

## Chapter Two

# INTERNMENTS IN AUSTRALIA DURING WORLD WAR TWO: LIFE HISTORIES OF CITIZENSHIP AND EXCLUSION

Ilma Martinuzzi O'Brien

About 20 percent of the Italian-born population of Australia was interned during the Second World War. This was a significant proportion of the community, a higher proportion than one would expect in a country so far from Italy and the European theatre of war. In addition, many of those Australian citizens and residents of Italian origin who were not interned were subject to various restrictions on their freedom of movement, or were conscripted into labour gangs and sent to work in remote parts of the continent. These measures had a profound impact on Italian-Australians, and because the internments and other restrictions were not applied evenly across the country, the impact was greater on some individuals and communities than others, and persists in many ways even to this day. The Italian communities in North

Queensland were particularly hard hit. It was from this part of Australia that the people whose case studies are analysed in this paper, were interned.

Various explanations over the years have been given for Australia's internment policy and its implementation. Paul Hasluck,

in his official war history, in general deplored the infringements of civil rights during the war, and was critical of some of the government's actions. In the case of Italians, however, he believed that a large number were recent emigrants from Italy, and therefore posed a threat to public security.<sup>1</sup> Italian-Australian historian Gianfranco Cresciani ascribed the internments to the fascist menace. He tended to the view that unless individuals were actively anti-fascist, they were passive supporters of fascism, and that therefore internment was the consequence of fascist activity in Australia.<sup>2</sup> Margaret Bevege points out that internments increased whenever the allies experienced a setback in the war. She regards internment as a relatively benign experience because the internees were not mistreated by their guards, and concludes that it was inevitable that people turned on Italians in a time of panic, because of their seeming sympathy with the enemy.<sup>3</sup> My own work stresses the importance of prejudice and discrimination as major contributing factors to the Italian-Australian internments in the communities most severely affected.<sup>4</sup> A welcome comparative study by Kay Saunders and Roger Daniels brings together the North American and Australian experiences in one volume.

Saunders and Daniels conclude that the United States and Canada “have been collectively better able to confront issues of ethnic persecution engendered by World War II”.<sup>5</sup>

In this chapter my focus will be on the importance of internment in the life histories of Italian-Australians, and on the light internments throw on Australian attitudes to citizenship and civil rights. Three case studies from North Queensland, the state most severely affected by internments, will be considered, to illustrate the scope and impact of internments, and their implications for civil rights. Each of these case studies relates to the internment of an individual in a particular category of citizenship in Australia. It is necessary to note that there was no separate Australian citizenship until 1949, so that Australians held British citizenship, or more specifically, were British subjects, as members of the British Commonwealth. I have argued elsewhere that the absence of a separate Australian citizenship encouraged the development of a racialised construction of British subjecthood in some sections of Australian society, and that boundaries were often drawn to exclude people of non-British origin, particularly those of Italian origin.<sup>6</sup>

People of Italian origin in each of the citizenship categories of Australian-born, naturalised British subject and Italian citizen were interned in Australia during World War II, unlike the situation in the United States, where American citizens of Italian origin were not subject to internment. In this paper, three case studies, one from each of these citizenship

categories, are analysed. The first story refers to the internment experience of an Australian-born citizen, who happens to be my father. The second is the case study of Giuseppe Cantamessa who relinquished his Italian citizenship and was naturalised in 1913. Both these cases are only briefly sketched here, to give an indication of the scope and extent of the internments and their impact on the particular communities in question, and to illustrate the experiences of citizens as well as non-citizen immigrant residents in Australia during the Second World War. The third example relates to the internment of Mario Sardi, the focus of this paper, who was an Italian citizen with seven years of residence in Australia when he was interned, and whose experiences are analysed here through an examination of his diary.

The social and legal position of Italian immigrants in Australia during the war was a logical extension of Australian immigration and settlement policy and practice in the preceding years. Following the federation of the Australian colonies into the Commonwealth of Australia in 1901, a restrictive immigration policy was applied to non-Europeans. Europeans, including Italians, on the other hand, were expected to assimilate and take naturalisation, which was granted routinely after meeting a few simple requirements, namely residence of five years, some use of English, and the provision of references or testimonials of good character. Although Italian immigrants had easy entry, Australia was not their preferred destination and the 1921 census recorded only 8,135 Italian-born in Australia.

