

Domestic Colonies in America: Labour, Utopian and Farm Colonies

Domestic colonies (entities explicitly called *colonies* by those who proposed them) were created first in Europe and then North America in the 19th and 20th centuries. Unlike imperial or external colonies, domestic colonies were created *within the borders of states* (rather than overseas) for *fellow citizens* (rather than foreigners) in order to solve a variety of social problem encountered within rapidly industrializing and urbanizing societies. There were three broad categories of domestic colonies based on who lived within them and the 'problem' to be solved: **labour colonies** for the idle poor, **farm colonies** for the mentally ill/disabled and **utopian colonies** by and/or for political, religious and racial minorities. In this paper I distinguish between domestic *colonization* (a *process* of segregating and engaging people in agrarian labour in segregated communities) and domestic colonialism (the *ideology* that justified it). This analytical distinction is important as it allows me to analyze domestic colonies on two different levels - the *process* of domestic *colonization* through primary, archival sources on the empirical reality of the colonies themselves and the *ideology of domestic colonialism* in America through the writings of Abraham Lincoln, Charles Bernstein, Frederick Douglass, Booker T. Washington, and Walter Fernald.

This ideology of domestic colonialism shares three key principles: **segregation** of the idle and irrational from the rest of 'civil' society to help them break free their bad habits/customs, engagement in **agrarian labour** on a large, bounded acreage of uncultivated soil in the countryside, **improvement** of both the colonized themselves and the land. The ultimate goal of domestic colonies was to

transform the idle and irrational as far as possible into the 'industrious and rational' while creating economic revenues through the sale of produce to offset the costs of maintaining such populations. Colonialism is first articulated in modern political theory in an embryonic form in Locke's 17th century agrarian labour theory of property in America (Arneil, 1996). Locke claims English settlers have the right to claim title over 'empty' or 'wast' land in America because they enclosed and cultivated the soil, consistent with God's will.¹ This theory of property rooted in agrarian labour contrasts sharply with previous theories of property founded in the principle of either occupation (favored by the Ancient Romans) or conquest (favored by Catholic natural law theorists) with Locke explicitly rejecting conquest as the basis of colonial right over land (which he describes as a 'strange doctrine' being so different from the accepted ways of the world).

Locke argues there at economic and ethical benefits of colonization. Against a very skeptical audience at home who generally saw colonization in America as draining the wealth of England) Locke argues agrarian labour increases the value of land by a hundred-fold and revenues are created for colonial proprietors through sale of agricultural produce including for Locke's patron, the Earl of Shaftesbury. Locke also argues colonization is good for American 'Indians' as they have a model for 'industriousness' so that once separated from their 'ways, modes and notions' and educated in England, thus broken free from their customary and idle ways, they could be transformed into industrious and productive 'freemen' (and enjoy the

¹ "God gave the World to Men in Common...but it cannot be supposed he meant it should always remain common and uncultivated. He gave it to the use of **the Industrious and Rational and Labour** was to be his Title to it." John Locke Two Treatises: II ¶ 475 emphasis added

same conveniences as the 'more improved' English settler). Colonization is thus justified in terms of both its ethical and economic benefits.

Locke's arguments are important because the same justifications (economic and ethical) were deployed to defend *domestic* colonies in the 19th and 20th centuries. Transforming the 'idle and irrational' whether at home in Europe or overseas is key. Thus segregation into domestic colonies to break them free from their bad habits, engaging them in the cultivation of 'empty' soil was the key to this transformation and thus was in the interest of the members of the colony itself. Secondly, domestic colonialists will argue that such labour also produces revenues for the state to offset costs of maintaining such populations (increasing in the 19th century and early 20th centuries and seen as burdens or drains on society).

It is important to note this definition I am proposing of colonialism that animated domestic colonies, characterized by **segregation, agrarian labour and improvement**, is at odds with the definition provided in contemporary dictionaries and post-colonial scholarship which tend to define colonialism almost invariably as racialized **domination of foreign** peoples and lands. Thus, the Oxford English dictionary's definition is: 'a) send[ing] settlers to (a place) and establish political control over it... b) settl[ing] among and establish control over (the indigenous people).'¹ Similarly, the main scholars of contemporary post-colonialism (Edward Said, Albert Memmi, Georges Balandier, Jürgen Osterhammel and Ronald Horvath)²

² On the 'external' nature of colonization, Said it as 'implanting of settlements on a *distant* territory' 1994:9; Memmi speaks of 'the colonizer [as] a *foreigner*, having come to a land by the accidents of history.' 1991:9 In terms of domination, Balandier 1966 defines colonization as 'domination imposed by a foreign minority... on an indigenous population', Osterhammel as a 'relationship of domination between an indigenous...majority and a minority of foreign invaders...in pursuit of interests...defined in a distant

define colonies and colonization are *external* to Europe and invariably engaged in *domination* over racialized othersⁱⁱ. Even ‘settler colonial’ scholars define colonization as domination by a ‘foreign’ entity but the colonizer exists *within* the same territory. ‘Settler colonialism constitutes a circumstance where the colonizing effort is exercised from *within* the bounds of a settler colonizing political entity.’ (Veracini, 2010: 6)

There is one very good reason why colonialism has been defined in these terms – a racialized form of domination over foreign/indigenous lands and peoples – because, far and away the most profound manifestation of colonial power in the modern era is indeed European and settler states assimilating/dominating non-western indigenous others and dispossessing them of their territory while exploiting their resources. I wish to acknowledge this central point at the outset, because while this article focuses on the largely overlooked historical existence of *domestic* colonies and their contradictory normative character within settler colonization in America, the shift in focus to domestic colonies and the related shift in the meaning of colonialism should not in any way diminish the enormity or profoundly negative nature of European foreign colonization and/or settler colonization (which will be discussed in this paper).

But it is also important to acknowledge colonialism and colonization are used less and less to describe a set of actual historical processes within or outside of

metropolis’ and Ronald Horvath: “it seems generally, if not universally, agreed that colonialism is a form of domination – the control by individuals or groups over the territory and/or behavior of other individuals or groups” Horvath, 1972: 47

states and more and more as metaphors for domination in general. Thus along with post-colonial scholars who define external colonization as domination by Europeans over indigenous peoples and lands, 'internal colonialism' is a term used to describe domination within one's own borders. Jurgen Habermas uses internal colonialism as a metaphor for an insidious and dominating power within late modern capitalism over the life system, Michael Hechter uses it to describe domination by England over the Celtic fringe in Britain, and Robert Blauner uses it to describe the American state's domination of African Americans. The words 'colonialism' and colonization have thus increasingly *not* been used to describe processes through which various kinds of colonies were created or justified but as a rhetorical device or metaphor to express how profoundly negative certain forms of domination can be.

It also follows that *decolonization* has likewise become a metaphor for resisting domination as distinct from colonization. There is a problem with this use of the term, as Tuck and Yang argue in their article 'Decolonization is not a metaphor', namely concrete historical processes of colonization and decolonization get lost: 'Decolonization brings about the repatriation of Indigenous land and life; it is not a metaphor for other things we want to do to improve our societies and schools.' (2012, 1) In this article I argue, like Tuck and Yang, I am seeking along with settler colonial and indigenous scholars to use the terms of colonialism and colonization to describe actual entities called colonies and focus on concrete historical processes of colonization and the ideologies of colonialism that justified them. Guided by historical evidence, I add domestic colonies into the more common

forms of scholarship on colonization which tend to focus on external or settler colonization.

Domestic Colonies in America: A Cacophony of Intersecting Colonialisms

While there are any number of colonies I could study in Europe, in this paper I analyze domestic colonies in America using three historical case studies: 1) *domestic colonies* for freed African American slaves within America as justified by Benjamin Rush, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and Eli Thayer (supported by Frederick Douglass) in the early to mid 19th century; 2) *utopian colonies* created by and for African Americans themselves in the late 19th and early 20th century (supported by Booker T. Washington) and 3) *farm colonies* for the mentally disabled proposed and created by Charles Bernstein and Walter Fernald in the first three decades of the 20th century. In all three cases, I demonstrate that leading progressive thinkers, who I call domestic colonialists, justified colonies using the principles described above of **segregation, agrarian labour and improvement** (emphasized in varying degrees) in order to produce *ethical* benefits (the colonized will be improved rather than simply contained or punished) and *economic* benefits (revenues will be created to offset costs of maintaining them). Colonialists proposed the 'colony model' in explicit opposition to costly, punitive and dehumanizing institutions such as slavery in the case of domestic colonies for African Americans, external colonization in the case of utopian colonies and the constraints of asylums and sterilization in the case of farm colonies. Domestic colonialism could thus be adapted for various purposes and, as we shall see, the key principles of colonialism were interwoven with various ideologies in America

including republicanism, eugenics and racism as well as anti-racism and anti-eugenics in America to produce different kinds of domestic colonies.

Domestic colonies located in America were embedded within *settler* colonization and the ideology of settler colonialism. Jodi Byrd's notion of colonialism as a 'cacophony' along with the distinction between 'arrivants' and settlers provide useful tools for framing domestic colonies for African American and disabled Americans and how this interests with settler colonization:

In geographical localities of the Americas, where histories of settlers and arrivants map themselves into and on top of indigenous peoples, understanding colonialism as a cacophony of contradictorily hegemonic and horizontal struggles offers an alternative way of formulating and addressing dynamics that continue to affect peoples as they move and are made to move within empire (Byrd, 2011: 53).

The 'hegemonic and horizontal struggles' of these groups located within domestic colonies create clashes in the *processes of colonization* and at the *intersections of the ideologies of colonialism*.

