ARRESTED IN ST PETER'S

ANTHONY MARTIN FERNANDO, ABORIGINAL AUSTRALIA AND FASCIST ITALY

Fiona Paisley

Griffith University

ABSTRACT This article concerns the protest of an Aboriginal Australian man, Anthony Martin Fernando, who during an international gathering of Rome Catholics in the Jubilee year of 1925 handed out flyers outside St Peter's Cathedral in Rome. By protesting against conditions for Aboriginal people in Australia, Fernando brought the question of settler colonialism in Australia directly and in person to the Roman Catholic community arriving from around the world. Where the Vatican's ethnographic exhibition of that year rehearsed the more usual representation of injustices towards Australia's indigenous people as integral to an unruly nineteenth-century colonial frontier, Fernando aimed to link Australian settler colonialism with the British world in the present – a world he characterized as yet to be brought to account for its actions towards colonized peoples, particularly the Aborigines of Australia. The audacity of that protest, as well as the literal presence of an Aboriginal man living by himself on the streets of interwar Europe, forces us to reconsider Aboriginal Australian activism in the twentieth century. It requires firstly a more genuinely transnational account of the history of indigenous politics in Australia, and secondly a more dynamic account of the diversity of often-ephemeral forms of black political activism carried out within and beyond colonial settings in the modern era.

Keywords: settler colonialism, religion and morality, settler violence, Catholicism, civilization, mobility

INTRODUCTION

In May 1925, the largest-ever official contingent of Australian Catholics arrived in Rome to attend the Roman Catholic Jubilee.¹ Having made the long boat and rail journey from Australia, they joined the throngs of faithful from around the world to seek absolution in the Holy City. Rome's streets were packed with thousands of foreigner pilgrims and tourists equally eager to sample the delights of Italian culture and history while fulfilling the duties of the modern-day pilgrim. Navigating a centuries-old path snaking through the city, with national flags in hand they followed their clergymen leaders to each of the city's seven basilicas, where they celebrated their membership in the world Church and sought personal salvation through offering prayers and hymns to the reliquaries of saints.²

The pilgrims' final destination was St Peter's. Unbeknownst to the Australian contingent, however, a fellow countryman had beaten them to a prime position at the

Address for correspondence: Dr Fiona Paisley, School of Humanities, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia. E-mail: f.paisley@griffith.edu.au

entrance to the famous cathedral. Not a member of the official contingent (dominated by Irish Australians), Anthony Martin Fernando was in fact an Aboriginal Australian with a substantial international activist career behind him. His letter calling for international intervention in Australia via the League of Nations had been published four years earlier in the Swiss press.³ Now turning his attention to the Catholic community, on the one hand, and to the British citizens among his fellow pilgrims on the other (Australians, from his colonial perspective, were merely British people living away from home), Fernando's pilgrimage concerned more than individual conscience. He was seeking public recognition of the collective sin of white settler colonialism as a step towards its remedy through social and political action. Setting out his views in a flyer that he distributed in person, Fernando's very presence brought into question the legitimacy of the Australians who were about to make their appearance in the city. Their displeasure can be gauged, perhaps, by the fact that he was arrested within twenty-four hours of their arrival. Tipped off anonymously that a lone protester outside St Peter's was circulating a flyer highly critical of Australia's treatment of its native people, undercover police took Fernando into custody while in the act, and confiscated the offending document.

Thanks to police vigilance in obtaining a copy of this flyer (and a series of related letters written by Fernando),⁴ we are able to compare three competing accounts of 'Australia' brought into proximity at the 1925 Jubilee. The Vatican's own exhibition for the Jubilee called upon Catholics from around the world to contemplate Britain's reputation as an imperial power, while the Australians (supportive of Ireland's resistance against British imperialism) aimed to confirm their credibility within the Catholic hierarchy in Rome. In contrast, Fernando's own protest contributed to the circulating debates about the settler colonial origins of the Australian nation as a matter for present-day intervention. He would deploy questions about identity, authority and ethics in the modern century raised by the Australian contingent, with its divided loyalties towards the renewal of Aboriginal Australia as itself a nascent nationalism – this at a time when Italy was seeking to establish its own place as an imperial world power within the League of Nations. Through the figure of Fernando as 'Aboriginal protester', contemporary shifts in European relations within the empire were exploited in the name of the Aboriginal people of Greater Britain.

CELESTIAL CHILDREN OF ADAM AND EVE

Printed in Italian on cheap paper and with a large cross at its top centre, at first glance Fernando's flyer might have passed for a religious tract. Yet its interests were more earthly and immediate. Opening with a sensational warning about 'THE FEW ABORIGINES THAT STILL REMAIN IN AUSTRALIA', it proceeded to argue against their ultimate extinction or preservation as remnant survivors. Instead, Fernando composed a text that drew from contemporary ideas about colonial frontiers and about the capacity of indigenous cultures to survive them. He aimed to construct a case for the future of Aboriginal Australia, one that focused on Aborigines living beyond the control of European society yet influenced by its civilization, particularly those living in the north of the continent now under threat post-federation as waves of

migration washed across their lands. While agreeing that these people were less advanced than their usurpers, Fernando argued that the capacity for modernization among Aboriginal people over the century and a half that had passed since first settlement had deliberately been obstructed by a colonial regime intent upon their exploitation. Far from legitimating this history of exploitation, the relatively primitive status of the Aborigines signalled their much greater closeness to God than the supposedly civilized British who had occupied their land, exploited their labour and ultimately sought to eradicate them entirely.

In constructing his case for the inherent modernity of the Aboriginal people, Fernando mobilized a combination of religious and secular arguments. As he reminded his fellow penitents under the auspices of the Jubilee, sins first had to be confessed before they could be absolved. But private confession with one's God was not sufficient in the case of a national sin against a race of people. Because the powerful grip of the British Australian state remained formidable, only a concerted international response – both secular and Christian – could ensure a real future for the Aborigines. In pressing his claim upon the conscience of the progressive world community, Fernando echoed a variety of Aboriginal spokesmen and women in Australia who variously appealed to a 'higher authority', including British royalty, the Anti-Slavery Society of London and later (in 1938) the League of Nations, in an attempt to improve their conditions.⁵ However, Fernando was speaking in Europe itself – indeed (at least for some) at its very headquarters – and thus his physical presence was well in advance of this larger genealogy, which did not really become established until after the Second World War.

