Domestic Colonies and Colonialism vs Imperialism in Western Political Thought and Practice

Over the last thirty years, there has been a rapidly expanding literature on colonialism and imperialism in the canon of modern western political thought including research done by James Tully, Glen Coulthard, David Armitage, Karuna Mantena, Duncan Bell, Jennifer Pitts, Inder Marwah, Uday Mehta and myself. In various ways, it has been argued the defense of colonization and/or imperialism is embedded within and instrumental to key modern western, particularly liberal, political theories. In this paper, I provide a new way to approach this question based on a largely overlooked historical reality - ‘domestic’ colonies. Using a domestic lens to re-examine colonialism, I demonstrate it is not only possible but necessary to distinguish colonialism from imperialism. While it is popular to see them as indistinguishable in most post-colonial scholarship, I will argue the existence of domestic colonies and their justifications require us to rethink not only the scope and meaning of colonies and colonialism but how they differ from empires and imperialism.

Domestic colonies (proposed and/or created from the middle of the 19th century to the start of the 20th century) were rural entities inside the borders of one’s own state (as opposed to overseas) within which certain kinds of fellow citizens (as opposed to foreigners) were segregated and engaged in agrarian labour to ‘improve’ them and the ‘uncultivated’ land upon which they laboured. Three kinds of domestic colonies were proposed based upon the population within them: labour or home colonies for the ‘idle poor’ (vagrants, unemployed, beggars), farm
colonies for the ‘irrational’ (mentally ill, disabled, epileptic) and utopian colonies for political, religious and/or racial minorities.

Domestic colonies were justified, I argue, by the modern ideology of colonialism rooted in the three key principles: segregation, agrarian labour and improvement of both people and land. The goal was to transform those deemed to be ‘idle’ and ‘irrational/custom bound’ (whether at home or overseas) into ‘industrious and rational’ citizens while also creating revenues via labour on ‘waste’ or ‘uncultivated’ soil for the colonizing power. First articulated in an embryonic form in modern political theory in John Locke’s 17th century theory of property, the ideology of colonialism was rooted in land and developing a specific kind of argument to justify the dispossession of indigenous peoples. Locke’s colonialism claims settlers have the right to usurp land in America because they engaged in agrarian labour on ‘empty’ or ‘waste’ soil consistent with God’s will. (Arneil, 1996)

Colonialism as an ideology is thus distinct from, although can overlap with, imperialism going back to their etymological origins. While colonies and colonialism originate in the Latin word colonia linked to both colonus (farmer) and colere (cultivation) means agrarian settlement, imperialism and empire originate in the verb imperare which means to dominate or rule from above. In Locke’s thought, therefore, he draws an important distinction between his own colonial claims and the more common imperial arguments of thinkers and other European countries who claimed land based on conquest. David Armitage is correct therefore, when he claims Locke

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
is colonialist but not an imperialist. Indeed Locke explicitly rejects conquest as providing any basis for claiming land in America (describing his own argument here as a ‘strange doctrine’ given how different it was from the accepted views of his day). Locke believed his defense rooted in agrarian labour was more ethical because it involved labour rather than war and the lives of both settlers and the ‘idle’ and ‘custom bound’ Indian would be ‘improved’ through colonization. In the case of indigenous peoples, to ‘improve’ and become industrious it was necessary to separate them from their ‘ways, modes and notions’ which had prevented them from becoming industrious and ‘educate’ them so they would be able to enjoy, through their labour, the same ‘conveniences’ as ‘more improved’ Englishmen. It is critical for colonial ideology that indigenous peoples are not inferior as the imperialist would argue but ‘backward’ in relation to the settler and Locke’s universal notion of progress.

A second critically important argument advanced by Locke through his colonialism on behalf of colonization in America was the economic benefits of cultivation of ‘empty’ land (critically important to a skeptical audience in England who believed the American colonies simply drained England of its wealth). Locke repeatedly speaks to the increased value of land and revenues created for English