Case #1: Labour Colonies for Freed Slaves

As the campaign for the abolition of slavery grew and increasing numbers of slaves were freed at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries, the question of what to do with 'idle free blacks' became one of the most serious 'problems' thought to be facing the republic. One very popular solution, advanced largely by abolitionists, was the creation of colonies for freed slaves at home in America and overseas. As Lockett comments: 'The idea of solving the race problem

by means of colonization preoccupied the minds and efforts of most leaders in America, both inside and outside of government, from 1800 to 1864'. (1991: 428)

While most historians are familiar with *overseas colonies* for freed slaves, most famously the colony of Liberia in Africa implemented by the American Colonization Society, little attention has been paid to *domestic* colonies proposed *within* America by leading thinkers and political actors of the era, including abolitionist Benjamin Rush, President Thomas Jefferson, journalist Horace Greeley, Congressman Eli Thayer supported by Frederick Douglass, Senator James Lane and, most importantly, President Abraham Lincoln. One key reason is that, unlike the overseas colonies, none of these proposals came to fruition *within* the United States, but the fact they were proposed, explored and discussed at the highest levels of American government and were supported in principle by the leading African American intellectual of the period makes them worthy of study in the history of colonial thought.

The first American to champion *domestic* colonies within the United States for freed African American slaves was Benjamin Rush, psychiatrist, ardent abolitionist and signatory to the Declaration of Independence. In 1794, Rush bought 20,000 acres of fertile soil for 'model farm colonies' in Bedford County, Pennsylvania, 'determined to act on his belief that yeoman farming was the best way of life for the Negro'. He 'presented 5,200 acres of his Bedford holdings to the Pennsylvania Abolition Society' for this purpose the same year. (D'Elia, 1969: 421) Despite these significant grants of land, however, Rush's scheme in Pennsylvania

never came to fruition and his son went on to become the vice president of the American Colonization Society.

Thomas Jefferson also proposed a domestic colony for freed slaves but whereas Rush's emphasis was on agrarian labour and improvement, Jefferson emphasized segregation, suggesting the agrarian based colony should be located in Ohio (at the edge of the existing republic) in his *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Gustave de Beaumont (who along with Alexis de Tocqueville recommended that *colonies agricoles* replace penal colonies and hard labour for juvenile delinquents in their 1833 report to the French government) was scathing in his response to Jefferson's proposal in his 1835 novel *Marie*: 'Jefferson...wanted a portion of American territory assigned to the Negroes, after the abolition of slavery, where they would live apart from the whites. One is struck at once by the defects and unwisdom involved in such a system.' (1835: 208) Republicanism is key to this disagreement since France and America shared a republican set of values. Both Jefferson and Beaumont saw the republic as a central concern – but while the former argued a domestic colony for freed slaves supported its unity, Beaumont argued the opposite.

A significant slave revolt in Virginia in 1800 caused Jefferson to question the idea of colonies on the North American continent, as he increasingly viewed freed slaves as threats to the republic. This led to an increased emphasis on the principle of segregation and support for *overseas* colonies as necessary according to Jefferson to ensure the 'security' of white Americans and their property. In a letter to Governor James Monroe on November 24, 1801, Jefferson suggests a colony *might*

be established for freed slaves in America but immediately questions its desirability, 'Questions would...arise whether the establishment of such a colony within our limits...would be desirable?' and more pointedly, 'should we be willing to have such a colony in contact with us?' (Jefferson, 1801:420) He ends with the suggestion that the 'West Indies' would 'offer a more probable and practicable' place for a colony since it is 'inhabited by a people of their own race and color'. (421) Segregation by race dominates his colonial thinking as we see the competing influences of domestic colonialism, racism and republicanism play out over time in shaping Jefferson's thought and the debate in America over domestic versus overseas colonies. Most significantly, as we shall see shortly, African American leaders universally opposed overseas colonization (as rooted in racist segregation) but embraced certain models of domestic colonization (as rooted in principles of 'improvement' and labour).

Throughout the 19th century, the American Colonization Society grew in strength and eventually established a colony for freed slaves in Liberia in West Africa. While this organization was mainly devoted to overseas colonies, there was always debate about whether a colony could be created within America that would be more efficient and less costly. Such colonies, as Jefferson's proposed colony, were generally to be located at the edge of the American state, and hence segregation from white society, even for domestic colonies, was at the forefront of considerations. The main issue arising within the ACS in its examination of domestic colonies was the problem posed by indigenous land title. Thus domestic colonies for freed slaves ran directly into settler colonialism, particularly where

domestic colonies were to be established in territories to the west of the existing United States.

Thus, the ACS were in general committed to the racist idea that the two 'races' could not live together and thus colonies for freed blacks ought to be founded overseas, but the issue of finding land at the edges of the existing republic at the beginning of the 19th century also raised questions about securing land from indigenous peoples. Thus in July 1832, the Fifteenth Annual Report of the American Colonization Society notes what prevented the creation of a colony *within* the United States but at its borders was the problems this might entail with indigenous peoples who would fight any further incursion on their territory: 'The territory which might be procured should, at all events, be without the limits of the United States...A domestic Colony...would be impracticable, *on account of the number and disposition of those who must be parties to such an arrangement.*' (128) It becomes clear that what the author of this report has in mind when he refers to 'parties' are indigenous peoples. Thus he goes on to talk of the one example of the a 'feasible' domestic colony proposed by Senator Tucker of Virginia in 1825 who 'offered a Resolution to the National Senate, the object of which was to ascertain through the War Department, the probably expense of extinguishing the Indian title to a portion of the country lying *west of the Rocky Mountains*, 'that may be suitable for colonizing the free people of color, the best known routes across the said mountains, and the probable cost of a road and military posts, necessary to a safe communication with

such colony'. (20) The author ultimately dismisses this proposal out of hand as impossible to realize.³

The most important proponent of colonizing African American freed slaves in the 19th century, however, was Abraham Lincoln, a member of the ACS from his early years through to his Presidency where he eventually viewed colonization as the necessary corollary to emancipation. Together they became a centerpiece of his administration. Shortly after becoming President, in early 1862, 'as a result of the persuasive efforts of President Lincoln, the US House of Representatives created the Select Committee on Emancipation *and Colonization* for the express purpose of thoroughly examining all aspects of the question of colonization in an attempt to determine its feasibility.' (Lockett, 1991: 431) As the name of this congressional committee would suggest, emancipation, for Lincoln, was inextricably linked to colonization as he secured significant funding from Congress to undertake colonization (\$600,000). Historians Phillip Magness and Sebastian Page estimate this figure was about 1% of the entire federal budget at the time(2011:4), with 'President Lincoln [the] sole trustee of colonization'. (Lockett, 1991: 431)

Within that first year, in September 1862, Lincoln issued his *Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation*, in which he states: 'It is my purpose upon the next meeting of Congress to again recommend... immediate or gradual abolishment of slavery....and that the effort to colonize persons of African descent, with their

³ Fifteenth Report of the American Colonization Society, 1832. *North American Review*, Vol. XXXV, Boston, Gray and Bowen, 141 Washington St. 1832 (118-164).

consent, *upon this continent, or elsewhere...* will be continued.’⁴ Two key points from this sentence: first, Lincoln explicitly links colonization and emancipation as two sides of the same coin, one could not be done without the other. Second, Lincoln says explicitly that colonies can be created *within* the United States as well as outside of it; that is domestic or external. It is worth noting however that when the Final Emancipation Proclamation was issued on January 1, 1863, there is no explicit reference to colonization or domestic colonies, even though Lincoln had sent 450 freed slaves to a colony in the West Indies the day before it was signed.

The Final Emancipation Proclamation actually demarcates two phases in Lincoln’s colonization policies during his presidency. In the first phase, he publicly defends colonization and makes several attempts to implement schemes overseas, under the auspices of private interests over either charitable organizations or either American or foreign states that fail quickly and spectacularly. The second phase involves secret negotiations with foreign states, the British and Dutch, in order to send freed slaves to their colonies in Central and South America and Lincoln’s exploration, in conjunction with Congressman Thayer and Senator Lane of domestic colonies in Florida and Texas. This second phase is the subject of heated debate amongst historians as to whether he continued to pursue his plans for colonization after the Final Proclamation (largely in secret) or gave them up altogether.

There is a lot at stake in the outcome of this historical debate, as Henry Louis Gates argues, because if the claims ‘about Lincoln’s continuing support of

⁴ Abraham Lincoln, *Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation*, September 22, 1862.
http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/american_originals_iv/sections/transcript_preliminary_emancipation.html

colonization as late as 1865 turned out to be true, our image of the Lincoln who had wrestled with and by the end of his life had transcended anti-black racism...would be deeply troubled.' (Gates, 2009: liv) Gates concludes, this narrative is important to America as a whole, but particularly to African Americans who see Lincoln as a hero of racial equality (Barack Obama, for example, began his first campaign for president in Springfield, Illinois, the birthplace of Lincoln). Historians Magness and Page (2011, 2013) provide compelling evidence Lincoln remained seriously engaged with colonization until his death in 1865 but was very secretive about his plans compared to earlier in his presidency which leads to the question of why he would be so secretive about it, given his public support in the years before emancipation?

There are a number of reasons why this might be the case. First, the colonies Lincoln established in Central America and the Caribbean via private speculators failed so quickly and spectacularly that Congress rejected any further plans and withdrew funding for colonization. Lincoln thus found himself politically isolated and without funding. Second, because the earlier colonies had also created diplomatic problems with neighboring countries in Central America, negotiations with both British and Dutch governments about sending freed slaves to colonies in South and Central America required delicacy, privacy, and secrecy. Third, Lincoln's exploration of *domestic* colonies in Florida or Texas seemed so outlandish (even to members of his own government) that he likely feared ridicule if discussed publicly. Thus, it is not that Lincoln believed colonization was no longer necessary but without political support or money from Congress, he needed to pursue his plans, particularly ones close to home, covertly.