First, Fernando set about appropriating the common evocation of indigenous people as living in nature. In his account, primitive vulnerability had produced a culture of settler violence by which indigenous people literally were hunted down by men whose professional work as settlers was to kill them. Claiming to provide a conduit directly "[f]rom the forests and the woods" ... to the "Lord" and by means of the Pope and Christianity and other organisations [claiming] to protect them from the vile and ruthless assassins', he aimed to politicize (and therefore indigenize) a long-standing humanitarian discourse asserting the sins of unregulated colonialism visited upon primitive peoples and their lands. Comparing Old Testament with modern anthropological time, Fernando declared that colonial violence was especially reprehensible in Australia, given that the ancient Aborigines were closest to the first man and woman, and thus truly the chosen children of God.⁶

The Vatican, world Christianity and progressive state powers had all failed in their duty towards the colonized. Yet each should uphold Christian liberal standards – including the value of the lives of colonized people. The secular organization Fernando sought to mobilize in Rome was Italy's Fascist government – and here he may well have been thinking of Italy's own colonial holdings in North Africa, which it would soon seek to expand in the 1930s. Note the present tense that characterizes his argument: rather than protect the most defenceless, these organizations or movements preferred to go on ignoring the plight of colonized peoples. They remained 'cowardly, deaf and dumb' in the face of overwhelming evidence of past and present injustice, particularly in relation to the treatment of the Aborigines in Australia.

Standing up to the British would require courage and tenacity. Fernando had discovered for himself the risk of speaking out from within Australia. After accusing a policeman of criminal acts against local Aborigines in outback Western Australia during the first years of the century, he had experienced death threats.⁷ Now in Rome over twenty years later, Fernando sought to explain the brutal tenacity of British Australian rule by reflecting on its historical origins in convictism. In this way, he returned to the past not because it was the primary period in which colonial injustice had occurred, but in an effort to explain its ongoing valency in Australian society. Church and state must join forces and speak out against Britain's murderous regime in Australia, he wrote, in order to 'save the natives ... from the inhumane British assassins, and from the descendants of the British convicts'.

In Fernando's account of early Australia, the fact that civilization had failed to flourish was nowhere more clearly evident than in the treatment of the Aborigines. Convicts – dominated by the Irish – had been deployed by Protestants of social rank to carry out the dirty work of settlement. Because they and their descendants had become the shock troops of the frontier, it was the degenerative influence of the Irish frontiersman and the disinterest of their English masters – not the primitiveness of the Aborigines – that had created the poor environment. Through applying eugenic and racial theory in his account of the criminal class of Irish as a degenerate race, Fernando's analysis of the frontier extended well beyond any simple Manichaean distinction between white and black. It incorporated the role of religion in shaping social rank and power, while explaining the role of 'race' in cultural as well as racial terms to emphasize the positive powers of the Aboriginal people and the negative influences of the Irish. These were the social and political realities behind the brutality upon which British rule had been secured in Australia.

With a particular focus on addressing 'Britons' – the collective 'race' behind the British Empire – Fernando declared their universal complicity, however indirect, in the sins of settler Australia. The corrupting influence of colonialism would have to be remedied before they or the world could move forward – an argument recently reiterated within Australia via a national apology for the removal of Aboriginal children during the twentieth century. In this way, Fernando constructed his central readership as already aware of the reality in Australia, but unable to come to terms with their implication in its injustices. By making this realization the basis for their pilgrimage to Rome, they could begin to reinstate the civilizing mission for the good of the Aborigines.

It is worth emphasizing that Fernando was not opposed to European influence in his country. As his own peripatetic life made evident, he was far from being an isolationist. In his vision of a future Australia, the adaptation of European culture by the Aboriginal people was crucial. But first the British had to realize that colonization was more than a project of uplift; it was a pivotal force in world history. Naive pride in the achievements of European culture overlooked its origins in the colonization of their own ancestors by the Romans. White Australians would have to share the achievements of civilization with the next people to emerge out of primitivism, the Aborigines, or the necessary process of renewal would not be achieved: 'You boast about your civilization, about your education, humanity and science etc. etc. Put into practice that of which

you boast, and show your gratefulness to the Romans who civilized you, by doing the same for your primitive brothers in Australia.’

In his reference to the Roman Empire as exemplar, Fernando inverted a common allusion equating the successes of Imperial Rome with those of the British world.⁸ Given his location in the city of Rome itself, he seemed to evoke instead an image of British travellers (including, we can assume, the recently arrived Australians) who failed to recognize in the historical ruins surrounding them evidence in stone edifice and mosaic tiles of their own fate, the lesson of history being that all empires inevitably fall into ruin. So British rule would continue to degenerate and ultimately disappear. Indeed, Australia’s failed civilization offered strong evidence that this process of decline was already under way. However desperate conditions might be in Australia for his people, salvation was to come. This was Fernando’s radical message: the Aborigines were not simply proto-moderns awaiting their rightful access to European modernity but were in fact the inheritors of world culture, destined to make civilization into their own likeness.

Not all colonized peoples would be able to take up the baton of civilization, however. Fernando agreed with contemporary anthropology that the shadow of modernity had caused the passing of those primitive peoples too fragile to survive contact. Races were also hierarchical in his world-view, but in terms of their capacity for cultural innovation and in their moral resilience the Aborigines had shown themselves to be remarkably resilient, despite the evil influences of their colonizers. They had not quietly faded away, but instead somehow had managed to survive a violent colonial regime.

Nor were all settlers equally responsible for the frontier conditions faced by the Aborigines. A Catholic himself, Fernando was keen to distinguish between Catholic and non-Catholic settlers in Australia. Emphasizing the lower status of Catholics in Australian society, he argued that political and social disempowerment was behind their failure as a group to act against the status quo in Australia and to defend the rights of the Aborigines. Without a concerted opposition, the Protestant elite had been able to enlist the predominantly Irish convict class in a war against the Aborigines, allowing them to carry out murder and violence as they occupied their lands with little regard for the rule of law. In fact, their unlawful ‘order’ was one of the most reprehensible of the frontier’s open secrets. Fernando’s analysis of the genocide in Australia anticipated more recent historical accounts of the sometimes veiled, sometimes explicit process of ‘clearing’, ‘dispersal’ and ‘settlement’.⁹ Clear evidence of the success of this collaboration could be found, he asserted, in the almost total absence of Aboriginal people from urban centres in Australia:

N.B. In the shadow of the British one does not find natives. The British Protestant assassins and the descendents of the British convicts now conspire to annihilate those who are not in their shadow. It is the order that all natives in their shadow must die. In any city, big or small, that you visit, you will not see a sole native, and woe to the unfortunate person who gives sign of friendship to a native, even in the desert lands.

Using a method almost scientific in its effectiveness, British settlers forwarded their genocidal aims by direct and indirect means – through driving off Aborigines from

their land and exploiting their labour, and through starvation, disease and acts of cruelty:

THE METHOD ADOPTED:

By shooting and poisoning food, when the number of natives is already diminished.

By means of hard work, shortage of sufficient food, venereal diseases, and other inhuman cruelties, all that the human intelligence can invent.

