command formalised the description of the *Fascio Femminile* as essentially a Fascist organisation performing ostensibly ‘social’ activities in order to further Fascist goals:

[T]he Principal work ... consisted in visiting the homes of sick and poor Italians, and in visiting the hospitals, asylums and prisons ... This Opera Assistenziale (Relief Work) ostensibly a work of charity, would appear to have been in reality a subtle form of propaganda, the Fascists being well aware that the way to a man’s heart is not necessarily through his sense of ethics.⁸²

The deployment of biopolitical racial technologies of gender locked Kate’s body to constitute a ‘woman’ using ‘unscrupulous methods’ and that effectively enabled her detention on the grounds that it was ‘for the community well-being’.

⁸¹AAVic: A367, C18000/44 Objection No.53 of 1941 - Kate STASSI - Advisory Committee No.1, Investigation Branch Melbourne and Canberra, 6 May, 1941

⁸² AAVic: A367, C18000/44 Objection No.53 of 1941 - Kate STASSI - Advisory Committee No.1, Investigation Branch Melbourne and Canberra, 6 May, 1941

Victoria: Southern Command

When considering more specifically women's internment in Victoria, it is clear that by August 1941 the Southern Command had produced a view that Italian and German female bodies linked to the *Fascio Femminile* and *German's Frauenschaft* were not 'engaged in politics'. This contributed to a lower rate of women's internment. The security report from the Southern Command '*Internment of Women: Fascio (Women's Section) and Frauenschaft*', dated 28 August 1941, argued that there were 62 members of the *Fascio Femminile* when the war broke out⁸³ and that this branch was 'conspicuous for its charitable work' and as supporting every enterprise initiated by the *Fascio*. In keeping with the case of the Giacosa family discussed above, the report deployed a biopolitical technology of 'family warfare' that selected, measured and assessed the political practices of 'prominent' female bodies by interlocking women's bodies within the 'kinship' of the heteronormative patriarchal family unit and its assumed filiative relations (Chow, 2007). In this case, the political loyalty of women's activities was measured by the extent of their relation with their 'father' and/or 'husbands,' who were also all members of the PNF. In this instance, however, the report's findings set up women's activities as non-political:

Neither the *Fascio Femminile* nor the *Frauenschaft* was engaged in politics, other than that the members followed the politics and tenets of

⁸³ NAAMP: MP508/1, 255/702/1346 *Internment of Women' Fascio (Women's Section) and Frauenschaft*, National Australian Forces, Southern Command, Report, Head Quarters, 28 August, 1941).

their husbands.⁸⁴

The interlocking of the Italian female body within the kinship of the heteronormative patriarchal family and its filiations produced a gendered hierarchy that was assumed to be circulating within stereotypical notions of the Italian family unit and that positioned female political bodies as ‘followers’ of male politics. I would argue that this is also part of the military recognition that gender and sexual hierarchies were operative within Fascism and configured by its respective social and political divisions (Spinazze 2006, p. 58; Re 1995). This enmeshed the activities of suspected prominent female subjects such as Mrs Giannini, Mrs Borsi, Misses Triaca, Mrs Valente and Mrs Iambese within their families’ patriarchal filiations. These women were not interned and this stood in contrast to the Eastern command embodiment of women’s Fascist activism as a ‘subtle form of [Fascist] propaganda’.

It is unclear how many women who were identified as Italian enemy aliens were actually interned in the state of Victoria. The only available files are that of Maria Costella (interned 7/11/42) and that of her daughter Antonetta, who agreed to be interned with her mother (interned)⁸⁵. Victorian authorities scripted Maria Costa as a defiant enemy alien. In effect, the shift away from interning members of the women’s *Fascio* set up a focus on monitoring compliance to war-based disciplinary relations.

⁸⁴ NA Vic: MP508/1, 255/702/1346, *Internment of Women’s Fascio (Women’s Section) and Frauenschaft*, Southern Command, 28 August, 1941

⁸⁵ NAA367/1: C80286, Security Services, Recommendation for Detention Order, Deputy Director of Security of Victoria, November 1942.

The *Particulars of Person for Internment Form* operates as a technology of security that determined Maria's detention as essential as 'a restriction order would not be adequate'. The authorities determined Maria to be a dangerous risk to the nation:

- She makes no secret of her love of Fascism;
- She has regularly associated and corresponded with persons of known Fascist sympathies;
- She has shown little regard for national security, particularly having regard to the wireless equipment seized at the time of the search of her premises;
- She is a potential danger in that she may either harbour escapees from internment camps or persons of Fascist leanings;
- The changed international situation.⁸⁶

Maria is here represented as visibly displaying political enmity relations of a war against British-Australian sovereignty and, critically, as a dangerous 'enemy within' requiring internment. Recently, Antonetta (Maria's daughter) has spoken of her mother's internment not by denying her Fascist leaning, but by underscoring Maria's defiant politically forceful and antagonist stance:

Mum didn't pull any punches when it came to the politics either. She was pro-Fascist and pro-Mussolini. She had a ham radio from which she used to obtain bulletins directly from Italy and distribute them amongst the Italians. Her catch cry over the airwaves used to be 'Zio Roberto's doing well', and what the authorities didn't know was that 'Roberto' stood for Rome, Berlin and Tokyo. She was a member of the Cavour Club, a prominent Italian community club, before the War. There they used to teach all of us to recite the words 'I love Australia, my native land; I love Italy, my motherland'. We had to be faithful to both. (Cited in De Bolfo 2002, p. 109)

Let me immediately emphasise, before I proceed any further, that I am in no way validating or supporting Maria's Fascist politics. On the contrary,

⁸⁶ NAA: 367/1, C69871, Maria Costella, Particulars of Person for Internment Form, Security Service, Melbourne, July 1942.

I find Fascism in all of its forms abhorrent. Rather, what I want to bring into focus here are the complexities of political positions precisely as they are complicated by questions of race, gender and agency. Her daughter's narrative, for example, evidences these interlocking complexities; she scripts Maria in terms of a defiant subject that is pro-Fascist, sometimes more visibly than others, outsmarting, fighting and breaking British rules. De Bolfo, in the same short biography of Maria, goes further by explaining that this defiance was anti-British, in the sense of being connected to Maria's loss of her husband in World War One. As De Bolfo noted, this death created for Maria and her children a sense of 'want[ing] nothing to do with anything that helped England' (2002, p.109). In light of this, Maria emerges as a Fascist who was defiant and forceful but also as a subject who was imprinted by the suffering that had been connected to a British imperial war and the loss of her husband. Maria was eventually interned in the Tatura Camp where she would be kept under constant sovereign surveillance until 19 January 1944.

Before finalizing this chapter, I want to introduce the name of the diasporic civilian internees from Western Australia and Queensland that were interned. More details on each name have been included in the Appendix. In Western Australia, the women were all interned in 1942 and they included: Gregorina Nina Caterina, Aurelia Bonomi and her daughter Adelia, Anita Sertorio and Elizabeth Funazzi and Carmela Travia⁸⁷. In

⁸⁷ NAA: A367/1, C69585 Sertorio Anita, Investigation Branch Melbourne and Canberra;

Queensland we find that the women were captured between 1941 and 1942 from the Northern Queensland regions, and they included: Catherine Grimaz, Maria Barbi, Gina Omodei, Agata Villari, Carolina Garrone, Catrina Bergamatti, Assunta Gianocelli, Angiolina Costa, Anna Mazzocchi, Maria De Giovanni, Felicia Randazzo, Fontanella Veronica, Alfano Elena, Rosalia Albanese, Carmelina Meoli, Ines Gatti, Luigina Ganora, Lily Teresa Ganora, Artura Tullia Valente, Maria Fasano, Franceschina Merenda, Maria Franci and Vittoria Fenoglio, Maria Caruso, Chiara Curcurito, Maria Ghidella, Giovanna Nosenzo, Elena Catalano⁸⁸.

This list is not final. And it is symbolic of my attempt to re-open the archives and reconsider its outlawed subjects. These names, however, do not stand alone, as it is also important to acknowledge that many children and partners accompanied these women and under the directives of a militarised biopolitical surveillance lived in abject conditions of the interment camp. These women joined the many internees and prisoners of war of the Australian internment camps. Many of the civilian women

NAA A367/1, C69870 Funazzi I Mary Elizabeth, Investigation Branch Canberra and Melbourne; AA Vic: MP1103/1, WF15210, Prisoner of War/Internee: Gregorini, Nina Caterina; Date of birth - 06 February 1892; Nationality – Italian, Melbourne; AA Vic: MP1103/1, WF15260, Prisoner of War/Internee: Travia, Carmela; Date of birth - 27 June 1902, Melbourne, Prisoners of War information Bureau; AA Vic: MP1103/1, WF15279, Prisoner of War/Internee Bonomi, Aurelia; Date of birth - 25 September 1900; Nationality – Italian, Melbourne, Prisoners of War Information Bureau; AA Vic: MP1103/2, 15200-15305 Italian, Bonomi Adele;

⁸⁸ For records of files of women interned in Queensland see Reference List/Primary sources.

became sick in the camp and saw other women dying in the camp (Palombo 2007; Bignall 2008). Furthermore, as the recent work of Spizzica (2011) on the families of internees evidences, many ex-internees faced financial bankruptcy and ruin, health issues and even premature death associated with their lives as internees. Other women from Port Pirie, who stood accused of being active fascists, were shamed and never given an opportunity to explain their motivations. Most importantly, it is important not to forget that the damage done by unjust internment lingered in the lives of the internees: as Angela Wayne recalls, the ‘hurt received ... remained with my parents until their deaths’ (p.113).

The Australian state’s deployment of practises the interning of enemy aliens in the course of World War Two must be seen as part of a long, often discontinuous and fractured pattern of deploying the Australian Camp as a critical biopolitical technology by which it sought to preserve and reproduce the white settler-colonial state. As I proceed to outline in my conclusion, in the contemporary context of refugees and asylum seekers, and in the context of the Northern Territory Intervention with its quarantining of Aboriginal communities and suspension of their citizenship rights – the camp is still a critical ‘matrix and nomos of the political space in which we live’ (Agamben 1996, p. 107).

Conclusion

In one of the key final lines of a recent movie on concentration camps, *The Reader*, one of the female guards attempts to pass on her savings to the daughter of an ex-internee who had recently died. This act is rejected by the daughter of the ex-internee with the line ‘that nothing good comes out of the camps. Nothing’. Regardless of this sharp and unconditional observation, the Australian state has continued to deploy and mutate its use of the camp. The continuous use of the camp in the context of the history of the Australian settler-colonial state evidences Agamben’s (1998) warning that the camp has now become a permanent presence in the annals of nation-state formations. The camp as a *norm*, as I have argued throughout the course of thesis, operates as a biopolitical technology of violence produced by an arsenal of raciality that has ensured and securitised the occupation and territorialization of white state colonial-settler sovereignty. In fact, as I am writing this Conclusion, asylum seekers have been captured by the repressive forces of the Australian state and are being held in indefinite imprisonment in on-shore and offshore detention centers and even on the sea in prison-ships. The Australian Government has also now returned Tamil asylum seekers to the very genocidal Sri Lankan state that they have escaped. Dispatched right back into the hands of the very state that currently stands accused of human rights abuse and war crimes against its own Tamil population, the Australian government must be seen as complicit in sanctioning, indirectly, the very war crimes condemned by the international community.

In the context of the critical examination of the role of the camp as deployed by the settler-colonial Australian state, I am lead to conclude that something, indeed, does come out of the camp and that is the violence unleashed by the Australian state in order to ensure at every turn its self-preservation. In the course of this thesis, I have argued and demonstrated that the camp, from Wybalenna to World War Two, has been instrumental in the territorialization of a violent, white settler Australian nation-state and its global interests. Its continual re-occurrence, and its mutations, does not operate as an ‘exception’. Rather, it has become a norm produce by a European onto-epistemology of raciality that has grounded and saturated the daily life of the nation-state and its (in)securities. Viewed in this light, I have argued that the camp must be seen as a critical part of the array of biopolitical racial technologies of violence and killing that has operated in terms of intensive processes of territorialization. These processes have spatialized and secured the ongoing operations of the white settler-colonial nation state. In Perera (2009) terms, this is part of the spatialization of an ‘insular’ national mentality. Indigenous people and diasporic subjects have been shaped by this territorialization, including, being captured and imprisoned in the various camps as I have evidenced throughout the chapters of this thesis.

The repeated immunization and consolidation of white sovereignty is based on the lack of an ‘originary’ sovereign authority, a lack resulting from the Australian nation-state’s troubling colonial illegitimacies.

Crucially, the camp has been one of the key biopolitical technologies that have been enabled by, as well as being constitutive of, what Aileen Moreton-Robinson terms as ‘the possessive logic of white patriarchal sovereignty’. This logic is predicated foremostly on the denial or extinguishment of Indigenous people’s sovereignties and finds expression in the overall attempt to obliterate such sovereign lives -- precisely as I demonstrated in the analysis of the violent events preceding and occurring within the colonial Wybalenna Camp. Indigenous people’s sovereignty is today, as Watson (2007a, p. 20) argues, still ‘feared as posing a threat to the security of Australians’. The fact that Australia’s Indigenous people remain the racialised figure of the ‘enemy’ is brutally evidenced by the current policy of the Northern Territory Intervention, formally known as the *Northern Territory National Emergency Response* (Cwth), deployed on 21 June 2007 (Kramer 2014). This Act, again, must not be seen as an exception; rather, it works to continue to secure ongoing state control over Aboriginal lives. The breadth of the historical period that I examined in this thesis has shown how the forced internalization of Indigenous people within a white colonial legal-juridico order has operated attempts to obliterate Aboriginal sovereignties. As I have demonstrated, the territorialization of a European onto-epistemology of raciality already figured Australia’s First Nation people as ‘enemies’. The Indigenous warriors fighting to reclaim their sovereignties, the Indigenous non-citizens, so-called ‘full bloods,’ ‘half-castes,’ the ‘immoral’ women of mixed-race relations – all of these subaltern subjects were already and always defined as enemies before the law of the colonial-settler state, and

they were therefore criminalized, punished, killed or biopolitically left to die with impunity. In other words, the racial arsenal of the white settler-colonial state positioned Indigenous people as the ‘non-bodies’ of the law (da Silva 2007), and thus they were denied access to justice. Situated in this context of this violent settler-colonial history, when the Australian government declared, in 2007, a state of exception under the aegis of the Northern Territory Intervention, sending military troops and case/social workers into Aboriginal homelands, the law continued to do what it has always done. That is, it legitimated the exercise of the state violence of the white Australian state. Following the paternal logic of white colonial-settler state, this Act was configured as ‘protecting’ children perceived to be living in communities of ‘*necessitas*,’ that is, in zones where perpetual violence reigned. What was required, then, was the forceful and orderly intervention of the militarised white sovereign state in order to rectify this. Viewed in this biopolitical context, the camp must be seen as operating as axiomatic in the formation and existence of the white settler-colonial state, ensuring its self-preservation.