However, Italian migration increased substantially after the immigration restrictions were imposed in the US, culminating in 1924, resulting in the doubling of the Italian population between 1921 and 1925. Immigration continued to increase, with large numbers attracted to opportunities in the sugar industry in tropical North Queensland, where there had been an Italian presence since 1891.<sup>7</sup> As the numbers of Italian immigrants increased, anti-Italian sentiment grew, and restrictions were imposed in an attempt to reduce the immigration flow.

In North Queensland, the sugar industry was subsidised and regulated by the federal and state governments and by the unions. Italians settled there successfully and owned a significant proportion of the farms in some areas, and newcomers were attracted because seasonal work harvesting sugarcane paid well, and land clearing for increased agricultural development offered future settlement possibilities. So great was the growth in the Italian presence that it was believed in some quarters that Italians would dominate the sugar industry, both as canecutters and as farm owners. Despite the prosperity and the opportunities for individuals, there was considerable industrial and political unrest in the sugar towns, and opposition to Italian immigrants grew throughout the interwar years. In most sugar districts Italian canecutters were restricted by the imposition of what was called British Preference, whereby 75 per-cent of jobs were reserved for Britishers.<sup>8</sup> Naturalisation did not qualify an Italian-born person as a

Britisher so already we have a racial rather than a citizenship category used to distinguish people. Protests against British Preference by Italian-origin farmers and workers organising to support their rights occurred from time to time, and involvement in such activities was later cited as evidence of anti-British activity, and became a ground for internment.

Australia entered the Second World War in September 1939, at the same time as Great Britain. The Australian government enacted a National Security Act in September 1939 which gave it extraordinary wartime powers including the power to make laws by a regulation, and these regulations had supremacy over other laws. Under the National Security Regulations, there were special restrictions for immigrants who were classed as “enemy aliens” because they had not naturalised by taking British citizenship. There were restrictions on travel, work, residence, the sale or transfer of land, as well as prohibitions on the possession of items such as cameras, wirelasses, carrier pigeons or petrol, together with motorcars, yachts and aeroplanes. It was an offence to speak a language other than English on the telephone, and freedom of assembly was denied. However these prohibitions and restrictions on enemy aliens were extended to those who had taken citizenship by naturalisation, by means of Regulation 28 which contained the provision that Naturalised British Subjects of Enemy Origin could be subject to the same orders as Enemy Aliens, while Regulation 26 provided the power to intern citizens, whether they were naturalised British subjects or Australian born.

In all, Australia interned 4,721 people of Italian origin, mostly men, out of a total Italian-born population of approximately 26,000, amounting to almost 20 per-cent of the Italian-born residents of the continent. Almost half, 2,216, were interned from Queensland. Queensland also interned the majority of the naturalised British Subjects of Italian origin, namely 602 from an Australian total of 947. A few Australian-born of Italian origin were also interned, again the majority from Queensland.<sup>9</sup>

For those classed as enemy aliens, the internment of the individual was initiated and controlled by the Army, without the requirement of civilian approval. For Australian citizens, authorisation by the Minister for the Army was required to intern an individual. The initial policy was to intern leaders and men of influence in the community, and suspected trouble makers, and those who could be considered a security risk. Some of the reasons given in the interests of national security were to prevent spying and sabotage, and the passing of information to the enemy. There was a belief that a person of Italian origin would have a conflict of loyalties, and therefore would be a security risk. It was also believed and expressed in internal Army correspondence, that internment was a means of exercising control over the Italian communities by removing the leaders. Yet another view, not publicly stated, but documented, was that internment was a method of increasing public morale in support of the war effort by finding an enemy within.<sup>10</sup>

The day after Italy declared war, on 10 June 1940, police officers, in all parts of Australia descended on Italian immigrants as they were going about their usual business working in their fruit shops, farms, market gardens, fishing boats and homes. Using lists prepared from secret information gathered by military and police intelligence, hundreds were arrested and imprisoned. This action of the authorities met with general approval. Few voices were raised in protest, either then or later when even greater numbers were interned. Newspapers praised the efforts and clamoured for more internments with headlines such as “Make No Mistake about the Dago Menace”<sup>11</sup> and “Put all Aliens behind Barbed Wire”.<sup>12</sup> There were even calls for mass deportation.