Such treatment was all the more horrifying given the peaceful and inherently civilized nature of the Aboriginal people. Not the savages of the European imagination, they were in fact an ancient people of resilience and intelligence: 'The Natives (Aborigine) of Australia are not ferocious, cannibals, or cruel. They are the first primitives among the children of Adam and Eve. And yet they are the most intelligent among the primitive peoples that the historian has discovered.' Far from lacking in sophistication, they had made technological advances appropriate to their environment:

Consider the tools with which they hunt. The 'Boomerang', if it does not hit the object against which it is thrown, it returns to the feet of who threw it. They are the only primitive Natives in the world who use a spear, without a bow, and other devices that require dexterity and that surprise those that see them use them.

The boomerang was then being studied by ethnographers aiming to place Aboriginal Australians above the lowest rung on the ladder of human evolution.¹⁰ A contemporary of Fernando's living in Australia, the Aboriginal inventor and spokesperson David Unaipon who worked with the Museum of South Australia, also drew from anthropological claims about the invention of the boomerang to argue for the rightful place of the Aboriginal people within modernity.¹¹ At work in Fernando's schema is the notion that internal cultural dynamism predicts the capacity to cope with the impact of European civilization. Little space exists in this account of culture (or, for that matter, of 'race') for the urban or mixed descent Aboriginal people who, despite Fernando's assertion to the contrary, were present in increasing numbers in Australian cities and towns, or on their outskirts. Their cultural identity was not ostensibly located in land or tradition, but in the processes of accommodation that had brought them 'within' European ways of life.

The Aboriginality described in Fernando's flyer was also unlike his own. He was a man of part Aboriginality (his father likely a South Asian ex-sailor who had jumped ship). Nor were Aboriginal people living in southern or urban Australia – among them activists beginning to establish their own organizations – compatible with his account of celestial children living in nature, at risk of extinction. And certainly the popularity of boomerang throwing among European tourists visiting Aboriginal reserves and missions in Australia, eager to witness the positive influence of modernization upon this 'race',¹² failed to fit well within his account of an Aboriginality understood in terms of traditional lifestyle (despite its absence from his own accounts of his early life).

Broadening his scope to include his European readers more generally, Fernando appealed to their 'good sense' to see through humanitarian platitudes. The world was mostly ignorant of the reality of British colonialism – even those concerned about

Aboriginal rights were being misled by British Australian claims that protection boards and missions provided for a just Aboriginal future. Propaganda against the Aborigines had cast them as animalistic and dangerous opponents on a vicious frontier: 'the British thirst for the blood of these innocent celestial children of Adam and Eve is so strong that they had the ignorant world believe that the Natives of Australia are inferior to Animals, to the Beasts, to Reptiles, etc.' Even Christianity had been appropriated by the imperial agenda, with the current system of missions and government reserves merely camouflaging colonialism of old:

Trust in your good sense; do not let yourself be tricked by the British and by the astuteness of the descendants of convicts and by their meddling organisations such as the Commission for the Protection of Aborigines, the Government Reserves for Aborigines and Missionaries etc.

The aforementioned institutions do not exist in order to help Aborigines but rather to throw dust in the eyes of those who would like to obtain information.

Although the British were the benefactors of a terrible regime in Australia, Catholics among them might yet find redemption for their part in the sins of colonial rule if they decided to intervene: 'The Son of Our Lord Jesus Christ died on the Cross of Calvary, so that he could redeem those in need of help, and the exiled.'

While Fernando included missions among those responsible for the crimes of colonial rule, his own trajectory indicates that mission education was not simply a source of disempowerment for Aboriginal people. Biblical narratives of the exile and return of chosen peoples have been important to the historical emergence of Aboriginal activism from the late nineteenth into the twentieth century.¹³ More broadly, Aboriginal Christianity contributed to a hybrid modernity emerging between colonized and colonizer and circulating within and beyond the colony. According to art historian Ian McLean, the genesis of Aboriginal modernism can be seen in the longevity of its historical interactions in the 'convergent spaces' of contact with Europe, both in Australia and through multiple hybrid forms rebounding between Australia and Britain.¹⁴

Fernando's own pilgrimage – literally his self-exile from Australia and his colonization of Europe – can be interpreted as one of these hybrid forms. His presence in Europe expressed an Aboriginality located not so much in 'tradition' as in a mobile identity providing a source and site of being in the world. Nor was exile a foreign experience for Fernando. After all, as a colonized person he had lived the first half of his life in exile in his own country. Now an inveterate traveller beyond its shores as a wandering vendor, he engaged in intermittent acts of protest. In his book *Sacred Journeys*, Alan Morinis defines pilgrimage as being opposite to the act of wandering, an undertaking that in contrast has 'no predetermined goal'.¹⁵ Yet if we apply this definition to an indigenous itinerant, wandering takes on an additional meaning, Aboriginal society's supposed lack of husbandry having been used as justification by Europeans seeking to appropriate their own lands.¹⁶ Fernando's own wanderings in the world reversed this notion of Aboriginality as lack by making the act of wandering into an inherently political mode of being, based on the capacity to exploit opportunity and

to rearticulate dominant narratives about progress and culture into an original world-view.

As I show in the next section, Fernando echoed much of the Vatican's own account of its foreign mission in Australia for the Jubilee, and in particular rehearsed its views on the role of the Irish in Australian colonialism. However, Fernando adapted its narratives of degeneration and redemption towards a quite different vision for Australia's future. While he agreed that civilization in Australia had foundered under the weight of unchecked brutality, unlike the Vatican he rejected the notion that this effect had resulted in the contamination of the natives, who were now largely beyond redemption. Instead, he blamed the criminality and degeneracy of Irish convictism and the gross self-interest of the colony's Protestant rulers for the failure of British civilization to flourish among the Aboriginal people.

THE YEAR OF MISSIONS

Influential in shaping Fernando's protest in Rome was the exhibition staged by the Vatican to celebrate the pilgrimage year. The Pope had dedicated 1925 to a celebration of the Church's mission work among the primitive peoples of the world. The question of colonial rule and the fate of indigenous peoples must have been in the minds of many pilgrims as they passed by Fernando on their way into St Peter's, if for no other reason than that they recently had viewed the exhibition. Some may have been shocked by the account of settlers it represented. Whatever their response, Fernando was not protesting to an uninformed public so much as one, as Ann Stoler has argued, that 'knew but didn't know' the crimes of colonization being undertaken in their name.¹⁷ No doubt Fernando had seen it too. The exhibition offered a sympathetic reading of the injustices of colonial rule – but as a cruel past demanding Christian pity, not political action. It also represented Aboriginal culture on the lower branches of human civilization, not as the rich source of global renewal envisaged by Fernando.