As the thesis has shown, however, anti-colonial politics continued to be exercised by the First Nation People captured and imprisoned in the Wybalenna Camp. The *Flinders Island Chronicle*, I argued, even as it operated under the white editorial surveillance of colonial authorities, also evidenced the fragmented traces of the anti-colonial politics circulating within the very locus of the camp. It brought to light, in other words, the exercise of Indigenous agency in the face of the most genocidal conditions.

As I have discussed throughout this thesis, the Australian nation-state has long drawn from the onto-epistemology of raciality that has established racial, heteronormative and gendered hierarchies and categories to calculate and measure the assimilable value of diasporic political bodies circulating within the social. The Australian liberal nation-state has relied on biopolitical racial technologies to produce the segregation, banishment and forceful assimilation of non-Anglo subjects into its settler-colonial order and its larger, transnational British imperial interests. The camps established in World War One operated as modern military technologies of security that served to forcefully redefine the limits of whiteness by violently enforcing a total turn to British imperial interests. This produced a division of the population into citizens and ethnicised diasporic subjects identified as ‘enemy aliens’. German civilians were the largest group of diasporic subjects subjected to indefinite detention and exposure to the abject and often violent conditions of the camp. This historical moment, I demonstrated, also saw the Australian state’s refusal to grant so-called ‘full blood’ Indigenous people the right to enlist or fight in its imperial war. To add insult to injury, the so-called ‘half-castes’ who were allowed to enlist were, on their return to Australia, barred from accessing any social benefits or recognition as returned soldiers.

The inter-war period saw the further strengthening of the biopolitical Australian nation-state with the deployment of a number of surveillance and securitizing measures. The demand for assimilation became enmeshed

with immigration technologies that worked to screen, select and monitor Southern Europeans and especially Southern Italians, who were repeatedly seen as types of biocriminals. These racialised biotechnologies drew upon a European onto-epistemology that had already postulated these bodies as physically and morally inferior, criminal and unassimilable. Technologies of gender and sexuality, working together with this racial arsenal, hierarchised and categorised women from the southern regions of Italy as untrustworthy and as posing a danger to the purity and morality of the white race.

In the inter-war period, I argued, the continual surveillance of Indigenous and diasporic politics was evidenced by the introduction of national- and state-based media regulations. This securitized the treatment of the *Australian Abo-Call*, which was demanding equal rights, and the anarchist-based Italian-Australian newspapers *La Riscossa*, *Il Risveglio*, *L'Avanguardia Liberale* that attempted to espouse a radical politicization of diasporic subjects and forcefully opposed Italian Fascism. Significantly, as I demonstrated in Chapter 6, the liberal state admired and supported the violent and imperial ideology of Italian Fascism and they collaborated on the closure of the anarchist newspapers.

As I evidence in my final chapter, it was in the mid-1930s, as Italy began to challenge British imperial dominions, that the Australian state finally began to view Fascism as a threat, so that by the outbreak of World War Two, the state mobilised more intensive surveillance regimes that would

see the internment of Italian-Australians, regardless of the fact that often the internees had committed no crime. The internment of Italo-Australian women, as I contend in Chapter 7, demonstrates how the militarised biopoliticization of targeted ethnic groups is clearly grounded on pre-defined racial differentiations that gendered and produced these female bodies as immoral, suspicious, criminal and dangerous to white state sovereignty.

When those who had been unjustly interned returned home, many felt shame from their internment, suffered great economic hardship and stress-related health conditions. Francesca Miranda recounts that she did not publicly speak about her internment with her family at Tatura until the day she got a job with the Commonwealth Department of Immigration. She refused to participate in many of the recent community calls for ‘recognition and reconciliation’ of the plight of these internees; she did, however, make sure that her story would be told and heard (F Merenda 2002 pers. conv. Sydney 28 August). In 1991, in Perth, after intensive initial lobbying from Sonia Turkington (nee Calligaro), and later on from Liberal Senator Panizza, a dinner attended by sixty nine ex-internees was organized in Perth as part of this movement for ‘recognition and reconciliation’ from the state. The then Prime Minister, the Hon. Bob Hawke AC, in a letter to the ex-internees attending the dinner, said at the time: ‘I am proud to state that your mistaken internment in the 1940s was based on community attitudes of the time and would not occur in the multicultural Australia of 1991’ (1991 cited in Piccolo, Parliament of South Australia). This self-congratulatory assertion has proven, post-9/11,

to be entirely untenable following, for example, the racial profiling and unjust incarceration of Dr Mohamed Haneef by the Australian Federal Police.⁸⁹

On 20 June 2012, a detailed motion was moved by Mr Papalia in the Western Australian Parliament, in which he asked the House to acknowledge the presence of the internment camps for the purpose of detaining ‘enemy aliens’ and to ‘recognise the pain, suffering, grief and hardship experienced by the people who were interned and their families ... mothers and wives who were left to care for children, homes, farms or businesses without government assistance (Papalia, Parliament of Western Australia, Wednesday 20 June 2012, pp. 4100a-4117) (see Appendix B). The content of this motion was almost identical to a motion passed by Labor Senator Tony Piccolo in the South Australian Parliament on 10 November 2011 (see Appendix C). Piccolo’s motion, however, was exclusively concerned with ‘all internees of the Loveday Camp’ in South Australia (Piccolo, Parliament of South Australia, 10 November 2011 pp. 5926-5933). The important gesture of receiving an acknowledgement of, and an apology for, the hardship endured in the internment camps has been driven by survivors of the camp, their families and children of ex-internees. They embody the desire to be formally cleared from the accusations of any wrong doing and for the state to acknowledge the shame and hurt that internment caused (Piccolo, Parliament of South

⁸⁹ See Pugliese Joseph (2007), ‘Preincident Indices of Criminality: Facecrime and Project Hostile Intent,’ *Griffith Law Review*, vol. 18, no. 2 pp. 314-330.

Australia, 10 November 2011 pp. 5296-5933). These parliamentary motions emerge as important gestures that continue to demand the state's acknowledgment of wrong doing and the suffering that it has unjustly caused.

Having drawn attention to the importance of these calls for an acknowledgement of the state's wrongdoing with regard to the unjust internments, I want to conclude this thesis, however, by arguing that these same motions need to be problematised, precisely because I see them as also reconfiguring the Australian state's white settler-colonial sovereignty. A critical examination of one of these motions evidences my concerns. One of the motions, (fully reproduced in Western Australia Appendix B) states, amongst its 10 points, that the Australian state:

acknowledge that amongst the enemy aliens interned were people who were either permanent Australian residents born in Australia or had become British subjects in accordance with Commonwealth of Australia immigration and citizenship laws of the day...

believes that most people were primarily interned in the camps on the basis of their cultural heritage or the mistaken belief that it posed an unreasonable risk, and not for any demonstrated or validated criminal or security concerns...

asserts that, while internment policy was implemented in the circumstances of a national emergency, it nevertheless acknowledges that the injustice experienced by some Australians was unnecessary and avoidable...

hopes that as a maturing nation we have learnt from the World War II internment experience to ensure that future generations of migrants to this country are treated with justice and equality before the law and are not discriminated against on the sole basis of their cultural heritage. (Papalia, Parliament of Western Australia, Wednesday 20 June 2012, pp. 4100a-4117)

These motions, although they articulate an awareness of the unjust force of the state, are also still largely faithful to the concept of liberal rights that the category of Australian citizenship produces. Importantly, Foucault

(2003, p.26) argues that 'the essential role of the theory of right is to establish the legitimacy of power,' in the sense that rights work to legitimate the sovereign actions and the obligations of the population. What I want critically to bring attention to here is the brutal fact that in the 1940s, in the very times moment of diasporic internments of 'Australian residents' and 'British subjects,' as subjects occupying the position of Australian citizens, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were still denied, under the regime of the Protection Acts, the possibility to occupy this position and the attendant rights that it conferred.

What is deeply problematic about the items in the motion quoted above is that the event of unjust internment is still interpreted as 'exceptional' and as affecting largely Australian residents or British subjects in accordance to the citizenship laws of the day. The internments are treated as uniquely 'implemented in the circumstances of World War Two' and as an emergency that at the time suspended citizens' rights. The motion goes as far as to argue that Australia, as a 'maturing nation,' has learnt from this specific event and can move to 'ensure that future generations of migrants ... are treated with justice and equality' (Piccolo, Parliament of South Australia, 10 November, 2011 pp. 5926-5933). As I mentioned above, this self-congratulatory self-representation remains untenable – both in light of the Northern Territory Intervention, and its suspension of Indigenous peoples citizenship rights and Australia's draconian and racialised post-9/11 anti-terror legislation (Pugliese 2007). Furthermore, in scripting the World War Two internments as unique and exceptional, these

parliamentary motions effectively efface the long history of past camps, and their contemporary violent mutations on Manus, Nauru and Christmas Island, that I have drawn attention to in the course of this thesis.

Appendices

Appendix A

Italian-Australian Women Interned in the States of Western Australia, Queensland and South Australia: Documented Cases

Due to the large number of files related to the internee women from Queensland, the archival references have been recorded in the Reference List/Primary Sources page.

Western Australia: Western Command

Women's internment in Western Australia centered on the women's association and membership to the PNF and the *Fascio Femminile*. The report produced by the Western Command *Femminile- Women's Fascio* (*n.d*) named and associated six female subjects who were members of the *Fascio Femminile* and they were all interned (AA Vic: MP 508/1; 255/702/1346, Australian Military Forces, *Femminile- Women's Fascio* Report, July 1941). The Report connected directly the rise of the Women's *Fascio* in Fremantle, Perth, Wiluna and Gwalia to directives sent from Rome from the Italian Vice-Consul of Perth. The activities of the women's *Fascio* were classified as 'fundraising' activities for the building of a Fascist centre and as largely involving the GILE (Italian Youth Organisation Abroad). Amongst the internees Gregorina Nina Caterina (interned 25, March 1942) was described by the military command as a member of the Wiluna PNF and as someone involved in the Women's *Fascio*. Aurelia Bonomi (interned 10 October 1942) was profiled as the leader of the Women's *Fascio* in Gwalia and was interned with her

daughter Adelia. Anita Sertorio, (interned 4 April 1942) was described as the wife of a prominent Fascist and as participating in the collection of funds for *Casa D'Italia*; she was interned and then released on 5 October 1942. Elizabeth Funazzi (4 April 1942) body is narrated as a supporter of the Fascist Regime and as the Directress of Women's Fascio at Fremantle. Her internment was decided on the basis that 'her activities in the Fremantle port could be highly dangerous'. Carmela Travia (interned 6 June 1942) was connected to the GILE in Fremantle and was released in 26 September 1942 (Femminile, Activities of Women in Italian Community, Western Command MP508/1:255/702/1346). As the dates indicate, these women were all interned in 1942 and detained in Western Australia including at Fremantle Prison, Woodmans Point and York at a time when the fear of an invasion from Japan was at his highest.

Anita Sartorio came to the attention of authorities specifically in relation to a letter that she wrote to Mussolini on 20 March 1938. This letter was classified as an appeal for financial aid connected to opening the *Casa D'Italia* (Home of Italy) and as part of an act of disloyalty to the state. The Advisory Committee for WA, that considered her appeal against internment, attached an extract from the letter in its summary report:

[We have worked hard to collect money to build this fine Casa, but the money collected was not sufficient ...to pay it off so as to cut out an excellent figure before our enemies, the English ... I have six children, four males, and in a few years they will be your soldiers; they are growing with the enthusiasm of becoming soldiers of Italy; they want to be under the command of his Excellency Benito Mussolini. (Anita Sertorio, Supreme Court WA; Letter Addressed to Mussolini by Mrs Anita Sertorio 15/6/41A367/1:C69585)

This letter was assessed as a form of ‘disloyal utterance’ to the point that it was instrumentalized to write Anita’s body as racially incompatible with her ‘British citizenship,’ thereby enabling the liquidation of her naturalisation papers and of her status as an Australian citizen. Anita’s is thus classified as a disloyal ethnic foreign enemy. This racialised female enemy is inferiorized further when her body is written within an hierarchy of social classes ‘as one of a poorly educated woman of the peasant class’ (Anita Sertorio, Supreme Court WA 15/6/41A367/1:C69585).

Queensland: Northern Command

In a similar way to other internments, the majority of women internees originated from Northern Queensland. These women were largely interned in 1942, after the bombing of Singapore and due to the growing fear of an advancement of Japanese forces (Rando 2005, Alcorso, 1992). Membership to the Fascio or associations with people in the Fascio was often cited as a key reason used to justify women’s internment. But a very broad range of reasons were used to intern women that included accusations of interfering with war efforts, having returned from Italy just prior to the war, associations with fascists, signing petitions, complaining about house searches.

The Northern Command, in July 1941, reported that ‘the only Women’s *Fascio*’ suspected in the command area was at Babinda and that this was connected to the efforts to establish an Italian school (AA Vic: MP 508/1;

255/702/1346, Australian Military Forces, Femminile- Women's Fascio Report, July 1941). A list was also produced on 23/10/41 with names of women who had applied to establish the Women's Fascio (List of Women, 23 September 1941). The Command, however, was aware that, similarly to Babinda, other branches were established in Ingham and Brisbane.