Of the 35 adult Australian-born citizens who were interned, the majority of them were taken in 1942 from North Queensland. Alf Martinuzzi, interned in June 1942, was unlucky enough to be one of the last to be taken. When the police arrested him without a warrant he immediately protested through his solicitor, and the police who interned him confirmed the fact that no warrant or other documentation was made available. He was taken to the lock-up at Townsville, and not long after was sent south, initially to Gaythorne Camp in Queensland, then to Liverpool camp in New South Wales, then briefly to a camp at Loveday, South Australia, before being returned to Gaythorne in Queensland. The underlying reason for his internment was the fact that, as a local manager with the Shell Oil Company, he knew the location of the North



Queensland petrol supplies, and this knowledge in someone of Italian origin was considered a security risk, should a Japanese invasion take place. Other specific reasons given on his 'Summary of File' were membership of the Dante Alighieri Society in 1938, some disloyal remarks his sister was alleged to have made in 1940, his alleged use in 1940 of "we" when discussing Italian military reverses, and the fact that his father was reputed to have an ample supply of petrol. It also emerged that in his appointment to the Shell Oil Company as local manager he had supplanted someone of British origin.

Representations for his release by his wife and his mother, who were both Australian born, were made through the local member of Parliament, GW Martens, MLA, and his mother who travelled 1,600 miles to Sydney for a meeting with the Minister for the Army, Frank Forde on 4 July, 1942, to present his case for release. His Appeal before the Advisory Committee, a committee appointed to recommend to the Minister on release or continued internment, was heard on 7 August. The Minister's representative at the hearing reported that the case against him was "very weak indeed" but the Advisory Committee decided against his release. They wrote that "his is a borderline case which might be reviewed if pressure slackens in the north." When in early October he was released from internment to work in the Manpower service he immediately enlisted in the Australian Imperial Forces, but after a month or so he was discharged from the AIF back to the manpower authorities. Despite repeated applications to re-join

the army, the manpower authorities considered him “an excellent time-keeper” and “almost indispensable” and would not release him, so and he remained with the Civil Constructional Corps.

Many of the Australian-born internees like Alf Martinuzzi were described on their official Army forms as being of Italian nationality, despite their Australian birth. Sometimes this was qualified with Australian-born in brackets following Italian. Similarly many naturalised British Subjects were officially described incorrectly as having Italian nationality, when they had renounced their Italian citizenship. This may seem a trivial matter but by incorrectly naming or labelling people in this way they were being redefined and re-categorised, and it became easier to intern them.

In the second category, approximately 1,000 internees who had taken British citizenship by naturalisation were also interned. A number of them were community leaders and well assimilated into the wider Australian community. One was Giuseppe Cantamessa of Ingham, who came to Australia from Piedmont in 1907, was naturalised in 1913 and had lived continuously in Australia for 33 years by 1940. The underlying reason for Cantamessa’s internment was the fact that he was one of the most influential leaders of the Italian, as well as the wider, community in Ingham. He had been elected to almost every public office in the district, from local government to sporting bodies to industry associations, and was serving his fifth year as an elected member of the local government when

he was interned. He was chairman of the Herbert River District Cane Growers' Executive, and had represented the farmers of Ingham for six years on the Queensland Cane Growers' Council. He had also served as President or office-bearer of many of the local sporting clubs, including tennis, football, bowls among others. His oldest son was the first of Italian background in the district to volunteer for service in the Australian Military Forces. Cantamessa was interned immediately upon Italy's entry into the war, and was not released until 25 October, 1943. He was deprived of his liberty for a total of three years and five months. The specific grounds for his internment as listed in his dossier were slight, and there was no evidence that Cantamessa was or ever had been a member of the Fascist Party. One of the specific reasons given was his involvement in a short-lived organisation opposed to British Preference in 1931, which was considered to be evidence of anti-British activity and regarded as disloyal.

The denial of the rights of citizenship on account of ethnicity or "extraction" as it was called in those days, was not, in my view, a phenomenon that arose in the crisis of war, but was part of a much deeper racist attitude towards Italians which had increased between the wars. The racial exclusion demonstrated by British preference in the sugar industry amongst the most vulnerable Italian immigrants, the canecutters, and efforts to restrict the acquisition of land by the Italian-born farmers were extended and amplified by new measures with the outbreak of war. It was a relatively seamless

transition from these openly tolerated demonstrations of prejudice and discrimination to the imposition of internment. These two stories illustrate problems in the concept of citizenship as it was applied to citizens of non-British origin. For them, citizenship was constructed in terms of extraction and ethnic background. Clearly the full rights and benefits of citizenship were not available to these Australian-born and Naturalised British subjects of Italian origin.