When invited to send Aboriginal material to the exhibition, the Catholic Church in Australia had declined politely.¹⁸ Thus the Vatican had selected items from its existing collection to justify its inclusion of the Australian Aborigines as one of the four primitive civilizations in world history. The others were the 'pygmies of Africa', the peoples of Asia and the Pacific, and those of the Arctic and Tierra del Fuego. According to the curators, audiences were to experience the exhibition 'not only as a work of missionology, but also ... of Science'.¹⁹ A combination of religious and secular knowledge was to provide an educative and uplifting experience for the world's Catholics gathered in Rome, whom the exhibition programme advised of the importance of ranking primitive societies by their 'type' and 'relative epoch of development'. In this way, the antecedents to European civilization could be mapped across human history: such 'historical ordering demonstrated in a sure and objective way the development and succession of the various manifestations of human civilization'.²⁰ More recent research into the Vatican's collection has revealed that it contained objects from New Norcia, an early Benedictine mission in Western Australia, including numbers of boomerangs and spear throwers, as well as bark paintings and

stone tools.²¹ The exhibition remained on display long after the end of the Jubilee Year and was still a draw for visitors a quarter of a century later.²²

Australia also featured in a section on missions among settlers, the slippage between who was 'colonial' and thus worthy of mission and who was 'native' indicative of the double status of the white settler colonial. Here the focus turned towards the convict stain as an obstacle to Christian (and hence Catholic) development, the original purpose of the colony as an open gaol having resulted in the 'relatively late ... diffusion of Christianity' and providing for crimes against the indigenous population. In the worst case of Tasmania, the Aborigines had been entirely wiped out:

Indeed, before Catholic clergy was allowed to work freely in this country, where the first free colonies had assumed as a slogan 'neither Papists nor pagans', the poor indigenous people were systematically swept away by the government to make way for the rising tide of European immigration. While the Tasmanians had disappeared (by 1876), in Australia those who had not died due to the inhumanity of settlers, or who were not victims of the arsenic dropped into the bread administered every now and again by the government, or who had not succumbed to the military expeditions organized precisely in order to destroy them, they were pushed towards the waterless plains of central Australia, and condemned to die out in vice and poverty.²³

Given the argument articulated in his flyer, Fernando no doubt would have agreed with the first part of the Vatican's analysis, but likely not with its conclusions regarding the moral contamination of the Aborigines. Nor would he have agreed that only through the arrival of missionaries were 'these wretches [saved] from their savage habits' and set on the road to 'a better life',²⁴ as he was critical of missions for their involvement in the colonial project. Fundamentally, the Australian frontier described in the exhibition remained frozen in a colonial past in which Aboriginal people figured as the victims of progress, whereas Fernando's flyer and its circulation in Rome brought into question the influence of that legacy upon the present state of the Aborigines. While vehemently opposed to the racism directed at his mother's people, Fernando applied his own racist perspective to the world around him. His anti-Irish sentiments found expression in his disdain for the convict origins of Australian settlement, while his Catholicism and his anti-British politics would combine in his condemnation of Protestants for what he saw as their open complicity with empire in Australia and elsewhere.

VIVA AUSTRALIA

Another framework for contextualizing Fernando's protest in Rome is its coincidence with a well-orchestrated Australian Catholic public relations event. As the leader of the Australian contingent, Archbishop Daniel Mannix evidently was concerned that regular reports of his group be published in the press at home. According to *The Age*, the Australians – with Mannix at their head – were treated like returning heroes: 'Pilgrims Enthusiastically Welcomed. Cries of "Viva Australia" from large crowds of Irish and Italians', while 'the strains of the Australian Anthem ... were the feature of [their] enthusiastic welcome'.²⁵

Behind the scenes, Mannix was engaged in rewriting his own and Australian Irish Catholic history. During the war, he had been subject to Australian government surveillance and public recrimination following his opposition to the introduction of conscription as a contribution to the British war effort. In contrast, the Anglican Church had endorsed involuntary enlistment as a patriotic duty towards the British Empire. By arguing for the distancing of religion from political decision-making, Mannix stood for an Australian nationalism separate from, although still closely aligned with, Britain. His position garnered a large following among pro-republican Irish working-class Catholics in Australia, who considered themselves oppressed by a Protestant majority (not unlike that operating within Ireland itself). Many assumed Mannix's refusal to bow to pressure would result in his removal from the position of Archbishop of Australia; however, when he was finally summoned to Rome in 1920, his popularity among Catholics in New York en route and his power base in Australia spared him from disciplinary action by the Vatican, and he returned home triumphant.²⁶

At the Jubilee, Mannix set about consolidating his alliance with the Church in Rome. After leading a pontifical high mass at a city church, he visited the Vatican, where he was 'congratulated upon having brought the largest Australian pilgrimage ever seen in Rome'. In recognition, *The Age* report continued, special seats were reserved for the Australians to witness a canonization in St Peter's, 'after which they will see the sights'.²⁷ Several days later, the Pope 'solemnly received' the contingent of Australian pilgrims – now 400 strong, having been joined by Australians living in the city. After the Swiss Guard had 'rendered military honours', Mannix delivered a short address in Latin, declaring that, 'although a tiny flock' in comparison with other national contingents, 'in view of the long journey ... [the Australians represented] a notable example of love and fidelity'. After blessing the men and their families, the Pope retired to converse privately with Mannix 'on religious, political and social conditions in Australasia, with which he [the Pope] showed himself well acquainted'.²⁸

Following the Jubilee, Mannix would take the Australian contingent with him to Ireland, where he would convey Australian Irish Catholic support for Ireland's fight for independence from Britain. In contrast, in the 1920s he had been refused entry to Ireland by the British authorities; he nonetheless made his position clear by keeping vigil with the pro-republican hunger striker Terence MacSwiney during his final days in London's Brixton prison.²⁹

Where might the question of Aboriginal modernity sit in this moment of emerging Australian nationalism and its changing relationship with empire? And how did the staging of Australia and the Aboriginal questions in newly Fascist Rome (via the Vatican) sit alongside Fernando's protest? If the Vatican was ready to criticize Australia, Mussolini was intent that Italy should join the world community of imperial powers. Fernando's protest illustrates how shifts in world politics articulated in their local context could be exploited by otherwise marginalized subjects as they interpreted the traces of global changes taking place all around them. While the political context for Mannix's crusade in Rome and the Vatican exhibition suggests that imperial sins were already on view, it was the particularity of the Irish past in convict Australia that had

been brought to the public eye. While colonial and imperial representations of the Irish may have been themselves racially coded,³⁰ Fernando was not about to express any empathy for the Irish struggle with imperial Britain. Rather, he appeared to agree with the Vatican that the negative effects of Irish convictism had corrupted Aboriginal relations with British Australia, a racial interpretation based upon the supposed differences in moral capacity between higher and lower races. Mutual knowledge of imperial oppression did not lead to interracial alliance: Fernando did not represent himself as empathetic to the pro-republican Irish-dominated Australian contingent, while as far as we know of their pilgrimage in Rome the latter remained silent concerning the Aboriginal question in Australia.