The proposals for *domestic* colonies during this phase came from various sources including Lincoln himself. Senator James Lane of Kansas and Congressman Eli Thayer proposed colonies in Texas and Florida, respectively in response to *both* Southern slaveholders who wanted freed slaves to be removed from the South and Northern states who worried a flood of free slaves would inundate their states. Texas and Florida colonies were thus located at the edge of the existing republic, within the continent but just barely, segregating freed slaves from both the heart of the republic and slave owners in the South. On February 17, 1863, Lincoln met with Thayer and his congressional committee to discuss the proposed Florida colony, which Thayer described in terms of agrarian labour on uncultivated soil: 'Northern men going there to cultivate the lands would employ the negroes...and the negroes would go there from the Northern and Border States from choice, because they would there find labor remunerated and a more genial climate'.⁵

Thayer's plan was supported by Frederick Douglass, the leading African American intellectual of the era, who while vociferously opposing external colonial schemes referring to them as forms of 'extermination', strongly *supported* this plan for a colony in Florida, arguing 'thousands of Northern blacks would participate'. (Escott: 58) Again, agrarian labour and improvement were key to Douglass: 'Let the freed slaves be sent into that state with implements to till the soil and arms to protect themselves', concluding a 'colony in Florida would rescue freed people caught between the "two fires" of white southern hostility and northern prejudice'. (Guyatt: 240) Douglass also argues there are economic benefits of domestic colonies

⁵ Address of Hon Eli Thayer at Cooper Institute. *New York Times*, February 8, 1863, p. 9.

compared 'to the plans for overseas colonization – in which Congress would spend millions of dollars “deporting black laborers to a foreign country”’. For Douglass, Thayer discovered the “true solution of this difficulty”, and thus describes Florida as a possible utopian colony or black ‘Canaan’. (Guyatt: 240)

On January 11, 1864, Senator Lane of Kansas ‘introduced a bill in Congress that sought to create a colony of four million blacks [in Texas] stretching from the Rio Grande to Colorado and westward to New Mexico’ (Vinson, 2004: 146) in which he emphasized segregation, agrarian labour and improvement. The ultimate goal, consistent with a Lockean view, is property ownership and the exercise of citizenship through agrarian labour on the soil.

The nation should make a reasonable effort to secure for the millions of freed men proper homes in a habitable...country on our southwestern border...where, by acquiring an undisputed title to the soil, and an independent legal organization, they may enjoy the privileges of republican civilization and there concentrate their whole strength for mutual *improvement*. (Lane 1864: 7, emphasis added)

On June 25, 1864, as Senator Wilkinson attached a clause to repeal any remaining colonization funds to the Sundry Civil Expenses Bill, Lane argued for an ‘amendment with the view that the fund would be transferred into a newly proposed domestic colonization scheme in west Texas.’ (Magness and Page, 2011:94)

Lane’s plan was interesting enough that Lincoln himself explored his own plan for a domestic colony in Texas for freed black slaves. As Lucius Chittenden, Registrar for the Treasury in Lincoln’s administration, notes in his memoirs,

Lincoln's explorations began after December 1862 as 'parties were ready to undertake the removal [of freed slaves] to Western Texas', likely referring to Lane's proposals. (Chittenden, 1891: 336) Shortly after, in early 1863, Chittenden recounts a visit from Lincoln to ask him if he knew of an 'energetic contractor...who would be willing to take a large contract, attended with some risk?' Chittenden naturally asked about the nature of the contract and Lincoln replies: 'There will be profit and reputation in the contract I propose...It is to remove the whole colored race of the slave states into Texas.' (337) Chittenden recommended John Bradley of Vermont and arranged a meeting between them that lasted for two hours. Bradley reported to Chittenden after the meeting that the 'proposition...is to remove the whole colored race into Texas, there to establish a republic of their own'. He also adds the President had not 'made up his mind' as to whether to go ahead. Chittenden goes on to say in his memoirs that 'the President had it under examination'. (338)

This idea of a colony in Texas as proposed by Lane and explored by Lincoln has received little attention in the scholarly literature on Lincoln or African American colonization, largely because Chittenden's was the only account of his direct and active involvement in exploring this idea but also because it never came close to implementation and, in any case, is still unclear how serious Lincoln was in it. In short, taken on its own, this idea of domestic colony in Texas just seems like an isolated, outlandish and simply crazy plan. But I believe this changes when seen in light of not only the reference in the Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation to colonies created on '*this continent*' but also various domestic plans that span a century of American history including Rush in Pennsylvania, Jefferson in Ohio,

Thayer in Florida and Lane in Texas, not to mention the labour and farm colonies being proposed in the last half of the nineteenth century in Europe for various populations of 'idle' and 'irrational' people. Suddenly, Lincoln's Texas plan no longer seems so ridiculous or something that should be dismissed out of hand, but rather simply one more example in a variety of proposals for colonizing African Americans as necessary to emancipation – whether these colonies were located at home or overseas was of much less importance to Lincoln than whether they served to protect the unity of the republic while also ensuring full emancipation.

President Lincoln's death in April of 1865 put an end to *domestic* colonies since President Andrew Johnson returned to *foreign* colonization schemes in 1865 and 1866; a shift in policy which earned a 'sharp rebuke from Frederick Douglass'. (Guyatt, 255) Thus while the distinction between domestic and foreign colonization mattered little to a white politician like Lincoln, it was of critical importance to African American leaders like Douglas (but also Booker T. Washington) who both supported domestic colonies but were vehemently opposed to external colonies exactly because they viewed the latter as nothing more than a manifestation of racism extermination but the latter as a policy of improvement and transformation from slavery to freedom/full citizenship.

While African American leaders preferred *domestic* colonization the creation of colonies on American soil, almost always it intersects with settler colonialism as the lands required for such colonies involved the prior dispossession and/or removal of indigenous peoples to exist at all. The principle of 'industriousness' was a key variable in these competing colonialisms as Lane, for example, defending his

proposed colony in Texas compares the industriousness of the freed African American to the idleness of the native 'Indian' to justify the former's right to land in Texas *over* the latter: 'We devote immense tracts of land and millions of dollars money to a few thousand savages, who are not producers in any sense...It is true they have a claim on us as the original owners; but have the negroes no claim? Have not they and their fathers toiled to build up our country and our country's wealth without pay or award?' (17) Lane, following a classical Lockean colonialism rooted in agrarian labour, argues the right to property lies in labour more than occupation and his proposed colony in Texas would take over the 'empty' land of the Indians and use it to help African Americans become industrious citizens via their labour.

Case #2: Utopian Colonies for Freed Slaves

Utopian colonies were created *by* African Americans *for themselves* as segregated agrarian communities during the Reconstruction era in the late 1870's. Despite emancipation, the situation in the South for freed slaves remained precarious, violent and oppressive. Domestic utopian colonies, known as 'freedom colonies' in some locales, became an important vehicle through which African Americans exercised their agency to exist freely separated from white society, while also fulfilling a dream to own property instead of slavery or 'sharecropping' (a form of land ownership where former slaves became tenants on large acreages working for basic subsistence at the behest of white land-owners). Indeed, Sitton and Conrad (2005) argue African Americans owned far more property than is generally recognized in the South during this period almost entirely through 'freedom colonies'. The key was to be segregated from white society entirely in order to

create a space of freedom within which African Americans could till a section of their own land and learn how to transform themselves from slavery to freedom.

As far back as 1864, within a year after the Final Emancipation Proclamation was issued, many African Americans believed true emancipation would *only* be possible if they lived *segregated* from white supremacist society within their own communities. As 'sixty-seven year old freedman Garrison Frazier [told Secretary of War] Stanton 'we would prefer' to 'live by ourselves' rather than 'scattered among the whites'. Frazier was not alone, as Elizabeth Bethel notes: 'the sentiments Frazier expresses were not unusual.' (Bethel, 1981: 7; Magdol, 1977: 70) Utopian colonies created by African Americans represented a chance to live as one chose and hence their name of 'freedom colonies': a space in a society that was otherwise oppressive: "Freedom colonies" [were] anomalies in a post war South where white power elites rapidly resumed social, economic and political control and the agricultural system of sharecropping came to dominate.' (Sitton and Conrad, 2005: 1).

One of the strongest domestic colonialists in support of African American utopian or freedom colonies at the turn of the 20th century was educator and principal of Tuskegee Institute, Booker T. Washington, whom W.E.B. Du Bois describes in 1903 as 'the one recognized spokesman of his ten million fellows and one of the most notable figures in a nation of seventy millions'. (1903:5) Washington followed in the footsteps of Frederick Douglass who, as discussed, also supported certain kinds of *domestic* colonies for African Americans, but while the only option available to Douglass in the 1860's were colonies proposed by white Americans, Washington penned three articles in defense of black utopian colonies.

In 1907, Washington wrote a defense of Mound Bayou colony in Mississippi as the way forward for African Americans in the South; in 1908, he wrote an article in the African American journal *The Outlook* (1908) in defense of the colony in Boley, Oklahoma; and finally in 1912, in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* he published an article entitled 'The Rural Negro Community' (1912) in which he speaks in a general way about these colonies along with the agrarian education to support them, which he called 'improvement of the schools and stimulating the efforts of the farmers to improve their methods of farming'. (1912: 86) Thus, in all three articles, Washington emphasizes the colonial principles of segregation, improvement through education and agrarian labour as key to their success and the 'improvement' / transition of the slave into a freeman.

African American utopian colonies were ultimately established in Kansas, Texas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and California. Ultimately, I will argue that these colonies represent an intersection of domestic colonialism (colonies were rooted like other domestic colonies in the principles of segregation, agrarian labour and improvement) with both settler colonialism (colonies require the prior dispossession and removal of indigenous peoples) and radical colonialism (the colony was a vehicle through which to resist and challenge larger existing power structures in society, namely white supremacy).