Mario Sardi's case is also an example of racial exclusion, but it raises a different set of issues, those relating to the rights of non-citizens. Like 3,712 other internees who had not become Australian citizens by naturalisation, Sardi was a citizen of Italy, not Australia, during the Second World War. Under Australian immigration and settlement policy, there were few obstacles to naturalisation once the person had been admitted into the country as a resident, and Sardi had met the residence requirement by 1941, but naturalisations had stopped the previous year when Italy entered the war. He probably felt no pressing need for naturalisation in any case, because the only major additional rights citizenship conferred beyond those available to resident aliens were access to ownership of land, the right to vote, and to stand for election. Sardi arrived in Australia from the island of Elba in 1935, and worked as a canecutter. He became engaged to Alfia Patane, the daughter of the farmer for whom he cut cane, and lived as part of the family on the farm. The reasons given for his internment were his subscription to *Il Giornale Italiano*, a pro-fascist newspaper

published in Australia, and 1938 correspondence regarding his subscription which he signed with the fascist year date, revealed by surveillance of mail by the security service. His name was also included on a list of Italian signatories protesting to the Italian Consul-General in 1935 about a local communist's public statement claiming that all the local Italians repudiated the Abyssinian War. These were considered sufficient grounds to cause his internment.

Sardi kept a daily diary during the two years he was interned, and he preserved it throughout an otherwise relatively uneventful life. After he died in 1996 his children passed the diary to me, and I am preparing it for publication. The diary begins with a graphic account of the police arresting him while he was working on his future father-in-law's farm. They were in a hurry, so he could not have a bath but was only allowed to wash his feet and face while his fiancé and future mother-in-law gathered his things. On the way to the local jail they came across Sardi's friend Giuseppe Grasso riding a bicycle to town, and he was interned, too, and had to give the bicycle to a companion who was riding with him. Sardi records how the internees were crowded into a small cell and tormented by heat and mosquitoes, and their indignation as they were given insufficient food and greeted with jeers on the train taking them 1,000 miles down south to the camp at Gaythorne in Brisbane. In this vein the diary details everyday matters such as the availability and type of food, the men's disgust at being given spaghetti sandwiches to eat, and the constant shortage of

tobacco. But as well, Sardi records his state of mind and the gradual hardening of his attitudes against the Australian authorities. In this way, the diary is a barometer of the rising disaffection amongst the internees as they experience their loss of freedom.

Sardi's political awakening began with an evening of speeches by fellow internees at the Gaythorne Camp, on the day when they were formally handed over by the police and entered into the control of the Army. Political discussions continued at Loveday, their permanent camp in South Australia, where each evening the censored newspapers were read aloud to those assembled, and at times this was followed by the singing of fascist songs and anthems and other expressions of nationalism. During mid-1942, there were bets about how long they would be kept prisoner, the length of the war, an Axis victory and their freedom.

It was here in Camp 14A at Loveday that Francesco Fantin, an anti-fascist internee from North Queensland, was killed with a blow to the head by a fascist supporter from Western Australia. Sardi does not elaborate on the incidents leading to Fantin's death, but he records that the perpetrator gave himself up and was taken to jail. There is no further mention of expressions of fascist or nationalistic sentiment following Fantin's death, and one can surmise that any further manifestation of patriotic or political sentiment in the camp was muted. An inquiry into the tragedy resulted in the transfer of some of the troublemakers to another camp.

Camp 14A at Loveday was set up to accommodate the Italian internees from North Queensland “captured” in early 1942. In the camp the inmates were organised under an elected hierarchy of leaders. The Camp Leader of 14A was Dr Piscitelli from North Queensland, until he was deposed by the authorities in January 1943 following the death of Fantin. The inmates then elected Ferruccio Guerra, previously of Mourilyan, in his place, but the camp authorities would not accept him because he had previously broken camp rules, and they insisted on holding a new election, eventually won by Eugenio Molachino from Ingham.

The daily routines of camp life are carefully recorded. Sardi’s main associates were fellow immigrants from the Isle of Elba, young men like himself yet to establish families and businesses, and a group of older Sicilian men whose network he accessed through his future uncle-in-law Giuseppe Barbagallo, who was also in Camp 14A. Sardi gives a graphic account of sleeping in tents on straw mattresses, with rain water flooding the tents and soaking their beds, and he describes how he and his friends stole timber from the supply provided for the construction of the camp buildings, to make beds so that their mattresses would be raised off the ground when rain flooded the tents, and other escapades to improve their comfort. Sardi was appointed as a “street leader” at the end of 1942, and in this role was responsible for ensuring the general tidiness of the dormitory, as well as having control of the distribution of various resources, such as the issuing of writing paper; and new

straw for mattresses; the allocation of razorblades and their collection and counting at the end of each week; the distribution of toilet paper and the division of blocks of soap; and of giving out the mail; and the allocation of fruit. After protesting about the lack of food in the kitchen and concluding that it was provisioned “in the camorra way”, Sardi then records his own “camorra” work of secreting away a razorblade when the opportunity arose.