INDIGENOUS AND MODERN: A LIFE IN EXILE

Despite his expression of concern about the fate of Aborigines only now coming into contact with Europeans, Fernando embodied the ambivalent status of an already 'civilized' indigenous person. On one level, his background epitomized the destructive impact of colonization upon Aboriginal communities living among Europeans in the early colony. A man from the Sydney area with no surviving family, his mother had died during his childhood and his father (probably a South Asian sailor) remained an absent figure in the autobiography he recounted episodically during his later life. With no community, 'culture' or land to speak of, Fernando's life story can be interpreted as an illustration of the dislocation perpetrated by colonization. At another level, it was under these very conditions that he had arrived in Rome, turning 'exile' within his own country into his *modus operandi* beyond its shores.³¹

Rather than seeking some 'return' to a traditional past, Fernando proposed the reform of modernity through reworking 'race' and empire towards upholding the rights of his people – the real Australians – because they were worthy of civilization. Fernando was not simply a critic of modernity but one of its subjects, and in more ways than an ex-colonial protester. While he called upon English, Irish and Australian pilgrims in Rome to realize the Jubilee's promise of atonement, far from envisaging the end of British rule in his country Fernando hoped for a renewed colonial ethic that would provide the Aborigines with a means to create their own modernity and thus help carry civilization into a new golden age.

Fernando did not seek to prevent a supposedly still-primitive Aboriginal Australia from pursuing its own engagement with the modern world. Nor, we can assume, did he consider this a possibility, given that Aboriginality and modernity were already inherently intertwined and that the former – far from being a hindrance to modernizing Australia – could help bring about the fulfilment of the latter. Fernando saw in the recognition of his people a renewed moral compass for the modern world. Although not 'Aboriginal' in the sense of the exhibition's version of boomerang-wielding primitives, in another sense the European-dressed Fernando was living evidence of the impact of missions on the Aboriginal race in Australia. A Catholic himself, he had likely been educated by one of the very 'foreign missions' lauded by the Vatican in the Jubilee Year. But out of the stuff of this education, Fernando had built for himself a life of protest.

He had reversed the trajectory of the European colonial mission: his life's work was to educate Europe about its own failure. Furthermore, he contradicted contemporary assumptions about the temporal and spatial immobility of the 'native' by enjoying one of the markers of white citizenship – the right to mobility.

Nor was Fernando 'an Aborigine' in the sense of being a race apart. He was a man of mixed descent who, while seemingly distant (autobiographically and spatially) from his 'own' culture and country, had applied the mobility and dislocation wrought by colonization through joining the global community of sailors, indentured workers and others, to proclaim the central role of Aboriginality in his itinerancy.³² As yet another black man in Europe, to the casual observer Fernando must have appeared a typically modern product of the colonial world. He was a coloured street trader whose protest and mobility raised the suspicion of state powers increasingly concerned to control movement across their borders as well as identify suspect populations within.³³

Yet as a devout Catholic, with missionary affiliations to the Italian rather than Irish Catholic Church, he was arguably a closer disciple of the Vatican than the Irish-dominated white Australian contingent arriving in the city. And given the Vatican's negative account of convictism, maybe he was also a better son of Italian Catholic Australia. He probably was more familiar with the city of Rome than the Anglo-Australian pilgrims who arrived in 1925 – he had left his home country over twenty years earlier to become a traveller on the streets of Europe. No stranger to Italy, he had first visited Milan while being repatriated (to England) in 1918, following his internment in Austria during the First World War, and he returned almost immediately in anticipation of employment with a family-run metalworking company based in the city, whose directors he came to know and respect. Thus Fernando may have visited the sights of Rome, including St Peter's Cathedral, well before 1925, and presumably he spoke Italian sufficiently well to facilitate his work as a metalworker and, when that work fell through, as an itinerant vendor of fruit and vegetables. The Italian people held a special place in Fernando's heart. He would later assert that he had changed his surname to Fernando (from Silva) in their honour;³⁴ ever concerned to highlight the injustices perpetrated by the British, he would contrast Italians' friendliness with the overt racism he faced in England. It was a viewpoint he would have to reassess following his detention by its newly instated Fascist regime.

ARREST AND DETENTION

At some time prior to 29 May, Italian authorities had been handed a copy of Fernando's flyer by an unnamed third party. Over several days, undercover officers observed crowds in the cathedral with the aim of catching its author. While posing as a fellow pilgrim, a policeman was given a copy of the offending flyer by Fernando's own hand. Without a current residency permit and in possession of a lapsed British passport, Fernando was to be detained indefinitely until more information could be ascertained regarding his movements and contacts.

On the day of his arrest, a description of Fernando was recorded at police headquarters. Reflecting the criminological framework favoured by modern police in

this period,³⁵ Fernando's appearance was documented for the purposes of future identification. He was described as being 1.69 metres tall and of slight build; his colour was recorded as black, his hair as 'black, grizzled/greying', and his face as clean-shaven apart from a drooping moustache. Significant to criminology's racialized interpretation of facial features, his 'forehead' was recorded as 'low', while his nose dipped at the bridge and his mouth was 'wide'. Most remarkably, his '[d]istinguishing features' were not described via the recommended record of 'scars or tattoos' but as 'Australian black race'.³⁶ Here Fernando's specificity lay in the unusual origin of his non-whiteness. Through his protest, he had 'appeared' in Rome as a person of Aboriginal descent, becoming an Aborigine by his own assertion.

However, by leafleting pilgrims about conditions in Australia, Fernando also had become embroiled in an emerging Fascist state, testing its relationship with world powers – especially Britain. The Italian government was sensitive to his occupation of St Peter's for the purposes of an apparently anti-British and anti-colonial protest. Mussolini had only a few years earlier walked into the city to claim control and was in the process of consolidating his place in world affairs, including through attending the Allied Premiers' Conference in London in December 1922, where he was mobbed in the streets.³⁷ Italy and Britain were engaged in protecting their colonial power bases, including in Africa, while fascism was a growing presence in London and elsewhere, raising questions about the future of a Europe in which tactics developed in the colonies were being applied to the policing of metropolitan populations.³⁸

Once in power, Mussolini had been concerned to weed out anti-Fascist sentiment, and had instigated greater control of the city streets in Rome by deploying police in larger numbers and providing them with increased powers of arrest. As the population of Rome expanded dramatically under his vision for the Fascist city of the future, armed militia carried out new levels of control on the streets.³⁹ At the same time, concern regarding anti-colonial agitation had intensified across Europe since the war. In 1923, Fascist Italy's newly installed Minister of Foreign Affairs had warned the Minister of Colonies that the influence of the African American Marcus Garvey and his 'Back-to-Africa' movement might soon reach Addis Ababa. The Italian embassy in Washington reassured them, however, that US authorities would soon arrest Garvey and his passport would be confiscated.⁴⁰