The first domestic colonialist to propose colonies was Benjamin Singleton who proposed 'at least four...colonies between 1873 and 1878' in Kansas prior to the great exodus of 1879. (Williams, 1985: 220) The 'great migration' of 1879 involved a mass movement of people from the South to other states. 'From 1875-1877, blacks

migrated west in a continuous and organized way. Much of the migration that occurred before 1879 was that of organized groups in colonies. The major characteristics of such colonies organized by blacks before 1879 were that all were thoroughly planned and led by able men'. (Williams, 222)

But even as this internal migration to domestic colonies represented a way to create a collective life of autonomy away from a white supremacist society in the South, it also was engaged in settler colonization, that is the prior dispossession and removal of indigenous peoples, in this case the Kaw or Kanza people and the Osage people from the two parcels of land upon which Singleton founded his first and second colonies. Singleton's first colony in Baxter Springs was built on the traditional territory of the Osage people, who in 1825, had 'ceded' millions of acres of their traditional hunting lands in Missouri, Arkansas and Oklahoma to the American government and had moved to a reservation in Kansas. In 1870, an act of Congress required that the remainder of land in Kansas be sold and the Osage people were removed again and relocated to Oklahoma. It was on this territory that Singleton founded his first colony. Baxter Springs was famous for being one end of the 'Black Dog Trail', created by the Black Dog tribal band of the Osage people around the turn of the 19th century and used by them as a site of healing on their way to their hunting grounds at the other end in Oklahoma. According to Louis Burns of the Oklahoma Historical Society, the Black Dog Trail was an enormous undertaking - the Osage people built a road to accommodate 'eight horsemen riding

abreast' that was the 'first [major] improved road in both Oklahoma and Kansas'.⁶

African Americans debated the advisability of segregation in utopian domestic colonies. In 1878, like Douglass's critique of mass exodus and full separation, the 'editors of the *American Citizen* and the *Colored Citizen* magazines [both African American publications]...challenged the notion that it was better for blacks to separate themselves into colonies rather than settle near or among other people – believing perhaps that separation would not provide solutions to critical problems'.⁷ Others who supported colonization and segregation were equally adamant that colonization was the only solution to their problem of how to be 'free' in America. 'I boldly assert that the only practical plan for ever settling the [race] question is for the black man...to select one of the territories of this government... and settle it...and form a state of their own. In this way and in this way only can the negroes make of themselves a happy and prosperous people.'⁸

Thad Sitton and James Conrad in their book *Freedom Colonies: Independent Black Texans in the Time of Jim Crow* argue colonies created in the South have been largely overlooked by historians focused on the exodus to the west and north. 'The desperate migration of freedman to Kansas and Oklahoma [has been studied but] historians largely missed the similar and more general response of the freedmen's settlements, where ex-slaves remained in the South to establish all black landowner communities as far away from white authority as possible'. (2005: 3)

⁶ Louis F. Burns, 'Osage' *Oklahoma Encyclopedia of History and Culture*.

<http://digital.library.okstate.edu/encyclopedia/entries/O/OS001.html> Accessed June 2014.

⁷ *American Citizen*, Baltimore, July 26, 1879; *Colored Citizen*, July 26, 1878, cited in Williams, 1985: 220.

⁸ *Colored Visitor*, Logansport Indiana, August 1, 1879.

The tendency to overlook informal colonies in the South and focus on migrations to the north and west is problematic if, as Sitton and Conrad claim, African Americans in colonies in the South far outnumbered the north. '[While] numbers are difficult to estimate...this ubiquitous unremarked *internal* 'exodus' to local "freedom colonies" must have dwarfed the famous move north'. (2005: 3, emphasis added)

Amongst the many informal colonies in the South, there were also larger organized colonies built on rural soil but which often included a town at its center. One of the most famous of these is Mound Bayou colony in Mississippi. Isaiah Montgomery and his cousin Benjamin Green established Mound Bayou colony in 1887 after an earlier colony at David Bend failed. By 1895, the mid-South's largest newspaper, *The Commercial Appeal* of Memphis Tennessee published an article on Mound Bayou subtitled 'Sketch of a remarkable negro colony...six thousand acres owned by the inhabitants, among whom there is not a white man – noble principles are inculcated into the inhabitants'. (Mound Bayou Settlement 1895: 19) After introducing the colony itself, the author of the article quotes Montgomery at length on its nature.

What is clear from this description is that domestic colonialist ideas are at work in justifying this colony beginning with the principle of 'terra nullius' given that 'the location of Mound Bayou was wild and lonely in the extreme.' The key was agrarian cultivation in this 'empty' land. 'The present population', Montgomery notes, 'is about 1500 souls and still there is room for immense expansion. Many thousand acres of the best lands along the banks of little Mound Bayou...are awaiting occupation by the sturdy tillers of the soil'. Tilling their own land rather

than laboring as a slave on somebody else's will improve the settlers life and transform them into autonomous citizens: 'the principles ought to be inculcated by the establishment of this settlement in contradistinction from... plantation life are self-dependence, responsibility, stability.' (19) Montgomery concludes that it is important for African Americans to have a colony *segregated* from white society: 'for the simple reason that we desire to preserve as broad as possible the avenues here for the development of business interest among our own people, in order that they may...earn the respect and confidence of all classes of their fellow citizens'. (19) In other words, by creating a black segregated colony, African Americans believed they could prove through their work that they were worthy of equal citizenship.

Like the colonies in Kansas, the Mound Bayou colony was the site of settler colonization, in two distinct ways. First as the name itself suggests, the colony was founded on what had been an indigenous burial mound, but also in Montgomery and Washington's defense of the colony, one finds repeated references to land lying 'wild' or uncultivated which, through African American's labour would be transformed into land that could economically sustain freed African Americans even as it helped them to improve themselves. Thus, the improvement of both land and people was articulated in terms very similar to John Locke's theory of justifying the dispossession of indigenous peoples via the right to claim title to 'wild' or empty land via the labour of settlers upon it.

Booker T. Washington in his article in 1907 in defense of Mound Bayou explicitly links agrarian labour to private property and citizenship within this colony and in opposition to the wild empty land they were settling: "Mound Bayou

[is] a Negro colony, occupying 30,000 acres, all of which is owned by Negroes, most of them small farmers who till 40 and 80 acre tracts.' (1907: 9125) At the heart of his vision is the development of 'empty' land to create revenues for the colony as a whole. 'It was Montgomery's idea to establish on these wild lands a Negro colony...twenty years ago, this whole region was wild and inaccessible.' But over time, 'the wilderness had become the frontier...the forest steadily receded in all directions and large areas were opened for...cultivation'. (1907: 9126) And agrarian labour was the key to citizenship, claiming Mound Bayou as a place 'where a Negro...has an opportunity to learn some of the fundamental duties and responsibilities of social and civic life'. (1907: 9130)

Thus African American utopian colonies are best framed as a 'cacophony' of colonial relations as former African American slaves, arrivants 'created [them] *on top of indigenous*' peoples' territory even as they served to secure freedom for themselves and challenge racist assumptions within a white supremacist society, in a contradictory but hegemonic form of struggle that only existed in the first place because of imperialism – without which neither the slave trade nor the dispossession of indigenous peoples would have occurred. But because such utopian colonies were not constituted by European settlers who emigrated to America of their own volition but slaves and their offspring forced to come to America as victims of European imperialism themselves. This creates a different kind of cacophony over land. *Domestic* colonies as opposed to *overseas* colonies thus represent, for African Americans, an opportunity to achieve freedom and resist white supremacy in the only country they had ever known.

Case #3: Farm Colonies for the Mentally Disabled

While the first two kinds of domestic colonies in America targeted a group of Americans based on both race and class, namely African American freed slaves, the farm colony targeted a different kind of minority, namely mentally disabled Americans based on disability. Thus while, in general, labour colonies sought to solve the problem of 'idleness' in European and North American industrialized society, *farm colonies* in Europe and America sought to address the 'problem' of 'irrationality', meaning both mental illness (lunacy, madness) and mental disability (idiocy, feeble-mindedness, imbecility, and mental deficiency). Farm colonies were created throughout Europe and North America from the late 19th to mid 20th century and were characterized, like labour colonies by the principles of segregation, agrarian labor and improvement and were likewise justified by domestic colonialists in terms of both their ethical benefits (improving and providing therapy to the colonized) and economic benefits (offsetting costs for states and creating productive citizens). Farm colonies differed from labour or utopian colonies in one important sense: eugenicist (repress reproduction) and anti eugenicist arguments (alternative to sterilization and permanent segregation) were combined with colonialist arguments (improvement of people and land) to justify colonies.

The two leading defenders of the colony model for the mentally disabled in America were Walter Fernald, M.D, Superintendent of the Waverly Farm Colony in Massachusetts and Chairman of the Special Commission Relative to the Control, Custody and Treatment of Defectives, Criminals and Misdemeanants and Charles Bernstein, Superintendent of the Rome State Asylum and Colony, and founder of 60

colonies in the state of New York. Both were committed to the principles of segregation, agrarian labour and improvement, emphasizing how vulnerable the 'feeble-minded' were to exploitation and corruption in the city. Fernald was also a eugenicist who viewed the feeble minded as a 'menace' to society, particularly early in his career whereas Bernstein opposed eugenics and supported the colony model as an alternative to sterilization and eugenics. Let us consider both of these key domestic colonialists and colonizers in more detail.

Fernald, described by the Chairman of the Ontario Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble Minded in Canada as 'the leading exponent for care for the feeble minded' in the United States at the beginning of the 20th century, defends the farm colony for both ethical and economic reasons consistent with the ideology of colonialism, but also for eugenicist reasons as a way to protect society from the 'menace' of the mentally disabled. As early as 1893, in an address to the National Conference of Charities and Corrections he notes: 'Nearly all of the states making provision for the feeble-minded have practically followed what is known as the colony plan of organization'. (Fernald, 1893: 219) The key to the colony model was agrarian labour and 'wild' or uncultivated land to farm as Fernald makes clear in his own colony: 'We bought land for our farm colony...two thousand acres of wild land ...The best and most fertile farms in that part of Massachusetts are on the hill tops...the essential thing was to get fertile land and enough of it.' (1903:74)

The farm colony model also requires, along a large piece of wild land, the creation of cottages or villas (rather than a single building as with a traditional asylum). Mentally disabled individuals were then housed in separate cottages in

accordance with their designated level of 'reason' based on Fernald's theory of 'mental age': idiots (IQs of 0-25), imbeciles (26-50) and morons (51-70). By 1920, both the American Association for the Study of the Feeble Minded and the US Census adopted these terms. (US Census, 1926:14) Thus, the colony model together with IQ testing constructed the various categories of mental disability.⁹ It is worth noting that these terms are ubiquitous in today's parlance – moronic, idiotic, imbecile (as perjorative slurs rather than scientific categories as they were thought of then).

Walter Fernald gave the 'Annual Discourse' to the Massachusetts Medical Society on 'The Burden of Feeble Mindedness' in 1912, where he deployed eugenics to defend both sterilization and the colony model with a 'policy of segregation of the feeble minded, especially those of child bearing years' (Fernald, 1912:3). In this speech he also defended the economic benefits of the domestic colony system. 'The expense of...farm colonies for the feeble minded will be counterbalanced by the reduction in the population of almshouses, prisons and other expensive institutions'.