Sardi and his friends passed the time playing cards and football, and making handicrafts as souvenirs. Usually they were wood carvings, but a specialty was obtaining silver coins and melting them down into rings, and engraving the name of a loved one on the inside. Writing the diary was another pastime, and the diary itself became an artefact and a labour of love. The covers are illustrated with drawings of Camp 14A, showing the perimeter barbed wire, the guard tower, tents, bocce and soccer areas, vegetable gardens and so on. There was no privacy in the camp, and the writing was both a ritual and to some extent a public performance. There are records of feelings, displays of patriotism, accounts of friendship and kindness, financial transactions and a list of the many letters he wrote, those in his own name and those he wrote using someone else’s allocation for correspondence. The diary became a record and a memento of camp life, to be shared with his fiancée and his future family.

A number of issues arise with the publication of the diary. The first is how to turn an artifact, a personal memento, into a published book. Sardi was not a highly educated man,



although he was an enthusiastic author. His words are not artfully fashioned; they are without much punctuation; and the language used contains many English and Italian crossovers, such as “cantina” for canteen, or “marcare” – to mark - the ball in soccer; he also uses English words spelt the Italian phonetic way, eg “polis”, “incis”, freely in the Italian context. His language use would have been the common language of the North Queensland camp inmates, and shows the pervasiveness of English and the difficulty of maintaining Italian in a new environment, even after only seven years in Australia and mixing mostly with other Italians. Considerable editorial discretion has been used in rendering the text into suitably colloquial English and footnotes are used to record the original expressions.

A second issue has to do with privacy. The diary records the names of individuals and incidents which were intended to be private, such as the way the men in Sardi’s tent teased the man who changed into his pyjamas under the blankets. More generally, not everyone who was interned, or their families, might be happy with having a personal idiosyncrasy or the fact of their internment published. Internment was often regarded by the wider community as proof of fascist sympathies or at least of disloyalty, and was a matter of considerable shame until recently. Attitudes have changed in recent years, and there has been much more open discussion. An interesting twist has recently emerged, as internment has come to symbolise the rite of passage that marked the transition between the

discrimination and other difficulties of the early years of settlement, culminating in the war years, and the relative ease of the post-war immigration experience. Now some young people are identifying their fathers or grandfathers as having been interned when in fact they were not. They are confusing it with work in the civilian labour corps.

The final issue raised by the Sardi case relates to the treatment of the internees throughout the whole process of internment. Citizens and non-citizens or “enemy aliens” were all imprisoned together, regardless of their citizenship category and their politics, their age and their interests, and the length of their incarceration bore no relationship to their citizenship status. In the process of regaining their freedom, the legal differences between citizens and aliens were recognized by the appointment of different tribunals to hear their cases, but beyond this difference in form, the treatment was substantially the same for people in each of the citizenship categories. The arbitrary manner of selection for internment and release, and the lack of an open trial to determine the status of the charges against them, were similar for all those of Italian origin, and ultimately citizenship offered no protection for either the Australian born or those who had taken citizenship by naturalisation.

Within the Italian community in Australia there are three main explanatory categories people use to account for internment. The first is that they were interned because they were not naturalised. Some might have believed this at the time,

because there was a rush of applications for naturalisation just after the war. However the fact of the internment of so many who were already naturalised does not support this view. This was a neutral, matter-of-fact explanation with no pain or shame attached.

For those who were already citizens of Australia there was no easy explanation. The fascist slur or the suspicion of disloyalty hung over them. Many believed they had been interned because neighbours or enemies made false accusations against them, and often they had, and the authorities invited and accepted such information, and were only too happy to use it.

Prejudice against people of Italian origin in the wider community, and hostility between the left and right in community politics in North Queensland, inflamed by discrimination, industrial unrest in the sugar industry and the Abyssinian and Spanish wars in the 1930s, and the struggle for supremacy of the left towards the end of the war, left a number of innocent victims, Cantamessa being one of the most notable. Those who were more integrated and assimilated into the wider community usually had more to lose through their internment than those who lived in an enclave of fellow Italians, as it affected their business, their reputation and their friendships and associations in the wider community. Frequently it symbolised a personal rejection of their assimilation. It was also easy after the war to point the finger and claim an individual was a fascist or disloyal or unworthy, using the fact of

internment as a justification.