One month later, Fernando was still in custody as questions about the extent of his protest gathered pace. Advice to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs provided on 2 August confirmed the Ministry of the Interior's recommendation that Fernando be extradited from Italy on the grounds that his 'activities render him undesirable', yet provided new information pointing to the necessity of his indefinite imprisonment. Foremost among their findings was that around 1,000 flyers had been discovered on Fernando's person on the day of his arrest, while another 9,000 were found later at his temporary residence not far from Rome. These numbers suggested a larger conspiracy.⁴¹

Fernando insisted from the start that he was a lone protester. When asked about his movements, he advised that a railway pass allowed travel 'continuously through almost all of Italy, staying on a few days in the various towns'. Between periods of work, he stated that he returned to rest at his permanent address in Milan (where he kept a

locker in the men's hostel while on the road).⁴² Fernando admitted that he had visited Italy previously in 1918 – likely on his way to England as a repatriated ex-internee following the war – and then again in 1919, but in the expectation of employment as a metalworker. As to the purpose of his current visit, Fernando was unequivocal: 'I hand out leaflets ... that promote the rehabilitation [*riabilitazione*] of the Australian Aborigines.'⁴³

Defending himself against the accusation of conspiracy, Fernando remained adamant that he had acted alone. Rejecting the idea of anyone else being involved in his protests, he set out to prove that he had arranged for his flyers to be printed in San Marino. He added that he did not have a police record, even volunteering the information that once in Magenta in 1922 he had been arrested on a train for 'answering back to the conductor' but had been released immediately. In a final effort to assert his bona fides, Fernando advised that he held a British passport,⁴⁴ but police informed the Minister for Foreign Affairs that it had lapsed. Issued in 1921, it contained a visa entry stamp dated 1923, and also in Constantinople with the destination of Trieste marked. Although Milan police had provided him with a certificate of registration as a 'wandering salesman of fruit and vegetables', he had failed to complete the required residency permits for his subsequent stays in Tivoli and Rome. Of most concern, Fernando was unable to furnish a receipt for the printing of the leaflets in San Marino, and police in Milan could not confirm his activities in that city. Adding weight to their suspicions, a notebook kept by Fernando to record his travels contained evidence that he had been circulating flyers in several other Italian cities.

In an effort to alleviate their fears, Fernando sought to explain his actions in terms of his autobiography. He declared that 'in so much as an Australian he felt compelled to protest against the English domination of his country'. And he informed his interrogators that 'each good Australian must feel the duty to sacrifice himself for such protest'. The word 'Australian' operates here in two ways: by referring to Fernando 'in so much' as an Australian, the recording officer seems to allow a degree of sympathy concerning his prior claim as an Aboriginal Australian, while Fernando uses the term more broadly to distinguish between good Australians and bad, whatever their 'race'. When required to state where he should be sent following his release, he declared himself a permanent exile from Australia, emphasizing that he was 'not willing to repatriate'. He continued: 'I came to Italy for propaganda in favour of we Australians and with the profits of my work I print manifestos in order to hand them out – I cannot therefore return to Australia.'⁴⁵ In Fernando's view, he was an enemy of the Australian state and could never return. Found unable 'to demonstrate how he, in the printing and distribution of the leaflets, could have acted only on his own initiative',⁴⁶ Fernando was held in detention without trial. It would be a few months before he was allowed to write from his cell.

In several letters written from jail, and more on his return to England, he would describe life as a 'foreigner imprisoned by the Fascist state'. Fernando wrote of the 'severe strain' of being held in 'captivity' for months without recourse to 'jurisdiction'. Claiming he had not been informed about the accusations against him, he found himself imprisoned in dank cells on poor rations until he was able to secure legal

representation from London. He later asserted that he was treated badly and manhandled by ‘insolent’ guards, while he witnessed other prisoners being beaten ‘for mere amusement’. He also described how finally, without warning and in the middle of the night, four plain-clothes policemen escorted him and at least one other prisoner out of Rome under cover of darkness. For two days and three nights, they travelled by train towards the French border before being transferred into the hands of border police and kept overnight in a cell with no food or water. At three o’clock in the morning, Fernando was at last escorted over the frontier. Protesting that he had sufficient money to purchase a train ticket, he was forced instead, ‘at the point of a bayonet’, to make his way on foot across ‘the world famous Alps’ – he was an old man scrambling over the ‘pathless, roadless’ mountain, ‘hungry, ill, weak after starvation detention’.⁴⁷

SERVING THE CAUSE OF HUMANITY

Spending several months working in the south of France, Fernando wrote an angry letter of protest to the Italian authorities, in which he warned the Italian people of the dangers of authoritarian rule. His strongly worded letter of protest to the Italian government opened with the declaration: ‘This is from an Educated Black Australian’. As if to emphasize the injustices he felt he had experienced as a young man in Australia, as an afterthought in pencil he inserted ‘un’ before the word ‘Educated’ (the rest of the letter being in type). After describing the nature and conditions of his arrest and imprisonment, Fernando moved on to analyse the state of affairs in Italy. He warned that the country was on a road to disaster if it allowed the domination of ‘murderous thieves’ and a ‘government of organised brigands’ to continue. In a swipe at the hierarchy of civilization, he added that ‘[c]ertainly it [Italy] could not be classed as a civilized government. Not even that of Europeans.’ The key to civilization was upholding the rule of law. Fundamentally, the new Italy he had witnessed lacked the kind of ‘public hearing by a properly constituted court of justice as [seen] in civilized countries’. He concluded: ‘believing you will take every step to clear the honour of Italy and its justice. By an innocent sufferer, “one who serves the cause of humanity”’.⁴⁸ As in his use of the term ‘rehabilitation’ (restitution?) when questioned by police soon after his arrest, Fernando mobilized the language of humanitarianism – although ironically, to make his point about the unreliability of modernity’s conscience.

To friends at Bossi and Morini, a metalworking company in Milan where he had once worked, Fernando was more direct. He declared Mussolini to be a despot and complained that the Italian people were too ‘good and submissive’. Like the Australian Aborigines, it would seem, their inherent qualities had left them vulnerable to abuse. He reminded his friends to take strength nonetheless from the ‘old adage – Even a worm will turn’.⁴⁹

When read alongside his flyer, Fernando’s accusations against the authorities in Italy suggest parallels between the colonial injustices faced by his people and his experience as a ‘foreigner’ imprisoned under the fledgling Fascist regime. As his protest and arrest in Rome indicate, Fernando’s politics drew from several ideas about the power of

community, including the resilience of his people, Catholicism's faith in restorative justice, and Western liberal-democratic notions of 'the imagined communities of humanity'.⁵⁰ In each case, Fernando warned that absolute power – whether wielded against a 'race' or another subordinated group when cast outside the rule of law – worked against the positive influence of civilization. Furthermore, the dual impacts of imperial Britain and Fascist Italy in Fernando's arrest in Rome remind us of the historical intimacy between colonialism and new forms of modernity arising in Europe.⁵¹ Fernando's hope that the worm would soon turn suggested not simply overthrowing injustice, but also seeking retribution. Historians Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds open their study of the global colour line being drawn in the first decades of the century with the prediction of Pan-African leader W.E.B. DuBois that the white brotherhood of nations then taking shape in modern Eur-America was inspired by fear of the rising black man. If pushed beyond the limit, colonized people might wreak havoc on their former colonizers in a postcolonial era.⁵²

CONCLUSION

When viewed through the lens of Aboriginal rights history, Anthony Martin Fernando stands as a remarkable example of an Aboriginal protester speaking from the streets of Europe during the first decades of the twentieth century. To this extent, the mere fact of his protest in Rome broadens the scope and content of that history, revealing not only its reach well into empire but also providing a unique (?) example of Aboriginality articulated within Europe well before the 1970s, when numbers of Aboriginal activists contributed directly to a post-war anti-colonial black political movement.