(4) The first person to respond to Fernald's address in 1912 during the question and answer period was Charles Bernstein who questioned Fernald's arguments with respect to both sterilization and permanent custody, claiming 'the place for those [whom Fernald thinks should be sterilized] is in the institution or on the farm' (6); and the objective should not be to keep them indefinitely in colonies but return them to society to labour in *rural* communities. 'Their employment in the country [is] advisable instead of the city. Those that we have in the country are the ones that

⁹ IQ testing was introduced by Henry Goddard into the United States and he was also a very strong advocate for farm colonies in Ohio.

are getting along the best'. (6) Thus, for Bernstein, agrarian labour for men was the key to the colony model, 'you cannot work those boys too hard...Let them go out and work just as hard as they will work. That is what they do for me when they are on the farm.'(8)

Fernald's 1917 article 'The Growth of Provision for the Feeble-Minded in the United States,' reflects a change in his attitude, under the influence of Bernstein, where he moves away from eugenics and permanent custody to emphasizing the principles of 'improvement' as well as the economic efficiencies of farm colonies but still emphasizes the economic benefits of the colony:

Experience has shown that there is a form of care that not only greatly improves the physical and mental condition of one group of the feeble-minded, but also reduces to practically nothing the actual cost of their maintenance. I refer to so-called "colony" care. (Fernald 1917, 166)

He argues again that 'colonies...should be located in the country ...on land suitable for cultivation' on uncultivated or 'wild' land: 'Temporary or permanent colonies may...be established on wild State lands for the purpose of clearing them and maintaining them' which shall 'return to the State a maximum revenue'. (166)

Fernald concludes by arguing farm colonies will create wealth by selling produce to offset the costs of maintaining this population. 'Such colonies... can be made self-supporting and seem to offer a most hopeful means of providing for a greatly increased number of cases at a minimum expense to the State.' (166)

Charles Bernstein opened his first farm colony in 1906 followed by 61 more colonies over the next forty years in rural settings. (Trent, 1994: 208) Like Fernald,

he championed the economic and ethical benefits of the farm colony: 'There are in New York some 30,000 feeble-minded and socially unfit in need of care...*a heavy burden upon the state if they are all to be maintained permanently in institutions...* It is our opinion that the time has come when something much less expensive and *many times more wholesome and natural than the physical custody of brick walls and iron enclosures...*is possible...that many of them can be rehabilitated... by careful training in the kinds of work that they are capable of performing'. (Bernstein, 1920:1, emphasis added) The key was 'labour. 'Self -respect is engendered in the individual rather than dependence...we are instructing our patients not only in hygiene and animal inhibition, but also in habits of industry.' (Bernstein, 1921:44) Bernstein argued 'paroling' members of the colony to privately owned farms would have both economic and ethical benefits:

A system that renders a large percentage of them self-supporting, apart from the benefit to the individuals directly concerned, performs a threefold service: It relieves the state financially, it permits...increased facilities for the...lower grades of feebleminded; and it adds to the community's supply of labour in fields in which the demand for works is far in excess of the supply - namely agricultural...work. (1920:2)

Trent claims Bernstein's model was adopted and 'by 1925 most institutions in America were trying colonies and parole.' (Trent, 1994:214)

Domestic colonies were not the product of eugenics as much of the literature on these and other institutions rooted in segregation assumes. Bernstein actively

opposed eugenics and forcible sterilization. In 1930, in response to the 1927 Supreme Court decision in favour of forcible sterilization, he published an article in the *Psychiatric Quarterly*: "There are several arguments which lead to the conviction that ...sterilization will not result in the benefits to the human race predicted by its advocates'. (1930a: 285) He argues colonization, specifically 'training and rehabilitation in 'farming work for men results in better outcomes than 'eugenic sterilization". (289) In the same year, Bernstein wrote a pamphlet (1930b) at the request of the National Catholic Welfare Council, who was working actively against sterilization, because it was believed such a pamphlet coming from a non-Catholic (Bernstein was Jewish) would be more effective. In this pamphlet, 'Bernstein advocates a colony system in which children and young adults could be educated and trained for productive work and potential employment in agricultural, domestic and industrial tasks.' (Leon, 2013: 86)

Bernstein's domestic colonialism was endorsed by one of the most powerful figures in American politics in the 20th century, New York Governor (and later President) Franklin Delano Roosevelt. 'Bernstein found a kindred spirit in...Roosevelt [who] along with Eleanor Roosevelt made annual visits to the institution [Rome Colony].' (Trent, 1994: 212) As always, agrarian labour was key to both men and would be used by Roosevelt in his own policies for the unemployed in the Depression: 'Roosevelt, a gentleman farmer himself, had advocated for 'back to the farm' policies, especially after the depression worsened. Bernstein's reclamation of abandoned farms fit closely with Governor Roosevelt's interest in resettling depression-ridden city folk on New York farms.' (212) Indeed Roosevelt,

as President, will be instrumental in creating agricultural colonies as part of the New Deal (including the famous Colonization Project Number 1 in Arkansas where Johnny Cash grew up).

Domestic colonies became extremely popular in America as Fernald himself observes in 1917: 'During the past decade, this form of care [farm colony] has rapidly grown so that now there is general approval of the formation of colonies for adult male feeble-minded persons in good physical condition'. (1917: 166) By 1930, multiple farm colonies for the mentally disabled were established in New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, South Carolina, Texas, California, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida and Hawaii. (Waggaman, 1920)

Conclusion: Domestic Colonies in America

Thus farm, labour and utopian colonies were proposed or implemented in America in the 19th and early 20th century for Americans based on race, 'idleness' and disability as justified by Rush, Jefferson, Lincoln, Douglass, Montgomery, Singleton, Washington, Fernald and Bernstein using domestic colonialism (which Europeans used at the same time to justify labour and farm colonies on that continent) but mixed in varying degrees with racism, republicanism, eugenics and/or a liberal emphasis on 'improvement' and progress. At the heart of these colonies, as we have discussed and the arguments justifying them were three key principles of domestic colonialism: segregation, agrarian labour and improvement.

The first principle of **segregation** was key to all three but for different reasons. For white American politicians, like Jefferson and Lincoln, segregation in colonies for freed slaves was justified by both racist beliefs that white and black

Americans could not live together in a single republic and colonialist beliefs that engagement in agrarian labour in separate labour colonies would provide the best way for Americans to transition from slavery to citizenship. For African American utopian colonialists like Montgomery and Washington, segregation was necessary not to serve white Americans interests but to create a space within which African Americans were free and equal in a deeply racist society. Finally in the case of farm colonies for the mentally disabled, segregation was necessary for both eugenicist reasons, that is repress reproduction (particularly Fernald in his early years) and colonialist reasons (seeking to improve the industriousness of the 'feeble-minded' and return them to society as productive farm labourers, particularly Bernstein).

The second principle of **agrarian labour** and cultivation was equally important to all three domestic colonies, justified in terms of both its economic and ethical benefits. In the case of domestic colonies for freed slaves, Thayer explicitly refers to the cultivation of 'wild' lands in his proposed Florida colony where African Americans would be improved because they would be better remunerated, Douglass supported Thayer's proposed colony as African Americans 'till the soil' for their own ends adding the domestic colony benefits the American state economically over overseas colonies which are enormous financial drains. Likewise, Senator Lane argued his colony in Texas allowed freed slaves through their engagement in labour to have 'undisputed title to the soil' and through this develop the capacity for republican citizenship. Finally, both Fernald and Bernstein put agrarian labour at the very heart of their *farm* colonies for the mentally disabled in Massachusetts and New York, respectively. In all cases, the key was to find 'wild' or 'uncultivated' land

that could be appropriated for the colony and make both the land and the colonized productive through agrarian labour.

The third principle of **improvement** was also key in all three case studies as domestic colonialists defended the domestic colony model as humane in contrast to institutions embedded in domination and punishment of the 'idle' and 'irrational' such as slavery, external colonies and asylums. Thus, Lincoln explicitly argued voluntary colonization of freed slaves was a necessary corollary to and replacement for slavery. In the case of his proposed colony in Texas, he envisioned a black republic populated by free citizens rather than slaves in charge of their own destiny through their labour (needless to say such a colony might also serve racist needs of separating the two races). Lane also explicitly referred to his plan for a colony in Texas as directed at the goal of 'mutual improvement' of African Americans. But perhaps the most important evidence that domestic colonies embraced as different principle, namely one of improvement over either slavery or external colonies was the support they received from leading African Americans. Douglass who supported Thayer's domestic colony in Florida, strongly opposed both external colonies and slavery. As discussed he saw the domestic colony as a vehicle for 'improving' freed slaves and allowing them to be freely employed in Florida rather than enslaved, removed from America altogether.

Likewise the utopian colonies as supported and/or implemented by Singleton, Montgomery and Washington were focused on 'improvement' of both the land and the lives of African Americans. As Montgomery himself comments of Mound Bayou –underpinning the colony '*in contradistinction to plantation life*' were the principles

of 'self-dependence' and 'responsibility' – in short freedom and agency for African Americans. Likewise Booker T. Washington refers in his article on such colonies to the improvement in methods of farming in the colony as compared to the plantation. Finally both Fernald and Berstein put 'improvement' through labour at the heart of their colony model in contradistinction to the constraints and domination of the asylum and institutional care. Fernald refers specifically to how 'colony care' is the only form of care which 'greatly improves the physical and mental condition' of the feeble minded. Bernstein goes further arguing the colony model is 'many times more wholesome' than the 'physical custody of brick walls and iron enclosures' since they allow the disabled to be in his words 'rehabilitated', creating independence and self respect which 'renders a large percentage' of disabled 'self-supporting'.

While they all share in common the principles of domestic colonialism, they also share in common the underpinning principle of settler colonialism. As discussed, the colonies created by white and black leaders for freed slaves were created not only on the traditional territory of indigenous peoples in the Americas but often required their explicit removal and/or dispossession for the colonies to exist at all whether we are talking about the labour colonies proposed by white politicians for freed slaves in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida or Texas or the utopian colonies proposed by African Americans for themselves in Kansas, Oklahoma and Mississippi, or farm colonies for the mentally disabled in New York and Massachusetts. As such virtually all of these colonies can be viewed as simultaneously the products of domestic and settler colonialism and domestic colonies are thus embedded within settler colonization.