Files connected to Babinda:

Catherine Grimaz was identified in the writing as the first female to be interned in this location. Identified as married to an internee, she was accused of being an active supporter of the Fascist Party in Babinda and assisting her partner in his duties in the *Fascio*. Her work as 'an interpreter' for Italians during hearing in court cases in Babinda was noted with suspicion and she was accused of holding secret meetings during the war. She was viewed as a dangerous person to be at large and was interned on 4 April 1942 at Tatura. Maria Barbi was described in her file as married to an interned Fascist and as an active worker for the Babinda *Fascio* because of her organizing of fundraising and cultural events. The membership, her husband and her activities are all defined as confirming her pro-Fascist and anti-British sentiments. Maria was interned at Tatura (interned 1 February 1942). Gina Omodei was profiled as married to an internee and as an active female body involved in the formation of a Women's Fascist Association and as donating gold to the Abyssinian cause. Gina was interned at Tatura on 22 April 1942; Agata Villari was profiled as a name that had appeared on a list published in paper *L'Italiano* requesting the formation of the *Women's Fascio* so that an Italian school

could be open locally. This list was instrumentalized in the narrative of the file to identify Agata as enrolled in the Women's *Fascio*. Agata was interned at Tatura on 13 April 1942. Carolina Garrone was interned with her two children at Tatura in 1942 (n.d). Bergamatti Caterina was interned on 6 April 1942 at Tatura, identified by intelligence work as a member of the *Fascio at Babinda*.

Files Connected to Brisbane:

Assunta Gianocelli's file narrated the body of a working nurse for a known Fascist Dr. Vattuone. Assunta was accused of being associated with Fascists and was interned at Tatura in February 1942. She was refused release until 1944s. Costa Angiolina was written as a supporter of Mussolini and as hating Britishers, Fascist statements and anti-British activities for opposing Military service of her son. She was interned at Tatura on 7 April 1942. Mazzocchi Anna was associated with Fascist organization Dante Alighieri and interned at Tatura 22 July 1942. Maria De Giovanni was interned because she had taken a trip to Italy, returning six weeks before the war; she became sick in the camp and was interned at Tatura on 6 April 1942. Felicia Randazzo's body was narrated as a pro-Fascist married to an internee and was interned at Tatura. Fontanella Veronica's file was incomplete, she was interned Tatura 12 June 1942. Alfano Elena's file was incomplete and she was interned 20 October 1942- at Tatura. Albanese Rosalia's file was incomplete and was Interned at Tatura 30 July 1942.

Files Connected to Cairns:

It is unclear why Carmelina Meoli was interned on 16 April 1942 at Tatura. Her body is however interlocked with that of her husband and son who were both interned. After her husband's internment Carmelina wrote a letter that stated 'I can only tell you that from this evening I have become a Fascist, that Mussolini has entered deeply into my heart'. She explained that she had left Italy because of Fascism. Ines Gatti was interned in November 1941. She was profiled as the mother of an internee. Her internment occurred after complaining during a search. Her body was categorised as 'single and immoral' and was categorized as anti-British and very Pro-Italian. Ganora Luigina was interned in January 1942 and her daughter Ganora Lily Teresa joined her in May 1942. Luigina had applied to have both of her daughters interned, but the authorities refused to have her younger daughter interned. Luigina was profiled as a Fascist sympathizer and accused of encouraging members of the Forces to remain longer at her Hotel in Cairns: 'This Hotel could be definitely used as a place to obtain information from drunken sailors. The crews are enticed from their ships and are encouraged to stay overnight. It would be easy for Mrs Ganora or any of other girls to extract information from drunken crew'.

Texas: Valente Artura Tullia, interned on 2 April, 1942 at Tatura. Her husband had been interned and they had three children.

Mossman: Maria Fasano, interned at Tatura 12 April 1942;

Tully: Franceschina Merenda was interned in October 1942 with her mother. Her father had already been interned. She was accused of making

‘Disloyal utterances’. She was educated and active in the participation of the local Italian community. Her censored letters reveal critical misunderstanding about meanings of Italian words by the Australian authorities, for example: fowls = *galline*; and masters = *padrone*. She saw herself as a leader in the Italian community. She was accused of being ‘anti-British’ and as a ‘danger to the Commonwealth’.

Innisfail: Fenoglio Vittoria: Interned after commenting on the war. She owned a pub at Innisfail. She was interned for making statements against British. Five members of British community sent letters in her favour to no avail.

More names of women internees with files include: Maria Caruso, Chiara Curcurito, Maria Ghidella, Giovanna Nosenzo, Catalano Elena.

South Australia: The Heterogenous Signification of Fascism

Women from South Australia were not interned. The military produced a number of dossiers that were to measure the nature of the activities conducted by the *Fascio Femminile* in both Adelaide and Port Pirie and in order to decide if they were subversive or dangerous to state security. Individual dossiers were created on Caterina Paculli directress of the *Fascio Femminile* at Port Pirie, America Vincenza Carolina directress of the *Fascio Femminile* from Adelaide, Giuseppina Maggi and Grigoul Maddalena members of the Fascio in Adelaide. After close inspection the authorities concluded that these activities were ‘social’:

running through many notifications of meetings, dances and celebrations making up the balance of documents in this file is the important part of the *Fascio* took in arranging and decorating these social activities. This apparently is the major individual effort that the Women's *Fascio* was called to do on behalf of Fascism.

The findings of the investigations asserted that the Italian female Fascists did little more than organise social activities and were not interned. The military authorities, however, did not clear these female bodies from accusations of being subversive. In fact, they were left suspended as suspicious subjects, that is, as always open to ongoing investigations and accusations of wrong-doing.

But there is also a contrasting signification of women's activities within the branches that women from this branch have long tried to make public. From a broader Fascist perspective, the Port Pirie branch was also 'accounted for' as raising gold for the Abyssinian cause (Italian Red Cross-Offerte di Oro all Patria, 5 March 1936) and participating in the celebration of the declaration of Abyssinia as an Italian colony (Festival of the Italian Colony, 10 September 1936). These events, however, were not run as single Fascist social activities. As Mazzini notes, they had to operate within local diasporic cultural practices (1992). Intelligence documents collected in the 1940s on the *Fascio Femminile* shows that the branch activities operated within the ongoing configuration of diasporic Molfettese-based cultural events, including the Madonna dei Martiri (8 September, 1938, Adelaide) festival, the Blessing of the Fleet, local weddings and balls (for example, the Ball of the Fishermen's Society) and Catholic rituals (AP501/2:35-Women's *Fascio* of Adelaide; Mazzini, 1992). Viewed in this light, some members of the *Fascio Femminile* must

be seen as consolidating anti-assimilationist practices and not following Fascism itself. This assertion is also confirmed in a set of interviews with women connected to the *Fascio Femminile* and who memorialized the diasporic cultural events that they attended without, however, denying that Fascism was also part of these activities:

They did not do anything wrong ... Then we organized the balls, the Madonna dei Martiri, family parties ... They would always come to my house because I had a big space and they would always come to dance and have fun. (A. Mezzini pers. Comm. 10 March, Port Pirie)

I was dressed in a black skirt and white top ... and a hat and I've got the photo somewhere. A lot of them even mum was involved, they used to do shows...they used to make bags in the ceiling, lucky dips and all that, you know all different things, no they did a lot...and we all enjoyed together...[My mother] she never did nothing, she only went and had photos with all the other people but they did not know much about it. There was not that many people and we always used to be together with each other even if you had a wedding or something you'd all be invited what was there. (A Camporeale 2002, pers. Comm. 10 March Port Pirie)

there was nothing bad, we only had those balls, you know, we used to have a lot of fun, just to have symbol, but there was nothing wrong...but the Australians didn't realize that we were only doing all those things to socialize, not to go against Australia. (Interview cited by Mezzini, 1992)

These women did not attempt to separate the work of the Port Pirie women's *Fascio* branch from Fascism. Rather, their recollections point to the fact that there was an heterogeneous level of support for Fascism and that its strategic intervention in local diasporic formations was complicated by a number of anti-assimilation sociocultural practices (Port Pirie, Oral Interviews, 2002; see also Mezzini, 1992).

Appendix B

Hansard: House of Assembly, Parliament of Western Australian

WORLD WAR II INTERNMENT CAMPS

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro) Wednesday 20 June 2012.

I move — That this house —

- notes the presence of internment camps in the state of Western Australia during the Second World War for the purpose of detaining —enemy aliens and prisoners of war and that some —enemy aliens were transported from Western Australia to internment camps in other states of the commonwealth of Australia;
- acknowledges that amongst the enemy aliens interned were people who were either permanent Australian residents born in Australia or had become British subjects in accordance with commonwealth of Australia immigration and citizenship laws of the day;
- accepts that the overwhelming majority of the people interned at the camps were law-abiding, had made a valuable contribution to Australian society and had posed no threat to the security of the nation or its people;
- believes that most people were primarily interned in the camps on the basis of their cultural heritage or the mistaken belief that it posed an unreasonable risk, and not for any demonstrated or validated criminal or security concerns;
- is aware of research and personal histories that demonstrate that the internment experience had a long-term detrimental impact on the health and welfare of many of the people interned;
- recognises the pain, suffering, grief and hardship experienced by the people who were interned and their families and, in particular, the impact on mothers and wives who were left to care for children, homes, farms or businesses without government assistance;
- congratulates those internees and their families who made the decision to remain in Australia and rebuild their lives following their internment;
- celebrates the lives of those former internees and families who, despite their internment experiences, went on to make a significant contribution to the economic, social and cultural development of Australia;
- asserts that, while the internment policy was implemented in the circumstances of a national emergency, it nevertheless acknowledges that the injustice experienced by some Australians was unnecessary and avoidable; and

- hopes that as a maturing nation we have learnt from the World War II internment experience to ensure that future generations of migrants to this country are treated with justice and equality before the law and are not discriminated against on the sole basis of their cultural heritage.

Appendix C

Hansard: House of Assembly, Parliament of South Australia

INTERNMENT CAMPS

Mr PICCOLO (Light) 10 November 2011

I move: That this house:

- notes that 1 June 2011 marked the 70th anniversary of the opening of the internment camps at Loveday during the Second World War for the purpose of detaining 'enemy aliens' and prisoners of war;
- acknowledges that amongst the 'enemy aliens' interned were people who were either permanent Australia residents, born in Australia or had become British subjects in accordance with the federal immigration and citizenship laws of the day;
- accepts that the overwhelming majority of the people interned at the camps were law abiding, had made a valuable contribution to Australian society and posed no threat to the security of the nation or its people;
- believes that most people were primarily interned in the camps on the basis of their cultural heritage on the mistaken belief that it posed an unreasonable risk, and not for any demonstrated or validated criminal or security concerns;
- is aware of research and personal histories that demonstrate that the internment experience had a long term detrimental impact on the health and welfare of many of the people interned;
- recognises the pain, suffering, grief, and hardship experienced by the people who were interned and their families and, in particular, the impact on mothers and wives who were left to care for children, homes, farms or businesses without government assistance;
- congratulates those internees and their families who made the decision to remain in Australia and rebuild their lives following their internment;
- celebrates the lives of those former internees and families who, despite their internment experiences, went on to make a significant contribution to the economic, social and cultural development of Australia;
- asserts that, while the internment policy was implemented in the circumstances of a national emergency, it nevertheless acknowledges

that the injustice experienced by some Australians was unnecessary and avoidable; and

- hopes that as a maturing nation we have learnt from the World War II internment experience to ensure that future generations of migrants to this country are treated with justice and equality before the law and are not discriminated against on the sole basis of their cultural heritage.

Reference List

- Affron, M & Antliff, M (eds.) 1997, *Fascist visions: art and ideology in France and Italy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Agamben, G 1995, *Homo sacer*, trans. D Heller-Roazen, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Agamben, G 1997, 'The camp as nomos of the modern', trans. D Heller-Roazen, in H de Vries & S Weber (eds.), *Violence, identity and self-determination*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp.106-118.
- Agamben, G 1998, *Homo sacer: sovereign power and bare life*, trans. D Heller-Roazen, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Ahmed, S 2004a, *The cultural politics of emotion*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Ahmed, S 2004b, 'Affective economies', *Social Text*, 79, vol. 22, no. 2, pp.117-139.
- Alafaci, M 1999, *Savage cows and cabbage leaves: an Italian life*, Hale & Iremonger, Sydney.
- Alcorso, C & Alcorso, C 1992, 'Gli italiani in Australia durante la seconda guerra mondiale' in S Castles, C Alcorso, G Rando, & E Vasta (eds.), *Italo-australiani. La popolazione di origine italiana in Australia*, trans. D Panzieri, Edizioni della Fondazione Giovanni Agnelli, Torino, pp.51-68.
- Anderson, I 1994, 'Reclaiming Tru-ger-nan-ner: de-colonising the symbol', *Art Monthly Australia*, vol. 66, pp.10-14.
- Anderson, W 2002, *The cultivation of whiteness: science, health and racial destiny in Australia*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.
- Anderson, W 2006, *The cultivation of whiteness: science, health and racial destiny in Australia*, 3rd. edn, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Anderson, W 2009, 'Ambiguities of race: science on the reproductive frontier of Australia and the Pacific between the wars', *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp.143-160. doi: 10.1080/10314610902849302
- Andreoni, H 2003, 'Olive or white? The colour of Italians in Australia', *Journal of Australian Studies*, vol. 27, issue 77, pp.81-92, doi: 10.1080/14443050309387853

Ang, I 2001, *On not speaking Chinese: living between Asia and the West*, Taylor & Francis, Hoboken.

Anzac Day Coloured Diggers March 2012, viewed 29 June 2014, <http://www.creativespirits.info/aboriginalculture/history/anzac-day-coloured-digger-march> Atkinson, A 1991, *Chinese labour and capital in Western Australia, 1847-1947*, doctoral thesis, Murdoch University, Perth.

Attwood, B & Magowan, F (eds.) 2001, *Telling stories: indigenous history and memory in Australia and New Zealand*, Allen & Unwin, Crowsnest.