In terms of the success or otherwise of his protest, as we have seen the response to Fernando's picket outside St Peter's was decisive. Casting the Aborigines as the victims of the nineteenth century frontier was a far cry from allowing an Aboriginal person to continue protesting against modern colonialism. Fernando was quickly removed from the street with hundreds of his flyers on his person, yet to be distributed. While it seems unlikely that Fernando expected that his protest would succeed in changing Australian colonialism, he was surely aware of its symbolic power. He had chosen to stage his protest outside one of the most iconic of European buildings.

Once transformed from ephemeral object into state evidence, his flyer was preserved on file in the government archives in Rome. Its survival represents a contradictory moment in the historical effect of the imperial archives, more usually concerned with glossing or appropriating the voices of its marginalized subjects. Through its unlikely preservation we have access not to Fernando's true self, but to the voice he constructed for the purpose of better informing pilgrims in Rome about Aboriginal Australia. In setting out to return this voice to the public domain, it has been possible to excavate the ethics he sought to convey to the white settler colonials among his readers. Above all, its reinstatement as a political text in the public domain allows us to recognize the ways in which indigenous travellers and protesters have been engaged in larger critiques than those pertaining solely to the rights of their own people. As the contributions to this collection on indigenous modernities have indicated, they have been exercised also

by the pressing issues of their day. How should the world respond to the continuing legacies of colonialism? What was the meaning of civilization? And when would Europe begin to acknowledge its responsibilities for the colonial past and its present effects? According to Fernando, those who were among the most vulnerable in the global community – the people of Aboriginal Australia – needed urgent answers to these fundamental questions.

As a result of his experiences in Rome, Fernando reluctantly included the new Italy among those obstacles precluding the reform of world politics, foremost among them being the British Empire. In the process, he warned against the corrupting nature of authoritarianism itself, as he knew from his observations during the first half his life of the status and conditions of Aboriginal people in Australia from the 1860s to the early 1900s. Ultimately, such power foretold its own destruction, however: empire would implode under the weight of its own injustices in the colonies, while in Europe authoritarianism would be brought down by its own citizens. Meanwhile, the lone protester must speak.

NOTES

1. Michael Gilchrist, *Daniel Mannix: Priest and Patriot* (Blackburn, Vic, 1982), pp. 120–1; see also Niall Brennan, *Dr Mannix* (Adelaide, 1964), p. 230.
2. 'Australian Pilgrims', *The Age*, 5 June 1925, p. 10.
3. F. Paisley, 'Resistance in Exile: Anthony Martin Fernando, Australian Aboriginal Activist, Internationalist, and Traveller in Europe', in Desley Deacon, Penny Russell and Angela Woollacott (eds), *Transnational Lives: Biographies in Global Modernity, 1700–Present* (New York, 2010), pp. 183–94.
4. Flyer, Inventario della Serie Affari Politici 1919–1939, Pacco 1200 Gran Bretagna, f.4791 – Expulsion, Arresti, Sorveglianza. Archivio Storico del Ministero Affari Esteri (ASDMAE).
5. Ravi de Costa, *A Higher Authority: Indigenous Transnationalism and Australia* (Sydney, 2006).
6. On the use of similar arguments as far back as the Spanish conquest of the Americas, see Neta C. Crawford, *Argument and Change in World Politics: Ethics, Decolonization, and Humanitarian Intervention* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 144–58.
7. Fiona Paisley, 'Australian Aboriginal Activism in Interwar Britain and Europe: Anthony Martin Fernando', *History Compass*, 7 (2009), pp. 701–18.
8. R.F. Betts, 'The Allusion to Rome in British Imperial Thought of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries', *Victorian Studies*, 15 (1971), pp. 149–59.
9. Patrick Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8 (2006), pp. 387–409; see also Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London, 1999), p. 41.
10. 'A.E. Neave: Permission to Take Aborigines from W.A. to London', Colonial Secretary's Department: Aborigines and Fisheries 68/11, Cons 652, Public Records Office of Western Australia. See also Rosalind Poignant, *Professional Savages: Captive Lives and Western Spectacle* (Sydney, 2004).
11. John Alexander, 'Following David Unaipon's Footsteps', *Journal of Australian Studies*, 54–55 (1997), pp. 22–9.
12. Maria Nugent, *Botany Bay: Where Histories Meet* (Sydney, 2005).