Finally, utopian African colonies were the products of a third and quite different kind of colonialism, namely a radical form of utopian colonialism, which like 19th century anarchists and socialists in Europe, including Robert Owen, Peter Kropotkin and Leo Tolstoy who supported domestic colonies for specific groups in Europe in order to challenge basic principles of capitalism, individualism and even state sovereignty, allowed them from within the segregated space of the colony to challenge existing power relations, specifically white supremacy in American society. The colony was thus a vehicle through which to protect their own freedom and way of life and challenge the norms of the immoral society surrounding them.

Ultimately therefore, domestic colonies in America were **cacophonous** as Byrd defines it, as various groups of citizens, experts, the state and (underpinning it all) indigenous peoples engage in struggles defined by race, disability, and state sovereignty as well as sites of clashing ideologies of colonialisms. The colonies were products of **domestic colonialism** (the ideology deployed to defend the benefits of utopian and farm colonies using the same principles of segregation, agrarian labour and improvement of both people and land to justify them); **settler colonialism** since colonies required the prior dispossession of indigenous peoples to exist at all (in a way that domestic colonies in Europe did not) and, in the case of African American colonies, **radical colonialism**. Inherent within these clashing ideologies or cacophony were the contradictory normative meanings of the domestic colony - the domestic utopian colony was, simultaneously, a vehicle through which a foundational immoral norm of America society - white supremacy - could be resisted and challenged by African Americans (a progressive or positive normative

meaning) as well as a vehicle for dispossession (negative normative meaning). The farm colony was a tool for eugenicists (a regressive normative ideology) and/or anti-eugenicists (progressive alternative to sterilization and return to society for the disabled) embedded, again in a process of dispossession justified by Lockean forms of settler colonialism (negative normative ideology) all of which are anchored in the three principles described above.

Bibliography

- Adams, Henry. (1880). 'Testimony Regarding the Negro Exodus', *Select Committee of the United States Senate to Investigate the Cause of the Removal of the Negroes from the Southern States to the Northern States*, 46th Cong., 2nd sess., 1880 in *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States*. New York, 715. <http://www.yale.edu/glc/archive/1129.htm>
- Alfred, Taiaiake and Corntassel, Jeff. (2005). 'Being Indigenous: Resurgence against Contemporary Colonialism'. *Government and Opposition: An International Journal of Comparative Politics*. 40:4, pp: 597-614.
- Allen, Robert L. (1970). *Black Awakening in Capitalist America*. New York: Double Day.
- Allen, Robert L. (2005). 'Reassessing the Internal (Neo) Colonial Theory'. *Black Scholar*, 35:1, Spring, 2-11.
- American Colonization Society (1832) *Fifteenth Annual Report of the American Colonization Society*, 1832. North American Review, Vol. XXXV, Boston: Gray and Bowen (118-164).
- American Colonization Society. (1817). *First Annual Report*. Washington.
- American Colonization Society. (1834). *The African Repository and Colonial Journal*. Vol X., No. 4. Washington: James Dunn.
- Anders, Gary. (1979). 'The Internal Colonization of Cherokee Native Americans'. *Development and Change*. 10:1, January: 41-55.
- Armitage, David. (2012). "John Locke: Theorist of Empire?". In *Empire and Modern Political Thought* ed. Sankar Muthu. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp: 84-111.
- Armitage, David. (October 2004). 'John Locke, Carolina, and the Two Treatises of Government' *Political Theory*, 32:5, pp: 602-627.
- Arneil, Barbara. (1996). *John Locke and America: A Defense of English Colonialism*. Oxford University Press.

- Arneil, Barbara. (April 2009). 'Disability and Self Image in Modern Political Theory'. *Political Theory*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp: 218-242.
- Arneil, Barbara. 1996. *John Locke and America: A Defense of English Colonialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Balandier, Georges. 1966. 'The Colonial Situation: A Theoretical Approach'. *Social Change: The Colonial Situation*. Immanuel Wallerstein ed. New York: Wiley. 34-61.
- Beaumont, G. d., & Tocqueville, A. d. (1833). *On the penitentiary system in the United States and its application in France with an appendix on penal colonies, and also, statistical notes*. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard.
- Bell, Duncan. (2013). 'Ideologies of Empire' in Freedon, Michael, Lyman Tower Sargent, Marc Stears (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp: 536-561
- Bernstein, C. 1920. Colony and Extra-Institutional Care for the Feeble-Minded. *Mental Hygiene*. 4, 1: 1-28.
- Bernstein, C. 1921. 'Colony Care Isolation of Defective and Dependent Cases'. *American Association of Mental Deficiency Proceedings*. 26: 43-59.
- Bernstein, C. 1930. 'Sterilization of the Feeble-minded' *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 4:2: 285-294.
- Bethel Elizabeth. (1981). *Promiseland: A Century of Life in a Negro Community*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bhabba, Homi. (1990) 'The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism', *Black British Cultural Studies: A Reader*. Houston A Baker Jr. Manthia Diawara and Ruth Lindeborg (eds.), University of Chicago Press, pp: 86-106.
- Blauner, Robert. (1969). 'Internal colonialism and Ghetto Revolt', *Social Problems*. 16:4, Spring: 393-408.
- Blauner, Robert. (1972). *Racial Oppression in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Blumer, G. Alder. (1899). 'The Care of the Insane in Farm Dwellings', *Proceedings of the American Medico-Psychological Association Annual Meeting*, New York, pp: 326-336
- Brawley, Benjamin. (1921). *A Social History of the American Negro*. Project Gutenberg.<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/12101/12101-h/12101-h.htm>
- Brown, Isaac. (1857). *A Biography of the Rev. Robert Finley*, Chestnut Street: Philadelphia
https://archive.org/stream/biographyofrevro00lcbrow/biographyofrevro00lcbrow_djvu.txt
- Burns, Louis F. (2014). 'Osage' Oklahoma Encyclopedia of History and Culture
<http://digital.library.okstate.edu/encyclopedia/entries/O/OS001.html>

- Butt, Daniel. 2013. 'Colonialism and Post-colonialism'. *International Encyclopedia of Ethics*. Hugh LaFollette ed., Blackwell, 892-8.
- Byrd, Jodi. 2011. 'Been to the Nation, Lord, but I couldn't stay There: American Indian Sovereignty, Cherokee Freedmen and the Incommensurability of the Internal.' *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*. 13:1: 31-52.
- Carmichael, Stokely and Hamilton, Charles. (1967). *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Random House.
- Casanova, Pablo Gonzalez. (1963). "Internal Colonialism and National Development", *Studies in Comparative International Development*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp: 27-37.
- Chavez, John. (2011). 'Aliens in Their Native Lands: The Persistence of Internal Colonial Theory', *Journal of World History* 22:4.
- Cheney, C. O. (1927). 'Are colonies practicable in the treatment of the insane?', *The Psychiatric Quarterly*, 1(4), 426-437.
- Chittenden, L. E. (1891). *Recollections of President Lincoln and His Administration*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Clay, Henry. (1827). 'Of African Colonization'. Speech in the Hall of the House of Representative before the American Colonization Society, January 20, 1827. *The Life and Speeches of Henry Clay*, Volume 1, Greely and McElrath, 1843, pp: 267-284.
- Coulthard, Glen. (2014). *Red Skins, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cranston, Maurice. (1985). *John Locke: A Biography*. Oxford University Press, 1984
- D'Elia, Donald J. (1969) "Dr. Benjamin Rush and the Negro," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30, no. 3, pp: 413-422
- Dahl, Adam. (2015) 'The Tocquevillian Moment: Settler Colonialism and the Democratic Social State'. Paper presented at the Western Political Science Association Meetings, Las Vegas, April 2015.
- Dann, Martin. (1974). 'From Sodom to the Promised Land: E.P. McCabe and the Movement for Oklahoma Colonization', *Kansas Historical Quarterly*, 40:3, pp: 370-378.
- Davis Lennard J. 1997. 'Constructing Normalcy: The Bell Curve, the Novel, and the Invention of the Disabled Body in the Nineteenth Century,' in *The Disability Studies Reader*, ed. Lennard J. Davis New York: Routledge, 9-28.
- Davis, Damani. 'D'elia, D. J. (1969). Dr. Benjamin Rush and the Negro. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 30(3), 413. Retrieved June 15, 2010 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2708566>.

- Davis, Damani. (Summer, 2008). 'Exodus to Kansas: The 1880 Senate Investigation of the Beginning of the African American Migration from the South'. *Prologue Magazine*, US National Archives, 40:2.
- Davis, Lennard J. 1996. *Enforcing Normalcy: Disability, Deafness and the Body*. Verso Books, New York.
- DiLorenzo, T. (2002). *The Real Lincoln*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Douglass, Frederick 'Hon. Horace Greeley and the People of Color' January 29, 1852b in *Frederick Douglass: Selected Speeches and Writings*, Chicago Review Press, 2000: 185-187, 186.
- Douglass, Frederick 'Horace Greeley and Colonization' February 26, 1852a, *Frederick Douglass: Selected Speeches and Writings*, Chicago Review Press, 2000: 187-8.
- Douglass, Frederick. (2000) *Frederick Douglass: Selected Speeches and Writings*, Chicago Review Press.
- Dowbiggin, I. R. (1997). *Keeping America sane: psychiatry and eugenics in the United States and Canada, 1880-1940*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- duBois, W. E. B. (1985). 'Colonialism, Democracy, and Peace After the War'. In Herbert Aptheker (ed.) *Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961 by W.E.B. DuBois*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 229-244.
- duBois, W.E.B. "Colonialism, Democracy, and Peace After the War," *Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887-1961*. Herbert Aptheker (ed.) Amherst MA: University of Massachusetts Press: 229-44.
- Eagleton, N. (1936, April). The Mercer Colony in Texas 1844-1883. *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 39:4. pp: 288-289.
- Edington, C. (2011). 'Beyond the Asylum: *Colonies Agricoles* and the History of Psychiatry in French Indochina 1918-1945', *Proceedings of the Western Society of French History*. 39: 267-277.
- Edington, C. (2013). 'Labor as Therapy: Agricultural Colonies and the Psychiatric Re-education of the Insane'. *Beyond the Asylum: Colonial Psychiatry in French Indochina, 1880-1940*, Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University. Chapter Five: 181-224.
- Egerton, D. R. (1985). "Its Origin Is Not a Little Curious": A New Look at the American Colonization Society. *Journal of the Early Republic* (5) 4. pp: 463-480.
- Ekirch, Roger. (1990). *Bound for America: The Transportation of British Convicts to the Colonies, 1718-1775*. Oxford University Press.
- Escott, Paul D. (2009). *What Shall We Do with the Negro?: Lincoln, White Racism and Civil War America*. University of Virginia Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. (1994). *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.