Bagnall, K 2008, 'Vermin, hot showers and a shortage of trousers: official visits to wartime internment camps', in J Beaumont, I Martinuzzi O'Brien & M Trinca (eds.), *Under suspicion: citizenship and internment in Australia during the Second World War*, National Museum of Australia Press, Canberra, pp.142-156.

Baker, K 2006, *Mutiny, terrorism, riots and murder: a history of sedition in Australia and New Zealand*, Rosenberg Publishing, Dural.

Bailey, J 2002, *The white divers of Broome: the true story of a fatal experiment*, Pan Macmillan Australia, Sydney.

Bandhauer, A & Veber, M 2009, *Migration & cultural contact: Germany and Australia*, Sydney University Press, Sydney.

Banivanua-Mar, T 2007, *Violence and colonial dialogue: the Australian-Pacific indentured labour trade*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu.

Banivanua-Mar, T 2010, *Making settler colonial space: perspectives on race, place and identity*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Banivanua-Mar, T 2012, 'Belonging to country: racialising space and resistance on Queensland's transnational margins, 1880-1900', *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 43, no. 2, 174-190, doi: 10.1080/1031461?2011.645841

Bartikowski, K 2006, 'Italy's Abyssinia campaign 1935-1936 and Italian colonial policy from the National socialist viewpoint', in G Besier, F Piombo & K Stoklosa (eds.), *Fascism, communism and the consolidation of democracy: a comparison of European dictatorships*, Global, Munster.

Bastian, P 2009, *Andrew Fisher: an underestimated man*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

Baum, B 2006, *The rise and fall of the caucasian race: a political history of racial identity*, New York University Press, New York.

Beaumont, J 2013, *Broken nation: Australians in the Great War*, Allen & Unwin, Crowsnest.

Behrendt, L 2001, 'Genocide: the distance between law and life', *Aboriginal History*, vol. 25, pp.132-147.

Bellassai, S 2005, 'The masculine mystique: anti-modernism and virility in fascist Italy', *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp.314-335.

Benadusi, L 2012, *The enemy of the new man: homosexuality in fascist Italy*, trans. S Dingee & J Pudney, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Benton, G 2007, *Chinese migrants and internationalism: forgotten histories, 1917-1945*, Routledge, London.

Bhabha, H 1994, *The location of culture*, Routledge, London.

Bigo, D 2007, 'Detention of foreigners, states of exception, and the social practices of control of the Banopticon', in PK Rajaram & C Grundy-Warr (eds.), *Borderscapes: hidden geographies and politics at territory's edge*, Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp.3-34.

Birch, T 1997, '“Nothing has changed”: the making and unmaking of Koori culture', in *Race matters: Indigenous Australians and our society*, Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, pp.11-28.

Birch, T 2001, 'The last refuge of the “Un-Australian”', *UTS Review*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp.17-22, viewed 29 July 2014 https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/bitstream/handle/11343/34135/66562_00001686_01_Birch018.pdf?sequence=1

Birch, T 2007, '“The invisible fire”: sovereignty, history and responsibility', in A Moreton-Robinson (ed.), *Sovereign subjects: Indigenous sovereignty matters*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, pp. 105-117.

Bird, DS 2014, *Nazi dreamtime: Australian enthusiasts for Hitler's Germany*, Anthem Press, London.

Blackshield, A 1970, 'Censorship and the law', in G Dutton & M Harris (eds.), *Australia's censorship crisis*, Sun Books, Melbourne, pp.11-26.

Bock, G & Thane, P (eds.) 1991, *Maternity and gender policies: women and the rise of the European welfare states, 1880s-1950s*, Routledge, London.

Bonutto, O 1994, *A migrant's story: the struggle and success of an Italian-Australian, 1920s-1960s*, rev. edn, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia.

Bonwick, J 1863, *The wild white man & the blacks of Victoria*, 2nd edn, Fergusson & Moore, Melbourne.

Bosworth, M 1992, 'Fremantle interned: the Italian experience', in *War, internment and mass migration: the Italo-Australian experience 1940-1990*, Gruppo editoriale internazionale, Rome, pp.75-88.

Bosworth, R & Ugolini, R (eds.) 1992, *War, internment and mass migration: the Italo-Australian experience 1940-1990*, Gruppo editoriale internazionale, Rome.

Boyce, J 2010, 'Towlangany: to tell lies. "What business have you here?"', in R Perkins & M Langton (eds.), *First Australians*, 2nd edn. Melbourne University Press, Carlton, pp.43-76.

Braidotti, R 2007, 'Bio-power and necro-politics', viewed 29 June 2014
<http://www.hum.uu.nl/medewerkers/r.braidotti/files/biopower.pdf>

Breen, S 2011, 'Extermination, extinction, genocide: British colonialism and Tasmanian Aborigines', in R Lemarchand (ed.), *Forgotten genocides: oblivion, denial, and memory*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Brunsdon-Fletcher, C 1917, *The new Pacific*, Macmillan, London.

Brune, T 1837, Editorial letter, 2 October, *Flinders Chronicle*.

Bunda, T 2007, 'The sovereign Aboriginal woman', in A Moreton-Robinson (ed.), *Sovereign subjects: Indigenous sovereignty matters*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, pp. 75-85.

Burke, A 2007, 'Security politics and us: sovereignty, violence and power after 9/11', in S Perera (ed.), *Our patch: enacting Australian sovereignty post-2001*, Network Books, Perth, pp.197-218.

Cabrini Fontana, M (ed.) 199-?, *A story is told: internment, truth, memory and reconciliation*, Harvey Shire Council, Harvey.

Calkins, LM 2005, 'Censorship (1914-1919)', in S Tucker & R Roberts (eds.) *World War I: encyclopedia*, ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara, pp.281-283.

Campbell, T 2008, 'Translator's introduction: Bios, immunity, life. The thought of Roberto Esposito', in R Esposito, *Bios: biopolitics and philosophy*, trans. T Campbell, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp.vii-xxxiii.

Carey, M 2008, *Whitefellas and Wadjulas: anti-colonial constructions of the the non-Aboriginal self*, doctoral thesis, Murdoch University, Western Australia, viewed 29 June 2014,
<http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/1757/2/02Whole.pdf>

Cassata, F 2011, *Building the new man: eugenics, racial science and genetics in twentieth-century Italy*, trans. E O'Loughlin, Central European University Press, Budapest.

Castles, S, Alcorso, C, Rando, G & Vasta, E (eds.) 1992, *Italo-australiani. La popolazione di origine italiana in Australia*, trans. D Panzieri, Edizioni della Fondazione Giovanni Agnelli, Torino.

Cawte, M 1986, 'Craniometry and eugenics in Australia: R.J. Berry and the quest for social efficiency', *Historical Studies*, vol. 22, no. 86, pp.35-53.

Cecilia, T 1992, 'Gli Italiani in Australia. 1788-1940: un cronistoria', in S Castles, C Alcorso, G Rando & E Vasta (eds.), *Italo-australiani. La popolazione di origine italiana in Australia*, trans. D Panzieri, Edizioni della Fondazione Giovanni Agnelli, Torino, pp.33-49.

Cetti, L 1984, 'Donne Italiane a New York e lavoro a domicilio (1910-1925)', *Movimento Operaio e Socialista*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp.291-303.

Cetti, L 1984-5, 'Work experience among Italian women in New York, 1900-1930', *Rivista di Studi Anglo Americani*, vol. 3, no. 4-5, pp.493-505.

Chaney, E 1998, *The evolution of the grand tour: Anglo-Italian cultural relations since the Renaissance*, Portland, London.

Chapman, A & Stabler, J (eds.) 2003, *Unfolding the South: nineteenth-century British women writers and artists in Italy*, Manchester University Press, New York.

Chen, MY 2012, *Animacies: biopolitics, racial mattering, and queer affect*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Chiro, G 2011, 'From multiculturalism to social inclusion: the resilience of Australian national values since federation', in F Mansouri & M Lobo (eds.), *Migration, citizenship and intercultural relations: looking through the lens of social inclusion*, Ashgate, Burlington, pp.13-32.

Chow, R 2002, *The protestant work ethic and the spirit of capitalism*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Chow, R 2007, *Sentimental fabulations, contemporary Chinese films: attachment in the age of global visibility*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Ciccotosto, E & Bosworth, M 1998, *Emma: a recipe for life*, rev. Freemantle Arts Centre Press, South Freemantle.

Clark, CMH 1981, *A history of Australia V: the people make laws 1888 - 1915*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.

Clark, M 1984, *Modern Italy*, Longman, London.

Clarke, FG 2002, *The history of Australia. Greenwood histories of the modern nations*, Greenwood Press, Westport.

Cohen, R 1997, *Global diaspora*, UCL Press, London.

Commonwealth Investigation Branch 1936, 'A summary on Italian fascist activities and propaganda in Australia. December 1936', Australian Federal Police, reproduced in G Cresciani 1988, *Migrants or mates: Italian life in Australia*, Knockmore Enterprises, Sydney, pp.182-195.

Cresciani, G 1980, *Fascism, anti-fascism and Italians in Australia, 1922 - 1945*, Australian National University Press, Canberra.

Cresciani, G 1982 (ed.) *Australia, the Australians and the Italian migration*, Franco Angeli Editore, Milano.

Cresciani, G 1982, 'The internment of Italians in New South Wales', in *Australia, the Australians and the Italian migration*, Franco Angeli Editore, Milano, pp.62-101

Cresciani, G 1982, 'Emigrazione e politica in Australia durante il Fascismo: il caso degli italiani del Nuovo Galles del Sud alla vigilia della seconda guerra mondiale' in P Bertinetti & C Gorlier (eds.), *Australiana: Italia, Europa, Australia: ieri e oggi*, Bulzoni, Roma.

Cresciani, G 1988, *Migrants or mates: Italian life in Australia*, Knockmore Enterprises, Sydney.

Cresciani, G 1999, 'The proletarian migrants: Fascism and Italian Anarchists in Australia', *Radical Tradition: An Australasian History Page*, viewed June 29 2014 <http://www.takver.com/history/italian.htm>

Crotty, M & Roberts, DA (eds.) 2006, *The great mistakes of Australian history*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

Crum, FS 1904, 'Report on the Royal Commission on the Decline in the Birth-rate and Mortality of Infants', *Publications of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 9, no. 67/68, pp.120-122, viewed 29 June 2014 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2276314?seq=1>

Cunneen, C 2001, *Conflict, politics and crime: Aboriginal communities and the police*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest.

Cunsolo, RS 1990, *Italian nationalism: from its origins to World War II*, Robert E Krieger Publishing Company, Malabar.

Curtis, L 2006, 'First World War intelligence and the Russian Workers Association of Australia', in K Bennet, M Jamarani & L Tolton (eds.), *2nd Annual Rhizomes: Re-visioning Boundaries Conference of the School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies*, The University of Queensland, 24-25 February, Brisbane, viewed 29 June 2014 https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/eserv/UQ:7706/lc_rhiz.pdf

- Curtis, L 2010, *Red criminals: censorship, surveillance and suppression of the radical Russian community in Brisbane during World War I*, doctoral thesis, Griffith University, Nathan.
- Cuvier, G 1817, 'Extrait d'observations faites sur le cadavre d'une femme connue a Paris et a Londres sous le nom de Venus Hottentotte', *Memoires du Museum d'Histoire naturelle*, vol. 3, pp.259-274.
- Cuvier, G 1849, *The animal kingdom arranged in conformity with its organisation*, W S Orr & Co., London.
- Dalseno, P 1994, *Sugar, tears and eyeties*, Boolarong Publications, Brisbane.
- Damousi, J & Lake, M (eds.) 1995, *Gender and war: Australians at war in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.
- Darwin, C 1859, *On the origin of species by means of natural selection*, online pdf rev, J Manis (ed.) viewed 28 June 2014, <http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/darwin/originspecies.pdf>
- Darwin, C 1871, *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*, online pdf rev, J Van Wyhe (ed.) viewed 28 June 2014, http://darwin-online.org.uk/converted/published/1874_Descent_F944/1874_Descent_F944.html
- da Silva, DF 2007, *Toward a global idea of race*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- da Silva, DF 2009, 'No-bodies: law, raciality and violence', *Griffith Law Review*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp.212-236.
- da Silva, DF 2011, 'Many hundred thousand bodies later: an analysis of the "legacy" of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda', in S Pahuja, F Johns & R Joyce (eds.), *Events: the force of the international law*, Cavendish Routledge, London.
- da Silva, DF 2011, 'Notes for a critique of the metaphysics of race', *Theory, Culture and Society*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp138-148.
- da Silva, DF 2013, 'To be announced: radical praxis or knowing (at) the limits of justice', *Social Text*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp.43-62.
- Davison, G 1979, 'Australian urban history: a progress report', *Urban History*, vol. 6, pp.100-109.
- Day, D 2009, '27 December 1941: Prime Minister Curtin's new year message: Australia "looks to America"', in M Crotty & DA Roberts (eds.), *Turning points in Australian history*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney, pp.129-142.

de Bolfo, T 2002, *In search of kings: what became of the passengers of the red'Italia*, Harper Collins, Sydney.

de Certeau, M 1988, *The practice of everyday life*, trans. S Rendall, University of California Press, Berkeley.

de Certeau, M 1998, *The practice of everyday life*, trans. T Tomasik, rev edn. L Giard, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

de Grazia, V 1992, *How Fascist ruled women: Italy, 1922 - 1945*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Deleuze, G & Guattari, F 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. and foreword by Brian Massumi, Athlone Press, London.

Department of Veteran Affairs, Canberra, n.d. *Australia's War, 1939-1945*, viewed 29 June 2014 <http://www.ww2australia.gov.au/allin/indigenous.html>

Derrida, J 1998, 'Faith and Knowledge', in J Derrida & G Vattimo (eds.), *Religion*, Polity Press, Cambridge, pp.1-78.

Derrida, J 2002, *Acts of religion*, Routledge, New York.

Derrida, J 2004, 'Autoimmunity: real and symbolic suicides: a dialogue with Jaques Derrida', in G Borradori, *Philosophy in a time of terror: dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, pp.85-136.