13. Bain Attwood, 'My Father's Country', in Bain Attwood (ed.), *Rights for Aborigines* (Sydney, 2004), pp. 3–30; see also Noel Loos, *White Christ, Black Cross: The Emergence of a Black Church* (Canberra, 2007).
14. Ian McLean, 'Bennelong's Gambit: The Origins of Aboriginal Modernism', in Renata Summo-O'Connell (ed.), *Imaging Australia: Reflections around the Reciprocal Construction of Identity between Australia and Europe* (Bern, 2009), p. 187; see also Ian McLean, 'Crossing Country: Tribal Modernism and Kuninjku Bark Painting', *Third Text*, 20 (2006), pp. 599–616.
15. Alan Morinis, 'Introduction', in Alan Morinis (ed.), *Sacred Journeys: The Anthropology of Pilgrimage* (Westport, CN, 1992), p. 13; see also Stephen Daniels and Catherine Nash, 'Lifepaths: Geography and Biography', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 30 (2004), pp. 449–58. On the pilgrim's successors in the city, the stroller, the vagabond and the tourist, see Zygmunt Bauman, *Life in Fragments: Essays in Postmodern Morality* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 92–9. And for an account of an Indian 'pilgrim' in Britain, see Antoinette Burton, 'A "Pilgrim Reformer" at the Heart of Empire: Beramji Malabari in Late Victorian London', in Antoinette Burton, *At the Heart of Empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late-Victorian Britain* (Berkeley, CA, 1998), pp. 152–87.
16. Bruce Buchan, *The Empire of Political Thought: Indigenous Australians and the Language of Colonial Government* (London, 2008).
17. Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, NJ, 2009), p. 253.
18. Stefan Girola, 'Rhetoric and Action: The Policies and Attitudes of the Catholic Church with Regard to Australia's Indigenous Peoples, 1885–1967', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Queensland, 2006, p. 78.
19. *Expositions et Musée Missionnaires* (n.p., 1925), p. 227. Vatican Archives. Thanks to Sarah Morgan for her research and for the translation.
20. *Rivista Illustrata della Esposizione Missionaria Vaticana*, no. 18, 31 August 1925, p. 576. Vatican Archives.
21. Carol Cooper, *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Collections in Overseas Museums*, Institute Report Series (Canberra, 1989), p. 73.
22. Harry Weedon, *A Pilgrim's Guide to Rome* (New York, 1950), pp. 198–9.
23. *Supplementi alla Rivista Illustrata della Esposizione Missionaria Vaticana*, no. 5, September–October 1925, p. 267. Vatican Archives. Although the claim that the Tasmanian Aborigines were made extinct by settlers has been thoroughly refuted in more recent times, the extent of murder during the 'clearing' of land in nineteenth-century Australia continues to be the subject of heated debate: Bain Attwood and S.G. Foster (eds), *Frontier Conflict: The Australian Experience* (Canberra, 2003). The euphemism of a culture swept away by a rising tide of modernity was invoked as recently as 1998 by a High Court decision against a native title claim: Bruce Buchan, 'Withstanding the Tide of History', *Borderlands*, 1 (2002), pp. 1–14.
24. *Supplementi alla Rivista Illustrata della Esposizione Missionaria Vaticana*, no. 5, September–October 1925, p. 267. Vatican Archives.
25. 'Dr Mannix in Rome', *The Age*, 1 June 1925, p. 9.
26. Michael McKernan, 'Catholics, Conscriptio and Archbishop Mannix', *Australian Historical Studies*, 17 (1977), pp. 299–314. On Protestantism and empire, see Robert S.M. Withycombe, 'Australian Anglicans and Imperial Identity, 1900–1914', *Journal of Religious History*, 25 (2001), pp. 286–305.
27. 'Dr Mannix in Rome', *The Age*, 1 June 1925, p. 9.
28. 'Australian Pilgrims Received by Pope', *The Age*, 4 June 1925, p. 10.

29. Jonathan M. Wooding, "It was in Human Nature to Love One's Native Land and Make Sacrifices for It": Monumental Commemorations and Corporeal Relics in 1920s Irish-Australia', *History Australia*, 4 (2007), pp. 39.1–39.18. Not surprisingly, when the entourage left for Ireland, Australian authorities were kept abreast of his movements, the British Legate to the Holy See advising the Governor General of Australia and through him the Prime Minister of Australia. 'Australian Pilgrims to Ireland', A461, D322/1/1. National Archives of Australia.
30. G.K. Peatling, 'The Whiteness of Ireland under and after the Union', *Journal of British Studies*, 44(1) (2005), pp. 115–33.
31. Aileen Moreton-Robinson, 'I Still Call Australia Home: Indigenous Belonging and Place in a White Postcolonizing Society', in Sara Ahmed, C. Catanada, A.M. Fortier and M. Sneller (eds), *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 23–40.
32. See, for example, G. Balachandran, 'Circulation through Seafaring: Indian Seamen, 1890–1945', in Claude Markovits, Jacques Pouchepadass and Sanjay Subrahmanyam (eds), *Society and Circulation: Mobile People and Itinerant Cultures in South Asia 1750–1950* (Delhi, 2003), pp. 89–130.
33. Jane Caplan and John Torpey (eds), *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World* (Princeton, NJ, 2001).
34. Maxwell Brown, 'Fernando: The Story of an Aboriginal Prophet', *Aborigine Welfare Bulletin*, 4 (1964), p. 7.
35. David G. Horn, *Social Bodies: Science, Reproduction, and Italian Modernity* (Princeton, NJ, 1994), pp. 28–35.
36. Information Form, 29 May 1925, B.31 – Fernando Martino Antonio fur Mariano. Ministero dell'Interno, Pubblica Sicurezza, 1925. Archivio Centrale dello Stato (ACS).
37. 'Prime Ministers' Council', *The Times*, 27 February 1923, p. 14.
38. Thomas P. Linehan, *East London for Mosley: The British Union of Fascists in East London and South-West Essex 1933–40* (London, 1996).
39. Martin Clark, *Modern Italy, 1871–1995* (London, 1996), especially chapter 7; David Atkinson, 'Totalitarianism and the Street in Fascist Rome', in Nicholas R. Fyfe (ed.), *Images of the Street: Planning, Identity and Control in Public Space* (London, 1998), pp. 13–30; John Torpey, *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 125; Horn, *Social Bodies*.
40. R.A. Hill (chief editor), *The Marcus Garvey Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers: Africa for the Africans 1923–1945*, vol. X (Los Angeles, CA, 2006), pp. 25 and 77.
41. Communiqué: 'Subject: Antonio Martino Fernando', 2 August 1925. ASDMAE.
42. He stayed at the large men's hostel near Milan, the Albergo Populare, <http://www.url.it/muvi/popalbergo.htm>. See also Langston Hughes, *The Sea: An Autobiography* (New York, 1940), p. 191.
43. Information Form, 29 May 1925. ACS.
44. Information Form, 29 May 1925. ACS.
45. Information Form, 29 May 1925. ACS.
46. Communiqué, 2 August 1925. ASDMAE.
47. Fernando to Signor Bossi and Morini, 9 September 1925. ACS.
48. Fernando to the Minister of Justice of the Italian Government, 11 September 1925. ACS.
49. Fernando to Signor Bossi and Morini, 9 September, 1925. ACS.
50. Robert John Holton, 'Cosmopolitanism or Cosmopolitanisms? The Universal Races Congress of 1911', *Global Networks*, 2 (2002), pp. 153–4; see also Lyn Hunt, *The Invention of Human Rights: A History* (New York, 2007). For a discussion of religion and modernity,

see Dror Wahrman, 'God and the Enlightenment: Review Essays', *American Historical Review*, 108 (2003), pp. 1057–80. On discourses of colonialism as themselves multiple, contingent and often contradictory, see Alan Lester, 'Epilogue and Conclusion', in Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain* (London, 2001), pp. 176–92.

51. Fingerprinting and other measurement and surveillance techniques first used in South Asia were then introduced to policing in Britain. See Clare Anderson, *Legible Bodies: Race, Criminality and Colonialism in South Asia* (Oxford, 2004).
52. Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the Question of Racial Equality* (Melbourne, 2008). The link between these fears and new histories of race is further explicated in Marilyn Lake, 'The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White Australia', *History Workshop Journal*, 58 (2004), pp. 41–62.