- Farr, James. (2009). 'Locke, 'Some Americans', and the Discourse on 'Carolina'. *Locke Studies*. 9: 17-96.
- Fernald, W. E. 1893. 'The History of the Treatment of the Feeble Minded'. *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction*, 20th Annual Session, June 8-11, Chicago. Boston: Press of Geo. H. Ellis, 203-221.
- Finley, Robert. Letter to John P. Mumford, February 14, 1816.
- Fogelman Aaron S. (1998). 'From Slaves, Convicts and Servants to Free Passengers: The Transformation of Immigration in the Era of the American Revolution'. *Journal of American History*, 85, 43.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Vintage-Random House.
- Foucault, Michel. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books/Random House.
- Foucault, Michel. (2006). *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the College de France, 1973-4*. Edited by Jacques Lagrange, Translated by Graham Burchell, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Freedman, Michael. (2004). *Liberal Languages: Ideological Imaginations and Twentieth Century Progressive Thought*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press
- Friedlander, W. J. (2001). *The History of Modern Epilepsy: The Beginning, 1865-1914*. (5th ed.). Portsmouth: Greenwood Press.
- Galenson, David. (1996) 'The Settlement and Growth of the Colonies: Population, Labor and Economic Development' in Stanley L., Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Gates, H.L. (2009). 'Abraham Lincoln on Race and Slavery', in Gates, H. L., & Yacovone, D. *Lincoln on race and slavery*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press
- Goddard, Henry H. (1917) 'Mental Tests and the Immigrant'. *The Journal of Delinquency*. 2:5, September 1917: 243-277.
- Goddard, Henry Herbert (1912) 'The Basis For State Policy'. *The Survey* 27, 1912 1853-1855.
- Goddard, Henry Herbert. (1911) 'The Elimination of Feeble-Mindedness' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. 37:2, The Public Health Movement, March, 1911, 261-272.
- Goldstein, Jackie and Godemont, Marc. (October 2003). 'The Legend and Lessons of Geel, Belgium: A 1500 Year Old Legend, a 21st Century Model' *Community Mental Health Journal*, Vol. 39:5, pp: 441-458.
- Goodwin, D. K. (2005). *Team of rivals: the political genius of Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Gramsci, Antonio. (1999) 'Some Aspects of the Southern Question', 1926, *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*. David Forgacs (ed.), Lawrence and Wishart: London:171-185.
- Gresko, J. (1975). White 'Rites' and Indian 'Rites': Indian Education and Native Responses in the West, 1870-1910. in A. W. Rasporich. (ed.). *Western Canada Past and Present* Calgary, Alberta: The Department of History, University of Calgary. pp: 163-181.
- Guyatt, Nicholas. (2014) "'An Impossible Idea?": The Curious Career of Internal Colonization', *The Journal of the Civil War Era*. 4:2, 2014: 324-263.
- Habermas, Jurgen. (1985) *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Beacon Press: Boston
- Hansen, R. and King, D. (2013). *Sterilized by the State: Eugenics, Race, and the Population Scare in Twentieth-Century North America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hart, Myrtle Grace. (1925). *Farm Colonies for Misdemeanors*. (diploma thesis). Library School at the University of Wisconsin.
- Hechter, Michael. (1975). *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Hicks, Jack. (June 2004). 'On the Application of Theories of 'Internal Colonialism' to Inuit Societies.' Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the CPSA, Winnipeg.
- Hind, Robert J. (1984). 'The Internal Colonial Concept' *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 26:3, pp: 543-568.
- Horvath, Ronald. 1972. 'A Definition of Colonialism' *Current Anthropology*, 13:1: 45-57.
- Howard, Ella. (2013). *Homeless: Poverty and Place in America*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Howe, F. C. (1918). A Constructive Program for the Rehabilitation of the Returning Soldiers. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 80(1), pp: 150-152.
- Hubbell, H. G. (1934). Colonization as a therapeutic measure. *The Psychiatric Quarterly*, 8(3), pp: 476-488.
- Hudson River State Hospital Board. (1890). *Hudson River State Hospital Annual Report*.
- Huntington, E. (1935). *Tomorrow's Children: The Goal of Eugenics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Iles, R. Edgar. (1925). 'Boley: An Exclusively Negro Town in Okalohma' *Opportunity: Journal of Negro Life*'. August. National Humanities Center Resource Toolbox, *The Making of African American Identity: Vol. III 1917-1968*.
<http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/pds/maai3/community/text1/ilesboley>.

[pdf](#)

- Illinois, Committee of Fifty. (1913). *How the uncared-for epileptic fares in Illinois; colony care the remedy; a plea for immediate legislative action; how you can help.*<https://archive.org/stream/39002010563436.med.yale.edu#page/n1/mode/2up>
- Jefferson, T. (1782-84). *Notes on the state of Virginia: written in the year 1781, somewhat corrected and enlarged in the winter of 1782, for the use of a foreigner of distinction, in answer to certain queries proposed by him....* Paris.
- Jefferson, Thomas. (1802) Letter to Rufus King, July 13, 1802. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, Barbara B. Oberg (ed.) Princeton University Press, 2011, Vol. 38: 54.
- Jefferson, Thomas. Letter to William H. Harrison, February 27, 1803. *Documents of United States Indian Policy*. Francis Paul Prucha (ed.), University of Nebraska Press, 2000. 22-23
- Jefferson, Thomas.(1801) Letter to James Monroe, November 24, 1801. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson: Correspondence*. (H.A. Washington, ed.), New York: Taylor and Maury, 1856, Vol. IV: 419 - 422
- Johnson, Alexander. (1903). 'The Segregation of Defectives', Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, Report of Committee on Colonies for Segregation of Defectives.
<http://www.disabilitymuseum.org/dhm/lib/detail.html?id=3251&&print=1&&page=all>
- Kearns Goodwin, Doris. (2005). *Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Kelly, Patrick (1991). *Locke on Money*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- King, D. (1999). *In the Name of Liberalism: Illiberal Social Policy in the United State and Britain*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- King, D., & Hansen, R. (1999). Experts at Work: State Autonomy, Social Learning and Eugenic Sterilization in 1930s Britain. *British Journal of Political Science*, 29 (1), pp: 77-107.
- Kissiov, D. Dewall, T and Hermann, B. (2013). 'The Ohio Hospital for Epileptics – the first “epilepsy colony” in America. *Epilepsia* 54:9, pp: 1524-1534.
- Kliwer C. and Fitzgerald L.M. (2001). 'Disability, Schooling and the Artifacts of Colonialism', *Teachers College Record*, 103, 3: 450-470.
- Kohn, Margaret. 2012. 'Colonialism', Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/colonialism/>. (May, 2012)
- Lane, Hon. James H. (1864). Speech to the US Senate on a bill 'To set apart a portion of the state of Texas for the Use of Persons of African Descent', Senate of the United States, February 16, 1864, on the Special Order, Being Senate Bill No. 45. <http://cdm.sos.mo.gov/cdm/ref/collection/mack/id/9835>

- Lewis, O.F. (1912). The Tramp Problem. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (40). pp: 217-226.
- Lincoln, A. (1953). *The collected works of Abraham Lincoln*. R. P. Basler, M.D. Pratt, L. A. Dunlap (eds). New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Lincoln, Abraham (1862) *Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation*, September 22, 1862.
http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/american_originals_iv/sections/transcript_preliminary_emancipation.html
- Locke, J. (1975). *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Locke, John. 1988. *Two Treatises on Government*. Peter Laslett ed., Cambridge University Press.
- Lockett, J.D. (1991). Abraham Lincoln and Colonization: An Episode That Ends in Tragedy at L'Ile à Vache, Haiti, 1863-1864. *Journal of Black Studies*, 21(4). pp: 428-444
- Magdol, Edward. (1977). *A Right to the Land: Essays on the Freedman's Community*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Magness, P. & Page, S. (2011). *Colonization After Emancipation: Lincoln and the Movement for Black Resettlement*, University of Missouri Press.
- Magness, P. W. & Page, S. N. (2013). 'Lincoln, Colonization, and Evidentiary Standards: A response to Allen C. Guelzo's criticisms of *Colonization after Emancipation: Lincoln and the Movement for Black Resettlement*.' *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*.
- Mastin, J. 1916. The New Colony Plan for the Feeble-Minded. *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics*, 21: 25-35.
- McCutcheon, A.M. 'Institutional Treatment of Mental Defectives, with Special Reference to Occupation', *Journal of Mental Science* (1925), pp. 694-703.
- Mead, E. (1918). *Summary of soldier settlements in English-speaking countries*. Washington: U.S. Reclamation Service.
- Mead, E. (1919). Placing Soldiers on Farm Colonies. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 81; 62. DOI: 10.1177/000271621908100111
- Mehler, B. (1987, Nov-Dec). Eliminating the Inferior: American and Nazi Sterilization Programs. *Science for the People*. pp: 14-18. Retrieved February, 2005 from <http://about.ferris.edu/ISAR/archives/mehler/eliminating.htm>
- Mehlinger, Louis. (June 1916). 'The Attitude of the Free Negro Toward African Colonization', *Journal of Negro History*, Vol 1:3, pp: 276-301
- Meier, August. (1954). 'Booker T. Washington and the Town of Mound Bayou' *Phylon*, Vol. 15:4, pp: 396-401.
- Memmi, Albert. (1991). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Beacon Press.