Derrida, J 2005, *Rogues: two essays on reason*, trans. PA Brault & M Naas, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Derrida, J & Prenowitz, E 1995, 'Archive fever: a Freudian impression', *Diacritics*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp.9-63.

Dewhirst, C 2014, 'The "Southern question" in Australia: the 1925 Royal Commission's racialisation of Southern Italians', *Queensland History Journal*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp.316-332.

Diana, A 1988, 'Italian women in Australia', *Affari sociali internazionali*, no. 2, pp.65-80.

Di Ulderico, B 2004, *Culture e integrazione: uniti dalle diversita*, Franco Angelini, Milano.

Docker, J & Fischer, G (eds.) 2000, *Race, colour and identity in Australian and New Zealand*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

- Douglas, A 2004, 'Australian LaRouche forces battle against a synarchist police state', *The New Citizen*, viewed 29 June 2014
http://cecaust.com.au/main.asp?sub=pubs&id=A1_Douglas.htm
- Douglass, W 1995, *From Italy to Ingham: Italians in North Queensland*, University of Queensland Press, Brisbane.
- Douglas, B 2008, 'Climate to crania: science and the racialization of human difference', in B Douglas & C Ballard (eds.), *Foreign bodies: Oceania and the science of race 1750-1940*, ANU E Press, Canberra, pp.33-96.
- Douglas, B & Ballard, C (eds.) *Foreign bodies: Oceania and the science of race 1750-1940*, ANU E Press, Canberra.
- Doulman, J & Lee, D 2008, *Every assistance & protection: a history of the Australian passport*, Federation Press, Leichhardt.
- Drago, A 1997, *From Raviscanina to Roseville: the migration of the De Sisto family*, Ku-ring-gai Library, Gordon.
- Dreyfus, H & Rabinow, P 1982, *Michel Foucault, beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*, 2nd edn. with an afterward by and an interview with Michel Foucault, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Dutton, D 2002, *One of us?: a century of Australian citizenship*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.
- Edkins, J, Persram, N & Pin-Fat, V (eds.) 1999, *Sovereignty and subjectivity*, Lynne Rienner, Boulder.
- Edkins, J, Pin-Fat, V & Shapiro, MJ (eds.) 2004, *Sovereign lives: power in an era of globalisation*, Routledge, New York.
- Ellinghaus, K 2000, 'Interracial marriage and the ideology of assimilation: Hampton Institute, 1878-1923', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. 108, no. 3, pp.279-303.
- Ellinghaus, K 2003, 'Absorbing the Aboriginal problem: controlling marriage in Australia in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Century', *Aboriginal History*, vol. 27, pp.185-209.
- Ellinghaus, K 2006, *Taking assimilation to heart: marriages of white women and indigenous men in the United States and Australia, 1887-1937*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- Esposito, R 2002, *Immunitas: protezione e negazione della vita*, Einaudi, Turin.
- Esposito, R 2008, *Bios: biopolitics and philosophy*, trans. T Campbell, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Esposito, R 2009, *Communitas: the origin and destiny of community*, trans. T Campbell, Stamford University Press, Stamford.

Esposito, R 2011, *Immunitas: the protection and negation of life*, trans. Z Hanafi, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Evans, R 1988, 'The pen and the sword. Anti-Germanism in Queensland during the Great War, and The Worker', in M Jurgensen & A Corkhill (eds.), *The German presence in Queensland over the last 150 years*, Department of German, University of Queensland, St Lucia, pp.3-21.

Evans, R, Saunders, K & Cronin, K 1988, *Race relations in colonial Queensland: a history of exclusion and extermination*, University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia.

Faber, D 2009, 'The Italian anarchist press in Australia between the wars', *IHSJ Italian Historical Society Journal*, vol. 17, pp.5-11.

Fanon, F 1967, *The wretched of the earth*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Featherstone, L 2011, *Let's talk about sex: histories of sexuality in Australia from federation to the pill*, Cambridge Scholars Publications, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Ferry, TA 1925, 'Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report on the social and economic effects of increase in the number of aliens in Queensland', *Queensland Parliamentary Papers* 3, pp.25-52.

Finaldi, GM 2009, *Italian national identity in the scramble for Africa: Italy's African wars in the era of nation building, 1870-1900*, Peter Lang, Bern.

Fischer, G 1984, 'At the hands of our own men and in our country', *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp.391-395.

Fischer, G 1989, *Enemy aliens: internment and the homefront experience in Australia, 1914-1920*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia.

Fischer, N 2002, 'Lacking the will to power? Australian anti-communists 1917 - 1935', *Journal of Australian Studies*, vol. 26, no. 72, Australian Public Intellectual Network, viewed 29 June 2014, http://www.api-network.com/main/pdf/scholars/jas72_fischer.pdf

Fischer, N 2011, 'The American Protective League and the Australian Protective League: two responses to the threat of communism, c1917-1920', *American Communist History*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp.133-149.

Fitzgerald, J 2007, *Big white lie: Chinese Australians in White Australia*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

FitzGerald, S 2010, 'Biopolitics and the regulation of vulnerability: the case of the female trafficked migrant', *International Journal of Law in Context*, vol. 6, pp.277-294.

Forgacs, D 2014, *Italy's margins: social exclusion and nation formation since 1861*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Foster, R & Nettelbeck, A 2012, *Out of the silence: the history and memory of South Australia's frontier wars*, Wakefield Press, Kent Town.

Foucault, M 1979, *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Foucault, M 1982, 'Afterword: the subject and power', in H Dreyfus and P Rabinow *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2nd edn., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp.208-226.

Foucault, M 1998, *The will to knowledge: the history of sexuality: 1*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Foucault, M 2003, *Society must be defended: lectures at the College De France 1975-76*, trans. D Macey, Penguin Books, London.

Foucault, M 2007, *Security, territory, population: lectures at the College de France, 1977-78*, M Senellart (ed.), trans. G Burchell, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills.

Foucault, M 2010, *The birth of biopolitics: lectures at the College de France 1978-1979*, trans. G Burchell, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Freehling, W 1994, *The reintegration of American history: slavery and the civil war*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Fresta, MC 1995, 'Two women: two stories', in E Perkins & RG Hay (eds.), *From all walks of life: an anthology of regional Queensland writers*, Central Queensland University Press, Rockhampton, pp.39-45.

Gabaccia, DR 1984, *From Sicily to Elizabeth Street: housing and social change among Italian immigrants, 1880-1930*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Gabaccia, D 2000, *Italy's many diaspora*, University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Gabaccia, D & Iocovetta, F (eds.) 2002, *Women, gender and transnational lives: Italian workers of the world*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Galassi, F 1991, *Sotto la croce del sud = under the South Cross: the Jumna immigrants of 1891*, Department of History and Politics, James Cook University, Townsville.

Galton, F 1904, 'Eugenics: its definition, scope, and aims', *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. x, no. 1. viewed 29 June 2014
<http://www.mugu.com/galton/essays/1900-1911/galton-1904-am-journ-soc-eugenics-scope-aims.htm>

Ganter, R 2006, *Mixed relations, Asian-Aboriginal contact in North Australia*, University of Western Australia Press, Crawley.

Garton, S 1986, 'The rise of the therapeutic state: psychiatry and the system of criminal jurisdiction in New South Wales, 1890-1940', *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp.378-388. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8497.1986.tb00884.x

Garton, S 2010, 'Eugenics in Australia and New Zealand: laboratories of racial science', in A Bashford & P Levine (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the history of eugenics*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp.243-257.

Gentile, E 1994, 'La nazione del Fascismo', in G Spadolini (ed.), *Nazione e nazionalita in Italia: dall'alba del secolo ai nostri giorni*, Laterza, Rome, pp.65-124.

Gillette, A 2002, *Racial theories in fascist Italy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gillespie, J 1991, *The price of health: Australian governments and medical politics 1910-1960*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.

Giuliani, G 2010, 'Whose Whiteness? Cultural dis-locations between Italy and Australia', in J Pugliese (ed.), *Transmediterranean: diaspora, histories, geopolitical spaces*, P.I.E. Peter Lang, Brussels, pp.125-137.

Goodall, H 2008, *Invasion to embassy: land in Aboriginal politics in New South Wales*, Sydney University Press, Sydney.

Gori, G 2004, *Italian Fascism and the female body: sport submissive women and the strong mothers*, Routledge, New York.

Gramsci, A 1978, 'Some aspects of the southern question. Unfinished October 1926', in Q Hoare (ed.), *Antonio Gramsci: sections from political writings (1921-1926)*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, viewed 29 June 2014
<http://blogs.uoregon.edu/j610drstabile/files/2014/03/gramsci-southern-question1926-2jf8c5x.pdf>

Gramsci, A 1999, *Selections from the prison notebooks*, ElecBook, London, viewed 29 June 2014
http://courses.justice.eku.edu/PLS330_Louis/docs/gramsci-prison-notebooks-vol1.pdf

- Graziosi, M 1995, 'Gender struggle and the social manipulation and ideological use of gender identity in the interwar years', in R Pickering-Iazzi (ed.), *Mothers of Invention*, University of Minnesota Press, London.
- Grip, L & Hart, J 2009, 'The use of chemical weapons in the 1935-36 Italo-Ethiopian War', SIPRI Arms Control and Non-proliferation Programme, October, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, online pdf accessed 29 June 2014.
- Groenewegen, PD & McFarlane, BJ 1990, *A history of Australian economic thought*, Routledge, London.
- Guglielmo, J 2010, *Living the revolution: Italian women's resistance and radicalism in New York City 1880 - 1945*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Gumpl, G & Kleinig, R 2007, *The Hitler Club: the rise and fall of Australia's no. 1 Nazi*, Brolga Publishing, Melbourne.
- Haebich, A 2000, *Broken circles: fragmenting indigenous families 1800-2000*, Freemantle Arts Centre Press, Freemantle.
- Hale, J 1996, *England and the Italian renaissance: the growth in its history and art*, Fontana Press, London.
- Hall, S 1992, 'New ethnicities', in A Rattansi & J Donald (eds.), *Race, Culture and Difference*, Sage Publications, London.
- Head, M 2011, *Crimes against the state: from treason to terrorism*, Ashgate, Surrey.
- Heath, D 2001, 'Literary censorship, imperialism and the White Australia Policy', in M Lyons & J Arnold (eds.), *A history of the book in Australia: a nationalised culture in a colonised market*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia.
- Heckert, J & Cleminson, R (eds.) 2011, *Anarchism & sexuality: ethics, relationships and power*, Routledge, New York.
- Heiss, A 2003, *Dhuuluu-yala = to talk straight: publishing Indigenous literature*, Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra.
- Heiss, A & Minter P (eds.) 2008, *Macquarie PEN anthology of Australian Aboriginal literature*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest.
- Henderson, A 1993, *From all corners: six migrant stories*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Henderson, L 1978, *Italians in the Hinchinbrook Shire, 1921-39*, BA Hons thesis, History Department, James Cook University, Townsville.

- Henderson, L 1995, 'The truth in stereotype? Italians and criminality in North Queensland between the wars', *Journal of Australian Studies*, no. 45, pp.32-40.
- Hinks, P & McKivigan, J (eds.) 2007, *Encyclopedia of antislavery and abolition*, Greenwood Press, Westport.
- Hong, GK 2006, *The ruptures of American capital: women of color feminism and the culture of immigrant labor*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Horne, J & Langton, M n.d. '(Australians, 1938, Chapter 3) the day of morning', viewed 29 June 2014
<http://www.reasoninrevolt.net.au/objects/pdf/a000226.pdf>
- Howe, A 1994, *Punish and critique: towards a feminist analysis of penalty*, Routledge, London.
- Howe, R & Swaine, S 1992, 'Fertility grounds for divorce: sexuality and reproductive imperatives', in K Saunders & R Evans (eds.), *Gender relations in Australia: domination and negotiation*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, Sydney, pp.158-180.
- Hugh, M 1839, *The encyclopaedia of geography, comprising a complete description of the earth: physical, statistical, civil, and political; exhibiting its relation to the heavenly bodies, its physical structure, the natural history of each country, and the industry, commerce, political institutions, and civil and social state of all nations*, rev. edn, Carey, Lea and Blanchard, Philadelphia.
- Hughes, R 1987, *The fatal shore: a history of the transportation of convicts to Australia, 1787-1868*, Collins Harvill, London.
- Huntley, R 2012, *The Italian girl*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia.
- Iacovino, L 1983, *Legislative and administrative requirements in relation to Italian migration to Australia during the interwar years*, Italian Historical Society, Carlton.
- Inda, JX 2005, *Anthropologies of modernity: Foucault, governmentality, and life politics*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken.
- Jenkins, L 1993, *The power of the land: il potere della terra: a social history of Italian settlement in Lismore: una storia delle attivata' dell' insediamento Italiano di Lismore*, Leslie Jenkins, Mullumbimby.
- Jordan, R 2006, *In good faith: sedition law in Australia*, viewed 29 June 2014
http://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/Publications_Archive/archive/sedition

- Jose, N (ed.) 2009, *Macquarie PEN anthology of Australian literature*, Allen & Unwin, Crows nest.
- Jupp, J 2001, *The Australian people: an encyclopedia of the nation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jupp, J 2002, *From White Australia to Woomera: the story of Australian immigration*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Kabir, N 2013, *Muslims in Australia: immigration, race relations and cultural history*, Routledge, New York.
- Kahan-Guidi, A & Weiss, E (eds.) 1989, *Give me strength. Italian women speak. Forza e coraggio*, Women's Redress Press, Sydney.
- Kartinyeri, D 2005, 'One service charged with emotion', 7.30 Report, television transcript, ABC TV, viewed 29 June 2014, <http://www.abc.net.au/7.30/content/2005/s1353096.htm>
- Kartinyeri, D 2008, *Doreen Kartinyeri: my Ngarrindjeri calling*, Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra.
- Keith, AB 1912, *Responsible government in the dominions*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Khoo, T 2003, *Banana bending: Asian-Australian and Asian Canadian literatures*, Hong Kong University Press, Hong Kong.
- Knight, N & Heazle, M 2011, *Understanding Australia's neighbours: an introduction to East and Southeast Asia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Knightley, P 2001, *Australia: a biography of a nation*, Jonathan Cape, London.
- Kramer, J 2014, 'Legitimizing White sovereignty: terra nullius, the rule of law and self preserving force in the Northern Territory Intervention', presented at J Pugliese (convenor) *Troubling waters: speaking (of) Forbidden (legal) subjects*. Symposium in honour of Penny Pether, 18 July, Wollongong, Legal Intersections Research Centre, Connect School of Law, Wollongong University, Wollongong.
- Lake, M 2003, 'What man's country: the trans-national history of a national project', *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 34, pp.346-363.
- Lake, M 2008, 'White Australia points the way', in M Lake & H Reynolds, *Drawing the global colour line: white men's countries and the international challenge of racial equality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.137-165.