On the other hand, the man who explained his internment with the words, “It is their country, not mine”<sup>13</sup> was acknowledging the prevailing state of affairs by which citizenship, while legally constituted as British, tended to be socially and culturally constructed in the same way. Widely held attitudes equated citizenship or nationality with race, and there were associated attitudes which regarded assimilation as a necessary precondition to citizenship. The discrimination and exclusionary practices culminating in internments arose, on the one hand, from an inadequate concept of citizenship and, on the other hand, from an easy denial of the rights inherent in citizenship on the part of the authorities. What happened in such situations in the past should be a useful reminder of the need to protect the rights of all citizens, including those from groups temporarily unpopular, and the need to ensure that proper process and not prejudice prevails.

## **A BRIEF POSTSCRIPT**

Alf Martinuzzi is now 88 years old. He was actively engaged in community affairs from about ten years after the war. The internment and various associated incidents made a

deep impact on his wife, who was of British pioneering stock. For his part, he doesn't deny, but doesn't volunteer much information about his internment. He maintains that the Australian authorities "did not know what they were doing", and that his internment was a mistake. That is not to say it did not have a major impact on his life for some years after the war.

Giuseppe Cantamessa never recovered from his internment experience. It deprived him of his livelihood, his position in the community and his identity as an Australian citizen of Italian origin. He returned to his home at the end of 1943 and died in 1947, aged 55 years. His sons vowed never to be involved in public life or to accept public office. His internment story was included in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* to represent internees of Italian origin.<sup>14</sup> In about August 2002 the government of the Australian Capital Territory requested the permission of his sons to name a street in the National Capital, Canberra, Cantamessa Avenue in his honour.

Mario Sardi applied for naturalisation in 1944, married his fiancé in 1945, and was granted his citizenship in 1946. He cut cane for a few more years then entered into a partnership with his father-in-law and eventually took over the farm. He lived into his 80th year and died in 1996. His wife died in 1999. Of all his writings, he preserved his internment diaries, perhaps because of the significance of that period in his life. Some of his friends, and probably he, too, used to describe their internment as being "in collegio" (sent to college). Sardi was a resilient man

with a sense of humour.

His diary is displayed on loan in the social history exhibition Horizons at the new National Museum of Australia in Canberra.

## ***Endnotes to Chapter Two***

---

<sup>1</sup> See P. Hasluck, *The Government and the People*, (Canberra, 1952).

<sup>2</sup> See G. Cresciani, *Fascism, Anti-Fascism and Italians in Australia: 1922 – 1945*, (Canberra, 1980).

<sup>3</sup> See M. Bevege, *Behind Barbed Wire: Internment in Australia during World War II*, (St Lucia, 1993).

<sup>4</sup> See I.M. O'Brien, *Australia's Italians, 1788 – 1988*, (Melbourne, 1988).

<sup>5</sup> K. Saunders and R. Daniels, *Alien Justice: Wartime Internment in Australia and North America*. (St Lucia, 2000), xviii.

<sup>6</sup> I.M. O'Brien, "Nationality, Citizenship and Rights in Wartime Australia," *Cultural Citizenship: Challenges of Globalisation* edited by L. Kerr, Conference Proceedings, Deakin University, Melbourne, 5-8 December, 2002, pp 132 – 139.

<sup>7</sup> O'Brien, *op.cit.* 1988.

<sup>8</sup> See W. Douglass. *From Italy to Ingham: Italians in North Queensland*, (St Lucia, 1995).

<sup>9</sup> I.M. O'Brien, 1992, "The Internment of Australian Born and Naturalised British Subjects of Italian origin", *War, Internment and Mass Migration: The Italo-Australian Experience 1940-1990*, eds Richard Bosworth and Romano Ugolini. Rome, 1992) 92.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> *Smiths Weekly*, 6 July, 1940, 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Truth*, 3 January 1942, 1.

<sup>13</sup> D. Menghetti, “The Internment of Italians in North Queensland”, *Australia, the Australians and the Italian Migration*. Ed G. Cresciani. (Milano, 1983) 88- 01.

<sup>14</sup> I.M. O’Brien, “Giuseppe Cantamessa”, *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. (Melbourne, 1993) Vol 13, pp. 363-4.