- Muirhead, W. (1913). The Care of the Defective in America. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 59(244), pp: 53-66.
- Nash, Gary. (1988). *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Negri, Michael and Antonio Hardt. 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Noll, Steven. (1990). Care and Control of the Feeble-Minded: Florida Farm Colony, 1920-1945. *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, 69 (1), pp: 57-80.
- Noll, Steven. 1995. *Feeble-minded in our midst: institutions for the mentally retarded in the South, 1900-1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Oglethorpe, James Edward. (1733). *A New and Accurate Account of the Provinces of South Carolina and Georgia*. London: Worrall, Lincoln's Inn.
- Osterhammel, Jurgen. (1997). *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, translated by Shelly L. Frisch, Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener.
- Owens, Robert M. (2011). *Mr Jefferson's Hammer: William Henry Harrison and the Origins of American Indian Policy* University of Oklahoma Press.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (2012). OUP, Online Reference <http://www.oed.com/>
- Page, Edward. (1978). 'Michael Hechter's Internal Colonial Thesis: Some Theoretical and Methodological Problems', *European Journal of Political research*, 6, pp: 295-317.
- Page, S. (2011). Lincoln and Chiriqui Colonization Revisited. *American Nineteenth Century History*. (12)3. pp: 289-325.
- Page, S. and Magness, W. (2008). "Benjamin Butler's Colonization Testimony Reevaluated," *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*, 29.
- Page, Sebastian. (2012) Lincoln, Colonization and the Sound of Silence' *New York Times*, December 4, 2012.
http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/04/lincoln-colonization-and-the-sound-of-silence/?_php=true&_type=blogs&_r=0
- Parekh, Bhikhu. (1995) 'Liberalism and Colonialism: A Critique of Locke and Mill', *The Decolonization of the Imagination* Jan Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh (eds.), Zed Books, pp: 81-98.
- Pease, William H., Pease Jane H. (1997). *Black Utopia: Negro Communal Experiments in America*, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Historical Society
- Pittman, Dan. (Winter, 1970). "The Founding of Dyess Colony." *Arkansas Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 29, pp: 313-322.
- Pitzer, Donald E. (ed.). (1997). *America's Communal Utopias*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Polin, Jim Sr. (2009). *Tecumseh: Shooting Star, Crouching Panther*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.

- Radford, J. P. (1991). Sterilization versus segregation: control of the 'feebleminded', 1900-1938. *Social Science & Medicine*, 33(4), pp: 449-458.
- Reid, B. (1965, Summer). Colonies for Disabled. Veterans in Minnesota. *Minnesota History* (39). pp: 241-251.
- Rose, Sarah Frances. (2008). *No Right to be Idle: The Invention of Disability, 1850-1930*, Dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Royal Commission, UK. (1908). *The Problem of the Feeble Minded: An Abstract of the Report of the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-Minded*. London: PS King and Son.
- Rush, B. (1812). *Medical inquiries and observations, upon the diseases of the mind*. Philadelphia: Kimber & Richardson.
- Rushton, Peter. (1996). "Idiocy, the Family, and the Community in Early Modern North-East England," in *From Idiocy to Mental Deficiency: Historical Perspectives on People with Learning Disabilities*, eds. David Wright and Anne Digby, London, UK: Routledge, pp: 44-64.
- Rutter HC. (1898). Report of committee on "Insane and Epileptics." Ohio Conference of Charities. pp: 109-113.
- Ryan, Patrick J. (1997) 'Unnatural Selection: Intelligence Testing, Eugenics and American Political Cultures'. *Journal of Social History*. 30:3, Spring 1997: 669-685.
- Said, Edward. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sander, J. W., Barclay, J., & Shorvon, S. D. (1993). The neurological founding fathers of the National Society for Epilepsy and of the Chalfont Centre for Epilepsy.. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 56(6), pp: 599-604.
- Seguin, E. (1866). *Idiocy and its Treatment by the Physiological Method*.
- Sharpe, Jenny. (2000). 'Is the United States Postcolonial? Transnationalism, Immigration and Race.' *Postcolonial America*, Richard King (ed.), University of Illinois Press, pp: 103-121.
- Sherwood, H. (1917). The Formation of the American Colonization Society. *The Journal of Negro History*, (2) 3, pp: 209-228.
- Sitton, Thad and Conrad James. (2005). *Freedom Colonies: Independent Black Texans in the Time of Jim Crow*. Dallas: University of Texas Press.
- Stansfield, Knowles T. E. (January 1914). 'The Villa or Colony System for the Care and Treatment of Cases of Mental Disease', *Journal of Mental Science*, Vol LX: January 1913; pp: 30-
- Stirling, Jeanette. (2010). *Representing Epilepsy: Myth and Matter*. Liverpool University Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2011a, Winter. Colony. *Political Concepts: A Critical Lexicon*. New School for Social Research. Issue 1.

- <http://www.politicalconcepts.org/issue1/colony/>(September 2012)
- Streifford, D. (1979). The American Colonization Society: An Application of Republican Ideology to Early Antebellum Reform. *Journal of Southern History*, Vol 45:2. pp: 201-220.
- Stuckey, Melissa. *All Men Up: Race, Rights and Power in the All-Black Town of Boley, Oklahoma, 1903-1939*. A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 2009
- Thomson, M. 1998. *The problem of mental deficiency: eugenics, democracy, and social policy in Britain c.1870-1959*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tomlins, Christopher. (2001). 'Reconsidering Indentured Servitude: European Migration and the Early American Labor Force, 1600-1775'. *Labor History*. 42:1, pp: 5-43.
- Toth, Stephen. (2006). *Beyond Papillon the French overseas penal colonies, 1854-1952*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Trent, James W. (1994). *Inventing the Feeble-Minded: A History of Mental Retardation in the United States*, University of California Press.
- Tuck Eve and Yang K. Wayne, 2012 'Decolonization is not a Metaphor'. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society*. 1:1, 1-40.
- Tully, James. (2000) 'The Struggles of Indigenous Peoples for and of Freedom', *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Ivison, Patton and Sanders (eds). Cambridge University Press: 36-59.
- United States Census Bureau, Department of Commerce. (1926). *Feeble Minded and Epileptics in Institutions*. US Government Printing Office.
- United States Senate. (1880). *Report and Testimony of the Select Committee of the United States Senate to Investigate the Cause of the Removal of the Negroes from the Southern States to the Northern States*, 46th Cong., 2nd sess.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. (2010). *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Verney, Kevern. (2013) *The Art of the Possible: Booker T. Washington and Black Leadership in the United States, 1881-1925*. Routledge.
- Vinson, Ben. (2004). *Flight: The Story of Virgil Richardson, A Tuskegee Airman in Mexico*. New York:Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vorenberg, M. (2007). 'Slavery Reparations in Theory and Practice'. in Dirck, B. R. (ed) *Lincoln Emancipated: The President and the Politics of Race*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Vorenberg, M. (1993). 'Abraham Lincoln and the Politics of Black Colonization'. *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*. 14:2, pp: 22-45.
- Waggaman, M. T. (1920). Labor Colonies for the Feeble-Minded. *Monthly Labor Review*, 11 (8), pp: 12-19.

- Washington, Booker T. (1912). 'The Rural Negro Community', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Society*. 40: 81-89.
- Washington, Booker T. (January 4, 1908). 'Boley: A Negro Town in the West'. *The Outlook*, pp: 28-31.
- Washington, Booker T. (July 1907). 'A Town Owned by Negroes: Mound Bayou, Miss., An Example of Thrift and Self Government'. *The Booker T. Washington Papers*, Volume 9: 9125 – 9134.
- Williams, Nudie E. (Winter, 1985) "Black Newspapers and the Exodusters of 1879." *Kansas History* 8: 217 -225.
- Young, Robert. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Malden MA: Blackwell
- Zenderland, Leila. *Measuring Minds: Henry Herbert Goddard and the Origins of American Intelligence Testing*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Newspaper Articles

- Address of Hon Eli Thayer at Cooper Institute. (1863, February). *New York Times* 9.
- A Unique Negro Colony. *Harper's Weekly*. Chicago Illinois, October 1, 1896, p. 7.
- Arnold, Thomas. (1910, June 12) Ex-Slaves Dream of a Model Negro Colony Comes True: Mound Bayou, Mississippi, in the Heart of the Fertile "Delta" Is a Community of 8,000 Where No White Man Can Own a Square Foot of Property'. *New York Times Sunday Magazine*: SM5.
- Colonization of Blacks in Florida. (1862, October 3). *New York Times*
- Farm for Epileptics. (1936, April 23). *The Stouffville Sun-Tribune*.
- Farm Work for Lunatics: Dr. G.A. Blumer Describes the Colony of the Utica State Hospital. (1899, May 26). *New York Times*.
- Final Destiny of the Colored Race. (1879, August 1) *Colored Visitor*, Logansport Indiana
- Give Work to All. (1897, February 6). *Milwaukee Sentinel*, Milwaukee, WI. p. 4, col. D.
- Happy on Farms. (1916, March 3) *The Day Book*, Chicago. 1.
- 'Mound Bayou Settlement: Sketch of a Remarkable Negro Colony by its Founder', *The Commercial Appeal*, Memphis Tennessee, Sunday November 24, 1895, p. 19, Issue 328.
- 'Rush for Indian Lands' *Milwaukee Sentinel*, Wisconsin, September 20, 1891, 49:1.
- Stillwell spoke. (1899, May 30). *Arkansas Democrat*, Little Rock, AR. p. 6.
- The Home Seekers, *Los Angeles Times*, California, April 21, 1889.

The Rise and Fall of a Black Utopian. (2008, October 27). Los Angeles Times
<http://articles.latimes.com/2008/oct/27/local/me-oncal27> Friday June 9,
1899, Issue 12,012, p. 4.

The Scheme of planting a Negro Colony, *Morning Oregonian*, Portland Oregon.

To Start A Farm Colony. (1897, February 22). *New York Times*.

The Cession of Land. (1883, October 18). *Southwestern Christian Advocate*.