- Lake, M & Reynolds, H 2008, *Drawing the global colour line: white men's countries and the international challenge of racial equality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lake, M, Reynolds, H, McKenna, M & Damousi, J 2010, *What's wrong with Anzac?*, University of New South Wales Press Ltd, Sydney.
- Langton, M 1993, "Well, I heard it on the radio and I saw it on the television": an essay for the Australian Film Commission on the politics and aesthetics of filmmaking by and about Aboriginal people and things, Australian Film Commission, Sydney.
- Langton, M 1996, 'Foreword', in M Rose (ed.), *For the record: 160 years of Aboriginal print journalism*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards.
- Laurie, A 1959, 'The Black War in Queensland', *Royal Historical Society of Queensland Centenary Journal*, vol. VI, no. 1, pp.155-173 viewed 29 June 2014
https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/eserv/UQ:211819/s00855804_1959_6_1_155.pdf
- Lepervanche, M de 1989, 'Breeders for Australia: a national identity for women?', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp.163-182.
- Linehan, T 2000, *British Fascism 1918-39*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Loh, M (ed.) 1980, *With courage in their cases: the experiences of thirty-five Italian immigrant workers and their families in Australia*, FILEF, Melbourne.
- Lombroso, C 1911, *Crime, its causes and remedies*, Heinemann, London.
- Lombroso, C & Ferrero, W 1895, *The female offender*, TF Unwin, London.
- Lui, R 2002, 'Governing refugees 1919-1945', *Borderlands e-journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, para. 22, viewed 29 June 2014
http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol1no1_2002/loi_governing.html
- Lyng, J 1935, *Non-Britishers in Australia: influence on population and progress*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- Lyttelton, A 2004, *Seizure of power: Fascism in Italy, 1919-1923*, 3rd edn, Routledge, London.
- MacDonald, H 2005, *Human remains: episodes in human dissection*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.
- Madley, B 2004, 'Patterns of frontier genocide 1803-1910: the Aboriginal Tasmanians, the Yuki of California and the Herero of Namibia', *Journal of*

Genocide Research, vol. 6, no. 2, pp.167-192, viewed 29 June 2014
<http://www.yale.edu/gsp/colonial/Madley.pdf>

Madley, B 2012, 'Tactics of Nineteenth Century colonial massacre: Tasmania, California and beyond', in PG Dwyer & L Ryan (eds), *Theatres of violence: massacres, mass killing and atrocity throughout history*, Berghen Books, New York, pp.110-125.

Malik, K 1996, *The meaning of race: race, history and culture in Western society*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Manne, R (ed.) 2003, *Whitewash: on Keith Windschuttle's fabrication of Aboriginal history*, Black Inc., Melbourne.

Martinez, J 1999, *Plural Australia: Aboriginal and Asian labour in tropical white Australia, Darwin, 1911-1940*, doctoral thesis, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, viewed 29 June 2014
<http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2437&context=theses>

Martinez, J 2005, 'The end of indenture? Asian workers in the Australian pearling industry, 1901-1972', *International Labor and Working Class History*, vol. 67, pp.125-147.

Martinuzzi O'Brien, I 2005, 'Internments in Australia during World War Two: life histories of citizenship and exclusion', in C Elkner, I Martinuzzi O'Brien, G Rando & A Cappello, *Enemy aliens: the internment of Italian migrants in Australia during the Second World War*, Connor Court Publishing, Bacchus Marsh, pp.15-33.

Martinuzzi O'Brien, I 2006, 'The enemy within: wartime internment of enemy aliens', in M Crotty & D Roberts (eds.), *The Great Mistakes of Australian History*, UNSW Press, Sydney, pp.139-155.

Martinuzzi O'Brien, I 2008, 'Ubi bene, ibi patria: the Second World War and citizenship in a country town', in J Beaumont, I Martinuzzi O'Brien & M Trinca (eds.), *Under suspicion: citizenship and internment in Australia during the Second World War*, National Museum of Australia Press, Canberra, pp.16-34.

Martinuzzi O'Brien, I 2014, *Dr Ilma Martinuzzi O'Brien - the internment of Italians in Loveday*, Part 1, viewed 29 June 2014
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M1VmTBoCEMw>

Martucci, R 2007, *L'invenzione dell' Italia unita*, Milano, Sansoni.

Massumi, B 1987, 'Notes on the translation and acknowledgments', in G Deleuze & F Guattari *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Athlone Press, London, pp.xvi-xix.

Matthews, RCO 1982, *British economic growth 1856-1973*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Mbembe, A 2003, 'Necropolitics', *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp.11-40.

McClintock, A 1995, *Imperial leather: race, gender and sexuality in the colonial contest*, Routledge, New York.

McConville, C 1988, 'Peopling the place again', in V Burgmann & J Lee (eds.), *A most valuable acquisition: a people's history of Australia since 1788*, McPhee Gribble, Fitzroy, pp.73-86.

McGregor, R 2011, *Indifferent inclusion: Aboriginal people and the Australian nation*, Aboriginal Studies Press, Acton.

Meaney, N 2001 'Britishness and Australian identity', *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 32, pp.76-90.

Meaney, N 2009, *Australia and world crisis*, Sydney University Press, Sydney.

Mercer, PM 1981, *The survival of a Pacific Islander population in North Queensland, 1900-1940*, doctoral thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.

Mezzini, TM 1992, *Migration, identity and community-building: fourteen Molfettese women speak*, Honours degree of Bachelor of Arts thesis, University of Adelaide, Adelaide.

Miller, P & Rose, N 1990, 'Governing economic life', *Economy and Society*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp.1-31.

Moore, B & Fedorowich, K 2002, *The British Empire and its Italian prisoners of war*, Palgrave, Houndmills.

Moreton-Robinson, A 2000, *Talkin' up to the white woman: Aboriginal women and feminism*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia.

Moreton-Robinson, A 2004a, 'The possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty: the High Court and the Yorta Yorta decision', *Borderlands e-journal*, vol. 3, no. 2. www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/moreton_possessive.htm

Moreton-Robinson, A 2004b, 'Whiteness, epistemology and Indigenous representation', in A Moreton-Robertson (ed.), *Whitening race: essays in social and cultural criticism*, Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, pp.75-88.

Moreton-Robinson, A (ed.) 2007, *Sovereign subjects: Indigenous sovereignty matters*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest.

Moses, D (ed.) 2004, *Genocide and settler society: frontier violence and stolen indigenous children in Australian history*, Berghahn Books, New York.

Moses, D (ed.) 2008, *Empire, colony, genocide: conquest, occupation, and subaltern resistance in world history*, Berghahn Books, New York.

Moya, J 2002, 'Italians in Buenos Aires's anarchist movement: gender ideology and women's participation, 1890-1910', in D Gabaccia & F Iacovetta (eds.), *Women, gender and transnational lives: Italian workers of the world*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto. pp.189-216.

Murrayfield n.d. 'Murrayfield story - cultural heritage', para. 5, viewed 29 June 2014 <http://www.murrayfield.com.au/Aboriginal-and-European-history>

Naas, M 2006, ' "One nation ...indivisible": Jacques Derrida on the autoimmunity of democracy and the sovereignty of God', *Research in Phenomenology*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp.15-44.

Nah, AM 2007, 'Struggling with (il)legality: the indeterminate functioning of Malaysia's borders for asylum seekers, refugees, and stateless persons', PK Rajaram & C Grundy-Warr (eds.), *Borderscapes: hidden geographies and politics at territory's edge*, Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp.35-64.

Naimark, NM 2001, *Fires of hatred: ethnic cleansing in Twentieth-Century Europe*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Nettelbeck, A & Foster, R 2007, *In the name of the law: William Willshire and the policing of the Australian frontier*, Wakefield Press, Kent Town.

Neumann, K 2006, 'National security and the "disturbed state of public mind"', *Australian Book Review*, April, online pdf accessed 29 June 2014.

Newman, S 2012, 'Research methods and problems: postanarchism', in R Kinna (ed.), *The Bloomsbury companion to anarchism*, Continuum, New York, pp.41-49.

Nicholls, G 2007, *Deported: a history of forced departures from Australia*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

Nicoll, F 2004, ' "Are you calling me a racist?": teaching critical whiteness theory in indigenous sovereignty', *Borderlands e-journal*, viewed 29 June 2014 http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/nicoll_teaching.htm

Nicoll, F 2014, 'War by other means: the Australian War Memorial and the Aboriginal Tent Embassy in national space and time', in G Foley, A Schaap & E Howell (eds.), *The Aboriginal Tent Embassy: sovereignty, black power, land rights and the state*, Routledge, London, pp.267-283.

- O'Connor, D 1996, *No need to be afraid: Italian settlers in South Australia between 1839 and the Second World War*, Wakefield Press, Kent Town.
- O'Connor, D 1999, 'Declared Black: confrontation between Italian and Anglo-Celtic workers in Port Adelaide, 1928-1932', *Australian Labour History Reconsidered*, Australian Humanities Press, Unley, pp.191-207.
- O'Connor, D (ed.) 2004, *Memories and identities: proceedings of the Second Conference on the Impact of Italians in South Australia*, Australian Humanities Press, Adelaide.
- O'Connor, M 2003, 'Civilizing Southern Italy: British Italian women and the cultural politics of European nation building', *Women's Writing*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp.253-268.
- Oikkonen, V 2013, *Gender, sexuality and reproduction in evolutionary narratives*, Routledge, New York.
- O'Toole, S 2006, *The history of Australian corrections*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.
- Paisley, F 2000, *Loving protection? Australian feminism and Aboriginal women's rights, 1919-1929*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- Palombo, L 1998, *Italian women in Australia from the 1870s to 1930s: from invisibility to motherhood*, Master of Arts thesis, Flinders University, Adelaide.
- Palombo, L 2004, 'Representing women: reading files and beginning women's counter-histories', in D O'Connor (ed.), *Memories and identities: proceedings of the Second Conference on the Impact of Italians in South Australia*, Australian Humanities Press, Adelaide, pp.233-244.
- Palombo, L 2007, 'Whose turn is it? White diasporic and transnational practices and the necropolitics of the plantation and internment camps', *Australian Critical Race and Whiteness Studies Association (ACRAWSA) e-journal*, vol.3, no. 1, pp.1-20.
- Pankhurst, R 1999, 'Italian fascist war crimes in Ethiopia: a history of their discussion, from the League of Nations to the United Nations (1936-1949)', *North African Studies*, vol. 6, no. 1-2, pp.83-140.
- Papalia, P Hon. 2012, *World War II Internment Camps: motion*, 20 June, House of Assembly, Parliament of Western Australia, official Hansard, pp.4100a-4117a, viewed 29 June 2014
[http://www.parliament.wa.gov.au/hansard/hansard.nsf/451a59fb51257dd248256c85002bc738/26975d3c173ad0ee48257a46002d164d/\\$FILE/A38%20S1%2020120620%20p4100a-4117a.pdf](http://www.parliament.wa.gov.au/hansard/hansard.nsf/451a59fb51257dd248256c85002bc738/26975d3c173ad0ee48257a46002d164d/$FILE/A38%20S1%2020120620%20p4100a-4117a.pdf)

- Parry, N 2007, *Black and white children in welfare in NSW and Tasmania, 1880-1940*, doctoral thesis, University of NSW, Kensington.
- Pascoe, R 1987, *Buongiorno Australia: our Italian heritage*, Greenhouse Publications, Richmond.
- Passerini, L 1987, *Fascism in popular memory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Patten, JT 2009, 'Jack Patten', *Remembering Jack Patten 1905-1957*, viewed 29 June 2014 <http://www.pattenproject.com/jack/>
- Patton, P 2015, 'Foucault, Critique, Rights', *Critical Horizons*, vol. 6, n. 1, pp.267-287.
- Pedersen, P 2012, *ANZACS on the Western Front: the Australian War Memorial battlefield guide*, John Wiley & Sons, Richmond.
- Perera, S 2002, 'What is a camp...?', *Borderlands e-journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, viewed 29 June 2014 http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol1no1_2002/perera_camp.html
- Perera, SA 2005, 'Who will I become? The multiple formations of Australian whiteness', *Australian Critical Race and Whiteness Studies Association Journal*, vol. 1, pp.30-39.
- Perera, SA 2007a, 'A Pacific zone? (In)security, sovereignty, and stories of the Pacific borderscape', *Borderscapes: hidden geographies and politics at territory's edge*, vol. 29, pp.201-228.
- Perera, SA (ed.) 2007b, *Our patch: enacting Australian sovereignty post-2001*, Network Books, Perth.
- Perera, SA 2009, *Australia and the insular imagination: beaches, borders, boats and bodies*, Pulgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Perera, SA 2010, 'The fear of small things: Australia in the arc of insecurity', in SA Perera, G Seal & S Summers (eds.), *Enter at own risk*, Black Swan Press, Perth.
- Perera, SA & Pugliese, J 1998, 'Wogface, Anglo-drag, contested Aboriginalities... making and unmaking identities in Australia', *Social Identities*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp.139-172.
- Petraccone, C 2000, *Le due civiltà*, Roma and Bari, Laterza.
- Pezzano, G 2011, 'Il paradigma dell'antropologia filosofica tra immunità e apertura al mondo', *Dialegesthai. Rivista telematica di filosofia - online*, vol. 13, n.p, viewed 29 June 2014 <http://mondodomani.org/dialegesthai/>

Piccolo, T Hon. 2011, Internment Camps: motion, 10 November, House of Assembly, Parliament of South Australia', official Hansard, pp.5926-5933 viewed 29 June 2014
<https://hansardpublic.parliament.sa.gov.au/Pages/HansardResult.aspx#/docid/HANSARD-11-9599>

Pickering-Iazzi, R (ed.) 1995, *Mothers of invention*, University of Minnesota Press, London.