---

2 This is not to say that Locke’s opposition to conquest in theory led to a less oppressive form of power on the ground as experienced by indigenous peoples. Indeed, Locke’s form of colonialism led eventually to policies of both ‘removal’ since the land was not being used properly, according to Locke’s formulation, and assimilation, since the thrust behind his form of colonialism is ‘improvement’ from within. The point is simply that Locke’s colonialism like the later domestic forms of colonialism opposed domination and conquest in the name of labour and education, leading to a particular kind of power being exercised more insidious in nature, because colonialists did not seek to dominate from without as imperialists might do, but to change from within (‘improve’). This kind of power in the ideology of colonialism leads to residential schools and the removal of those deemed to be ‘idle’ from their own land.
proprietors including Locke’s patron, the Earl of Shaftesbury. Understood as engaging in agrarian labour on uncultivated soil, Locke thus believed he provided through these colonial arguments rooted in agrarian labour both ethical and economic justifications for colonization. These arguments are important to 19th and 20th century domestic colonialists as they turn his economic and the ethical justifications inward to defend domestic colonies for the idle and irrational of Europe as they too are to be transformed by segregation from their home environments and engagement in agrarian labour into industrious/ productive and rational citizens and ‘uncultivated soil’ within Europe is improved and revenues from the sale of agricultural produce are created.

To show this turn inward to colonies justified by the ideology of domestic colonialism, I examine four case studies of domestic colonies and the variation in the arguments advanced for them by their key proponents: colonies agricoles for juvenile delinquents in France defended by Alexis de Tocqueville’s; home labour colonies in Britain for the idle poor proposed by the founder of the Salvation Army William Booth; farm colonies for the mentally disabled in North America proposed by Walter Fernald and Charles Bernstein and utopian colonies for Doukhobors in Canada proposed and negotiated by anarchist Peter Kropotkin. In all four cases, colonialist arguments rooted in agrarian labour, segregation and improvement combined with a variety of ideologies (anarchism, liberalism, socialism, eugenicist or anti-eugenicist arguments) to create specific kinds of colonies for particular populations in various countries.

1. Colonies Agricoles in France
A ‘colony’ meant two things in France at the beginning of the 19th century: 1) French imperial settler settlements in Africa, America and Asia and 2) penal colonies that housed French prisoners overseas. Over the course of the 19th century the third domestic kind of colony, colonie agricole, located within France and targeting French youth in the countryside was born. Justified by an ideology of domestic colonialism interwoven with both paternalism, and a republican, Romantic belief in the morally redemptive qualities of the countryside, colonies agricoles differed from external colonies (either settlement and/or penal colonies) not only by their location (within the borders of France) but their purpose (embracing humanitarian or rehabilitative rather than coercive or punitive ideas).

1 a) Tocqueville and Beaumont: Republican, Paternalist Domestic Colonialism

Amongst the very first defenders of the colonie agricole in France were Alexis de Tocqueville and Gustave Beaumont in their 1833 report on the American penal system that had been commissioned by the French state. (Toth, 2006) In it they recommended eliminating the ‘barbaric’ penal colony model and implementing agrarian labour colonies instead for juvenile delinquents and the idle poor, particularly those who were young. Thus the fourth appendix of the report was entitled ‘Agricultural Colonies’ where they argued General van den Bosch’s model first used by him in Java and then imported back to Holland for the idle poor there was the one for France: ‘General van den Bosch, while in the Island of Java had learned ... how to make use of land ...When the General returned to Europe, he laid before the King of the Netherlands a plan of pauper colonies on uncultivated land. Thus the first agricultural colonies sprang into existence’. (Beaumont and
Tocqueville, 1833: 167) Tocqueville and Beaumont concluded the French
‘government should create agricultural colonies, similar to those... in Holland... If
such colonies were established in France, no idler could complain of not finding
labour; the beggars, vagrants, paupers and all the released convicts whose number
continues to increase...could find a place where they would contribute to the wealth
of this country by their labor’. (1833: 104)

Tocqueville embraced colonization because of his beliefs in Christian ideas of
charity and modern ideas of economic efficiency. On the second point of economic
value, Tocqueville argued vast tracts of empty land in Europe were available and
could generate considerable revenues: ‘By the side of these useless fields, a
population... is often placed who are in want of soil and of the means of existence. In
France nearly 2 million of poor are numbered and the uncultivated lands form the
seventh part of the area of the kingdom.’ This domestic colonization should happen
he concluded throughout Europe: ‘In all countries of Europe, without exception of
those where agriculture has perfected to the highest degree, vast territories are
found, the arid and unpromising soil of which has not attracted the industry of man,
and which remain the property of all, because no individual would take the trouble
to cultivate them’. (167)³