Pugliese, J 1994, 'Embodied economies of colonialism and desire in Hegel's empire of reason', *Social Semiotics*, vol. 4, issue 1-2, pp.163-183.

Pugliese, J 1995, 'Language and minorities', in S Fitzgerald & G Wotherspoon (eds.), *Minorities*, State Library of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

Pugliese, J 2002a, 'Migrant heritage in an Indigenous context: For a decolonising migrant historiography', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp.5-18, DOI 10.1080/07256860220122368

Pugliese, J 2002b, 'Race as category crisis: Whiteness and the topical assignment of race', *Social Semiotic*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp.49-168, DOI 10.1080/1035033022000002240149

Pugliese, J 2006, 'Bodies of water', *Heat*, vol. 12, pp.13-20.

Pugliese, J 2007, 'Preincident Indices of Criminality: Facecrime and Project Hostile Intent', *Griffith Law Review*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp.314-330.

Pugliese, J 2008, 'Whiteness and the Blackening of Italy: La Guerra Cafona, extracomunitari and provisional street justice', *Portal: Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp.1-35.

Pugliese, J 2010a, *Biometrics: bodies, technologies, biopolitics*, Routledge, New York.

Pugliese, J (ed.) 2010b, *Transmediterranean: diaspora, histories, geopolitical spaces*, P.I.E. Peter Lang, Brussels.

Pugliese, J 2013, *State violence and the execution of the law: biopolitical caesurae of torture, black sites, drones*, Routledge, New York.

Pullan, R 1984, *Guilty secrets: free speech in Australia*, Methuen Australia, North Ryde.

Quine, MS 1995, *Population politics in twentieth century Europe: fascist dictatorships and liberal democracies*, Routledge, London.

Rabinow, P (ed) 1984, *The Foucault Reader: an Introduction to Foucault's Thought*, Panthenon Books, New York.

Rae-Ellis, V 1996, *Black Robinson: protector of Aborigines*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.

Rajaram, PK & Grundy-Warr, C (eds.) 2007, *Borderscapes: hidden geographies and politics at territory's edge*, Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Rando, G 2005, 'Italo-Australians during the Second World War: some perceptions of internment', Faculty of Arts - Papers, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, viewed 29 June 2014, <http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1123&context=artspapers>

Razack, R 2013, 'Technologies of racial terror: torture, everyday violence and the story of three teens', paper presented at Are we really post-race?, Research Training Scheme Workshop, 2-3 Dec, School of Humanities and Communication Arts, University of Western Sydney, Parramatta.

Re, L 1995, 'Fascist theories of "Woman" and the construction of gender', in R Pickering-Iazzi (ed.), *Mothers of Invention*, University of Minnesota Press, London, pp.76-99.

Reekie, G 1998, *Measuring immorality: social inquiry and the problem of illegitimacy*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.

Reynolds, H 1995, *Fate of a free people*, Penguin, Ringwood.

Reynolds, H 2004, *Fate of a free people*, rev. Penguin, Camberwell.

Reynolds, H 2005, *Nowhere people: how international race thinking shaped Australia's identity*, Penguin, Camberwell.

Reynolds, H 2010, 'Are nations really made in war?', in *What's wrong with Anzac?*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney, pp.24-44.

Richards, J 2008, *The secret war: a true history of Queensland's native police*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia.

Rigney, LH 2001, 'A First perspective of Indigenous Australian participation in science: framing Indigenous research towards Indigenous Australian intellectual sovereignty', *Kaurna Higher Education Journal*, vol. 7, pp.1-13.

Rodwell, G 1998, 'Professor Harvey Sutton: national hygienist as eugenicist and educator', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, vol. 84, pp.164-179.

Romano, V 2007, *Brigantesse: donne guerrigliere contro la conquista del Sud (1860-1870)*, Controcorrente, Napoli.

- Romano, V 2007, *Storie di donne diverse: le brigantesse ottocentesche del meridione d'Italia*, para. 10, viewed 29 June 2014, <http://www.brigantaggio.net/brigantaggio/Briganti/Brigantesse4.htm>
- Rose, M (ed.) 1996, *For the record: 160 years of Aboriginal print journalism*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards.
- Russell, L 2001, *Savage imaginings: historical and contemporary constructions of Australian Aboriginalities*, Australian Scholarly Publishing, Melbourne.
- Ryan, L 1981, *The Aboriginal Tasmanians*, University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.
- Ryan, L 1996, *The Aboriginal Tasmanians*, 2nd edn, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards.
- Ryan, L 2006, 'Massacre in Tasmania: how do we know?', *Australia and New Zealand Law and History Journal*, pp.1-21, viewed 29 June 2014 http://www.anzlhsejournal.auckland.ac.nz/pdfs_2006/Paper_6_Ryan.pdf
- Ryan, L 2008, 'List of multiple killings of Aborigines in Tasmania: 1804-1835', *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence*, viewed 29 June 2014, <http://www.massviolence.org/List-of-multiple-killings-of-Aborigines-in-Tasmania-1804?cs=print>
- Ryan, L 2010, 'Hard evidence: the debate about massacre in the Black War in Tasmania', in F Peters-Little, A Curthoys & J Docker (eds.), *Passionate histories: myth, memory and Indigenous Australia*, ANU E Press, Canberra, pp.39-50.
- Ryan, L n.d, *Abductions and Multiple Killings of Aborigines in Tasmania*, *Electronic Encyclopedia of Genocide and Massacre*, viewed 29 June 2014 www.yale.edu/gsp/colonial/downloads/Aborigines_in_Tasmania.doc
- Ryan, L & Smith, N 1976, 'Trugernanner (Truganini)(1812-1876)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, vol. 6, Melbourne University Publishing, Melbourne, rev, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, viewed 29 June 2012 <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/trugernanner-truganini-4752>
- Rygiel, K 2013, 'Mobile citizens, risky subjects: security knowledge at the border', in S Ilcan (ed.), *Mobilities, knowledge, and social justice*, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal, pp.152-176.
- Rygiel, K 2006, 'Protecting and proving identity: the biopolitics of waging war through citizenship in the post-9/11 era', in K Hunt & K Rygiel (eds.), *(En)gendering the war on terror: war stories and camouflaged politics*, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp.145-168.

Said, EW 1983, *The world, the text, and the critic*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Saraceno, C 1996, 'Redefining maternity and paternity: gender, protonatalism and social policies in Fascist Italy', in G Bock & P Thane (eds.), *Maternity and gender policies: women and the rise of the European welfare states, 1880s-1950s*, Routledge, London, pp.196-212.

Saunders, K (ed.) 1984, *Indentured labour in the British Empire, 1834-1920*, Croom Helm, London.

Saunders, K 2000, '“Taken away to be shot?”: the process of incarceration in Australia in World War II', in K Saunders & R Daniels (eds.), *Alien justice: wartime internment in Australia and North America*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, pp.152-167.

Saunders, K 2003, 'The stranger in our gates: internment policies in the United Kingdom and Australia during the two world wars 1914-1939', *Immigrants & Minorities*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp.22-43.

Saunders, K & Daniels, R (eds.) 2000, *Alien justice: wartime internment in Australia and North America*, University of Queensland Press, St.Lucia.

Schaper, M 1995, 'The Broome race riots', in J Gothard (ed.), *Asian orientations studies in Western Australian history*, vol. 16, pp.112-132.

Scott, E 1936, *Australia during the war*, Angus & Roberston Ltd, Sydney, viewed 29 June 2014
[http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.\\$b58536;view=1up;seq=9](http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.$b58536;view=1up;seq=9)

Scott, JC 1985, *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Scott, JC 1990, *Domination and the arts of resistance: hidden transcripts*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Scully, R 2012, *British images of Germany: admiration, antagonism and ambivalence, 1860-1914*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Seitz, A & Foster, L 1989, 'German nationals in Australia 1939-1947: internments, forced migration and/or social control?', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp.13-31.

Smith, G 2000, 'The Japanese-Canadians and World War II', in K Saunders & R Daniels (eds.), *Alien justice: wartime internment in Australia and North America*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, pp.93-113.

Smith, R 2004, *Jamaican volunteers in the First World War: race, masculinity and the development of national consciousness*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Smith, S & Watson, J (eds.) 1992, *De/colonizing the subject: the politics of gender in women's autobiography*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Smithers, GD 2008, *Science, sexuality, and race in the United States and Australia*, Routledge, New York.

Smithers, GD 2012, *Slave breeding: sex and slavery in African American history*, University Press of Florida, Florida.

Smithers, GD & Newman, BN (eds.) 2014, *Native diasporas: Indigenous identities and settler colonialism in the Americas*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, viewed 29 June 2014
http://www.nebraskapress.unl.edu/Supplements/excerpts/Spring%2014/9780803233638_excerpt.pdf

Soguk, N 2007, 'Border's capture: insurrectional politics, border-crossing humans, and the new political', *Borderscapes: hidden geographies and politics at territory's edge*, vol. 29, pp.283-308.

Spackman, B 1995, 'Fascist women and the rhetoric of virility', in R Pickering-Iazzi (ed.), *Mothers of Invention: women, Italian Fascism and culture*, University of Minnesota Press, London, pp.100-120.

Spadolini, G 1994, *Nazione e nazionalita in Italia*, LaTerza, Rome. Spinazze, S 2006, 'Artiste nel ventennio il ruolo dell'Associazione Femminile tra Emancipazione e Nazionalizzazione', in MA Trasforini (ed.), *Donne d'arte: storie e generazioni*, Meltemi Editore, Rome.

Spizzica, M 2013, 'Italian civilian internment in South Australia revisited', *Journal of the Historical Society of South Australia*, vol 41, pp.65-79.

Spivak, G 1999, *A critique of post-colonial reason: toward a history of the vanishing present*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Stephenson, P 2007, *The outsiders within: telling Australia's Indigenous-Asian story*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney, pp.119-121.

Stoler, AL 1995, *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Suttor, WH 1887, *Australian stories retold, and, sketches of country life*, Glyndwr Whalan, Bathurst.

Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre 2010, *Draft History report - Mumirimina People of the Lower Jordan Valley*, 23 February, Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre Inc., viewed 8 February 2014
<http://tacinc.com.au/files/attachment2.pdf>

- Tatz, CM 2003, *With the intent to destroy: reflecting on genocide*, Verso, London.
- Therry, R 1863, *Reminiscences of thirty years residence in New South Wales and Victoria*, Sampson Low, Son & Co, London.
- Thomas, S (dir.) 1992, *Black Man's Houses*, DVD, Ronin Films.
- Thompson, S 2011, *The enemy at home: German internees in World War I Australia*, online exhibition, Migration Heritage Centre, Powerhouse Museum, viewed 29 June 2014
<http://www.migrationheritage.nsw.gov.au/exhibition/enemyathome/enemy-at-home-credits/>
- Titley, E 2012, *White vanishing: rethinking Australia's lost-in-the-bush myth*, Rodopi, Amsterdam.
- Tosco, A 2002, *The Italo-Australian press: media and mass communication in the emigration world 1900-1940*, doctoral thesis, Griffith University, Brisbane.
- Triaca, M 1985, *Amelia, a long journey*, Greenhouse Publications, Elwood.
- Van Toorn, P 2000, 'Indigenous texts and narratives', in E Webby (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Australian literature*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, pp.19-49.
- Van Toorn, P 2006, *Writing never arrives naked: early Aboriginal cultures of writing in Australia*, Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra.
- Venturini, VG 2007, *Never give in: three Italian antifascist exiles in Australia, 1924 - 1956*, SEARCH Foundation, Surry Hills.
- Verdicchio, P 1997, *Bound by distance: rethinking nationalism through the Italian diaspora*, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Madison.
- Wadiwel, D 2007, '“A particularly governmental form of warfare”: Palm Island and Australian sovereignty', in SA Perera (ed.), *Our patch: enacting Australian sovereignty post-2001*, Network Books, Perth, pp.149-166.
- Walter, M & Daniels, L 2008, 'Personalising the History Wars: Woretemoetyenner's story', *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp.35-44, viewed 29 June 2014
<http://www.isrn.qut.edu.au/pdf/ijcis/IJCIS%20Walter%20&%20Daniels.pdf>
- Wardrop, SB 1996, *By proxy: a study of Italian proxy brides in Australia*, Italian Historical Society, Melbourne.
- Warhaft, S (ed.) 2004, *Well may we say--: the speeches that made Australia*, Black Inc. Publishing, Melbourne.

Waters, C 2012, *Australia and appeasement: imperial foreign policy and the origins of World War II*, I. B. Tauris & Co., London.

Watkins, V 1999, *Pukunja*, Parker Pattinson Publishing, Hurstville.

Watson, F (ed.) 1922, *Historical records of Australia, Series III, vol. v*, Government Printer, Sydney.

Watson, I 2007a, 'Settled and unsettled spaces: are we free to roam?', in A Moreton-Robinson (ed.), *Sovereign subjects: Indigenous sovereignty matters*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, pp.15-32.

Watson, I 2007b, 'Aboriginal sovereignties: past, present and future (impossibilities)', in SA Perera (ed.), *Our patch: enacting Australian sovereignty post-2001*, Network Books, Perth, pp.23-43.

Willard, M 1978, *History of the White Australia Policy to 1920*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.

Williams, ST 2007, *Indigenous values informing curriculum and pedagogical praxis*. Doctoral thesis, Deakin University, Melbourne, viewed 29 June 2014 <https://dro.deakin.edu.au/eserv/DU:30023289/williams-indigenousvalues-2007.pdf>

Willson, PR 1996, 'Women in Fascist Italy', in R Bessel (ed.), *Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany: comparisons and contrasts*, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp.78-93.

Windschuttle, K 2002, *The fabrication of Aboriginal history*, Macleay Press, Paddington.

Winegard, TC 2009, 'A case study of Indigenous brothers in arms during the First World War', *Australian Army Journal*, vol. VI, no. 1, pp.191-206. Winegard, TC 2012, *For King and Kanata: Canadian Indians and the First World War*, University of Manitoba Press, Winnipeg.

Winter, C 2012, *Looking after one's own. The rise of nationalism and the politics of Neuendettelsauer Mission in Australia, New Guinea and Germany (1921-1933)*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

Newspapers

Hobart Town Gazette

'Lt Governor George Arthur's Proclamation, 1830', 10 September, n.p.

The Aboriginal Flinders Island Chronicle (1836)

The Queenslander

‘Deportation of Kanakas - Validity of the Act’ 1906, n.p.

Italian Bulletin of Australia (1922)

Corriere degli Italiani (1928)

Il Littorio (1928)

L’Eco d’Australia (1928)

Italo-Australian (Fascist)

‘Il Programma’, 1922, p.1.

‘Liberta e Liberalismo’, 1923, p.1

‘After the drama: the external enemies and internal cowards’, 1924, p.1

‘Grandiosa manifestazione d’Italianita’, 1924, p.4

‘The Herald’s Criticism of Mussolini’, 1925, p.1

‘Mr A. M. Pooley Again’, 1925, p.1

‘The Royal Commission Report’, 1925, 13 June, p.1

‘Un profile di Donna Rachele’, 1926, p.1

‘Scuola Emigrazione e Fascismo’, 1928, p.6

‘Mussolini and Women’, 1931, p.1

‘Una graziosa promessa sposa’, 1932, p.3

‘Anita, l’eroina che amo e morì per Garibaldi’, 1932, p.1

‘Splendida riuscita del Ballo Littorio’, 1932, p.3

‘The women of Italy’, 1932, p.1

‘Mussolini and Women’, 1932, p.1

‘Riunione Del Fascio Femminile di Sydney’, 1933, p.3

‘La Scuola Del Fascio di Sydney’, 1933, p.3

‘L’Opera del Fascio Femminile’, 1936, p.3

Il Giornale Italiano (Fascist)

‘One after the other the defense of the Abyssinian resistance has crumbled,’ 1936, 8 April, p.1

Il Risveglio (Anti-fascist)

‘The Vile Fascist Lies’, 1927, 1 August, p.2

‘La Menzogna di Dio’, [‘God’s Lie’] 1927, 1 August, p.2

‘Free Love’, 1927, 1 August, p. 10

‘Workers of Queensland’, 1927, 1 August n.p.

L’Avanguardia Libertaria (Anti-fascist)

‘The Problem of Action’, 1930, 15 December, n.p.

La Riscossa (Anti-fascist)

‘Comrades of North Queensland’, 1930, 20 April, p.1
‘Religione, La Patria, La Famiglia and Gli Anarchici’, 1930, 15
December, p.2
‘Gli Antifascisti di Ingham, N.Q., Non Permettono ai Consoli di fare La
Propaganda Fascista’, [The Antifascist of Ingham, N.Q. Do not Allow
Consuls to do Fascist propaganda]1932, 15 March, p.1

The Australian Abo Call (Editor, Jack Patten, President, Aboriginal
Progressive Association)

‘To All Aborigines’, April 1938, p.1
‘Massacres’, April 1938, p. 4
‘Our Ten Points’, April 1938, p.1
‘New Hope for old Australians’, 1938, May, p.1
‘Royal Commission Urgently Needed’, May 1938, p. 2
‘Massacre at Myall Creek’, May 1938, p.3
‘Calling all Aborigines Straight Talk’, June 1938, p.1
‘The Abo Call: Difficulties Overcome’ June 1938, p.2
‘The Massacres at Bathurst’, June 1938, p.3
‘The Abo Call in Queensland’, 1938, June p.4
‘Massacres in Victoria’, September, 1938, p.3

(Abo Call online NSW State Library - P. R. Stephensen - Papers, ca.1920-
1971)

National Archives

ACT

AA: A367, B18220, Italian Publications Italian Publications - Information
asked for by 6th Nov 1929 - In Memoria, La Riscossa, G. Matteotti,
Germinal, Commonwealth Investigation Branch, Melbourne and
Canberra.

AA: A3671/1, C1822 Part1 AA: La Rivista Italiana, il Giornale Italiano.
Recent articles on Abyssinia and Italian colonisation May - June 1936
Investigation Branch, Central Office, Melbourne and Canberra. 1922-1936.

AA: A433, 1945/2/6095, Internment of Enemy Women, War Cabinet Minute,
Melbourne, 29 August 1940.

AA: A816, 54/301/3, Enemy Women, Department of Defence Co-
ordination, Memorandum, 8 August, 1940.

AA ACT: A367, C38466, FENOGLIO, Vittoria - Internee file, Canberra,
Special Intelligence Bureau, (Central Office) Melbourne.

AA ACT: A367, C4023, F. Carmagnola, 1929-1947, Commonwealth Investigation Branch, Canberra and Melbourne.

AA ACT: A367, C57420, Albanese Rosalia (Mrs), Canberra, Special Intelligence Bureau, (Central Office) Melbourne.

AA ACT: A367, C70877, NOSENZO, Giovanna, Canberra, Special Intelligence Bureau, (Central Office) Melbourne.

AA ACT: A367, C73480, MERENDA, Frances Maria (Franceschina), daughter of Paolo and Nicoletta - Internment, Canberra, Special Intelligence Bureau, (Central Office) Melbourne.

AA ACT: A367, C78385, De Maria Giovanni, Special Intelligence Bureau, (Central Office) Melbourne.

AA ACT: A432, 1929/578 PART 4, Italian Newspaper Il Risveglio, Attorney General Department, Canberra, 1929.

AA ACT: A432, 1932/363 Carmagnola Francesco, Attorney General's Department, Canberra, 1932-1935.

AA ACT: BP25/1, FASANO M - ITALIAN, Fasano, Maria [Angela] - Nationality: Italian - Arrived Brisbane on Ormonde 9 May 1938, Brisbane, Collector of Customs, Brisbane, Queensland.

AA ACT: C69649, A367/1, Luigina Ganora 1943-45, Investigation Branch, Canberra and Melbourne, Cairns Police Report, Luigina Ganora and Royal Hotel, 30 January, 1942 n.p.

NSW

AA NSW: 2955- C123/1, Giovenale Elena (Italian) Box, Security Service NSW.

AA NSW: 367/1, C69276: Fanelli Iolanda, Australian Military Forces Eastern Command, Dossier by Sydney Police Headquarters, 5 August 1940.

AA NSW: A11803, 1918/89/852, Prisoner of War Camp - Bourke NSW, German Division London, Correspondence, 22 July, 1918.

AA NSW: SP908/1, ITALIAN/ROMEO MARIA [2], Maria Romeo [nee Caruso][Date of birth: 15 Sep 1916][Italian - arrived Sydney per SURRIENTO, 7 Feb 1956. Box 1087], Sydney, Department of Immigration, New South Wales Branch

SA

AA SA: MP367/1, 567/3/2202 Part 1, Australian Military Forces, Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry, 10 August 1915, Captain G E Hawkes, 77th Infantry - Court of Enquiry - Torrens Island Concentration Camp pp.1-160.

AA SA: MP367/1, 567/3/2202 Part 1, Australian Military Forces, Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry, 10 August 1915, Captain G E Hawkes, 77th Infantry - Court of Enquiry - Torrens Island Concentration Camp, p.2.

AA S.A: Disloyal Germans and Others in S.A', Department of Defence 1918-1919, List, pp.1-26.

QLD

AA Qld: BP242/1, Q30565, Italian General File, CIB, Report Of Commonwealth Investigation Officer –Italian Organization 26 July 1939, p.10.

AA Qld: BP242/1, Q24188, Catherine Grimaz, Catterina Grimaz [nee Costaberer] [aka Costa; aka Gaspari] - Queensland investigation case file Northern Command 28, January 1942.

AA Qld: BP242/1, Q30005, Mrs Ines Gatti- Queensland Investigation File, Investigation Branch, Brisbane, Report, 29 October 1941.

AA Qld: BP242/1, Q16936, Stellino Francesco and wife Margherita Queensland Investigaiton Case File, Investigation Branch, Brisbane. Range May 1941-June 43.

AA Qld: BP242/1, Q37962, Villari, Agata - Queensland investigation case file, Brisbane, Investigation Branch, Queensland.

AA Qld: A367/1, C69238, Meoli Maddellana Carmelinda, Investigation Branch Melbourne and Canberra, Victorian Advisory Committee, Objection by M.C. Meoli , September, 1942.

AA Qld: BP242/1, Q30233, Interment of Mrs Angiolina COSTA, 21 Junction Street, Stones Corner, South Brisbane, and search of premises occupied by her.

AA Qld: BP242/1, Q30246, Barbi, Maria Mrs - Queensland investigation case file [resided Babinda], Brisbane, Investigation Branch, Queensland.

AA Qld: BP242/2, Q30238 . Ganora Luigina Queensland Investigative case file 1942-45 Tatura Camp, Censored Personal Letter, 19 June, 1943.

AA Qld: BP9/3, ITALIAN SCAFIDI E, Scafidi [Alfano], Elena born 1903 - nationality Italian - arrived in Brisbane on MN REMO 24 April 1937 [husband - Alfano, Antonio], Brisbane, Collector of Customs, Brisbane, Queensland.

AA Qld: J25, 1956/4041, Ghidella, Maria and Lorenzo, Brisbane, Department of Immigration, Queensland Branch.

VIC

AA Vic: MP367/1, 567/3/1406, Matron Internment Camp, Bourke NSW, Department of Defence, Single Women Internees, Memorandum, June 18, 1918

AA Vic: MP367/1, 567/3/1406, Matron Internment Camp, Bourke NSW, Department of Defence, German Concentration Camps Headquarters NSW, Correspondence, 21 October 1915.

AA Vic: MP367/1, 567/3/2202 Part 1, Australian Military Forces, Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry, 10 August 1915, Captain G E Hawkes, 77th Infantry - Court of Enquiry - Torrens Island Concentration Camp pp.1-160

AA Vic: MP367/1 Inspection of Australian Prisoner of War Camps by Consul General for Sweden Closure Prisoners of War Camp at Bourke, Consular Swiss, Report Visit to Molonglo Concentration Camp, p.7, 5 November, 1918.

AA Vic: MP 508/1, 255/702/1346 Australian Military Forces Northern Command, Internment Of Women-Fascio Women's Section, Brisbane, 22, July 194;

AA Vic: MP508/1, 259/715/211, Internment of Women Accommodation for interned families, Dept. Of Army, Internment of Women Report- Eastern District 3 March, 1942.

WA

AA WA: A2, 1917/3501PART3, Enemy Subjects-Treatment of Prisoners of War Rottneest Island Camp, Governor General Office, Memorandum 3 March, 1915.

AA WA: PP 14/1, 4/3/493, Hostility of German Women, Department of Defence.

Acts and Bills

United Kingdom

Treaty of Commerce and Navigation 1938 (Italy with Britain)

South Africa

Immigration Restriction Act (Natal Act) 1897

Commonwealth of Australia

Immigration Restriction Act 1901

Pacific Island Labourers Act 1901

Commonwealth Franchise Act 1902

Factories Bill 1903

Pacific Island Labourers Act 1906

National Defence Act 1908

Maternity Allowances Act 1912

Crimes Act 1914

War Precautions Bill 1914

War Precaution Bill, Second Reading 1914

British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1914

War Precautions Act 1914

Regulations 1915

Regulations s.10-25, s55, s56, s56a

War Precautions Act 1916,

War Precautions Act - Aliens Registration Regulation 1916

Aliens Restriction Order 1916

Unlawful Association Act 1917

Amendment to Naturalisation Act 1917

Disloyalty Regulation 1918

Nationality Act 1920

Immigration Acts of 1920

Passport Legislation Act 1920

Publication of Newspapers in Foreign Languages Act 1921

Statutory Rule, Publication of Newspapers in Foreign Languages Regulations Act 1921

Immigration Act of 1924

Amendments to Immigration Act 1925

National Security Act 1939

National Security (Aliens Control) Act 1939

Northern Territory National Emergency Response 2007

Queensland

Aliens Act 1867

Master and Servant Acts 1892

Coloured Restriction Bill 1896

Aboriginal protection and restriction of the Sale of Opium Act 1897

New South Wales

Newspaper Act 1898

Hansard and Parliamentary Records

House of Commons, United Kingdom

George Arthur, A Proclamation 1 November 1828 in Colonies and Slaves, Parliamentary Papers, House of Commons and Command 1831, vol. xix House of Commons, p.259

Commonwealth of Australia

Year Book Commonwealth of Australia 1922, The Naturalisation Act conferring rights of a British subject p. 1090

Commonwealth of Australia 25 June 1925, pp. 456-461

Commonwealth of Australia 2 July 1925, pp. 655-688

Western Australia - House of Assembly

Papalia, P Hon. 2012, World War II Internment Camps: motion, 20 June, House of Assembly, Parliament of Western Australia, official Hansard, pp.4100a-4117a, viewed 29 June 2014
[http://www.parliament.wa.gov.au/hansard/hansard.nsf/451a59fb51257dd248256c85002bc738/26975d3c173ad0ee48257a46002d164d/\\$FILE/A38%20S1%2020120620%20p4100a-4117a.pdf](http://www.parliament.wa.gov.au/hansard/hansard.nsf/451a59fb51257dd248256c85002bc738/26975d3c173ad0ee48257a46002d164d/$FILE/A38%20S1%2020120620%20p4100a-4117a.pdf)

South Australia - House of Assembly

Piccolo, T Hon. 2011, Internment Camps: motion, 10 November, House of Assembly, Parliament of South Australia', official Hansard, pp.5926-5933

viewed 29 June 2014

<https://hansardpublic.parliament.sa.gov.au/Pages/HansardResult.aspx#/docid/HANSARD-11-9599>