Tocqueville’s domestic colonialism (which emphasized ‘improvement’ and

³ Farm labour colonies were defended by other ‘liberal’ reformers in France in the 1830’s including L.
F. Huere de Pommeuse’s in Des colonies agricoles et de leurs avantages (1832), Pierre Bigot de
Morogue in Du pauperisme (1834), Villeneuve Bargemont in Economie politique Chrétien (1834) and
Joseph-Marie de Gerando in De la bienfaisance publique (1839). De Pommeuse was particularly
important and also used van den Bosch’s system as his model, arguing once again that agricultural
colonies would not only solve the problems that accompanied youth in the city but would increase
wealth in the vacant land of France, noting: ‘one-seventh of territory in France was not under
cultivation’. (Crossley, 1991: 40)
benevolence) stood in stark contrast to his external theory of imperial colonization that emphasized French power and national glory. Margaret Kohn and Jennifer Pitts have both argued that Tocqueville’s defense of France’s colonization of Algeria was not concerned with serving ‘the interests of the native peoples...nor did his defense of colonialism rely on a concept of a civilizing mission’, rather it ‘reflected and reinforced the glory of France’. (Kohn 2008: 256, Pitts, 2005) As a result Tocqueville argued for martial law in the case of native Algerians as appropriate to their governance while rejecting penal colonies as barbaric for the idle poor or juvenile delinquents of France.

Recognizing Tocqueville’s deep and abiding interest in and support for domestic colonies creates a quite different lens with which to examine the continuing debates in Tocquevillean scholarship on the role that colonialism versus imperialism plays in his political theory. In particular, while most of this scholarship sees colonialism and imperialism in Tocqueville’s theory as largely interchangeable when viewed through external colonies such as Algeria, colonie agricoles require us to recognize that domestic colonialism rooted in labour and improvement differs from imperial arguments rooted in national glory and power.

French domestic colonialism was combined Rousseauian republicanism. Thus, as Toth (2006) and Crossley (1991) argue, the defense of the colonie agricole had a distinctively Romantic or Rousseauian dimension to it, with a deep belief in the redemptive powers of the ‘countryside’: “[What mattered to] the proponents of the agricultural colonies...was the power of the rural environment to mold behaviour. Closeness to nature offered the promise of an authenticity that had been
lost within urban society. The countryside seemed to possess a restorative, a regenerative power; away from the corruption of the urban environment.’ (Crossley, 52) As such, the countryside was seen as an exalted physical and conceptual space lying between the corruption of the city/civilization and the untamed wild/state of nature. ‘Early discussions about the colonies were marked by a condemnation of urban, industrial society and a countervailing valorization of the countryside as a site for the restoration of authority, order and social discipline.’ (Edington, 2011:268) Thus, for French thinkers, the idle citizen living in the corrupt city could be transformed via the rural countryside into an industrious citizen – the key was agrarian labour: This was not the countryside as escapism: agricultural work — with religion in support — was understood as a process of socialization.’ (Crossley, 52) Thus laboring in a rural field in France was seen as key to not only turning the idle into the industrious, but turning idle youths into free citizens within a republic.

French domestic colonialism also focused specifically on youth, as juvenile delinquents were the main group targeted as well as foundlings/orphans and poor urban youth. Again and again, defenders of French colonies argued the young were the group most likely to change their habits of idleness if they were removed early from the corrupting influences of the city and their family. French domestic colonialism anchored in the principles of segregation, agrarian labour and improvement was thus interwoven with a Rousseauian romantic focus on the countryside, a republican focus on citizenship and a paternalistic focus on youth.

1b) Mettray: France’s First Colonie Agricole

The first domestic agricultural colony for juvenile delinquents was established
in France at Mettray in 1840 by Frederic-Auguste Demetz and Viscount Courteilles bringing together these various threads of thought: ‘Our aim’ declared its founders ‘was to rescue young offenders from the influence of a prison life, and to replace the walls with which they had been surrounded by liberty and labour in the open air’. (cited in Jones and Porter, 1994: 125) Mettray was established under the auspices of ‘La Societe Paternelle pour l’education morale et professionnelle des jeunes’ (Paternal society for the moral and professional education of young people) which included both Tocqueville and Beaumont as members.

The motto of Mettray, coined by DeMetz, was: ‘ameliorer l’homme par la terre et la terre par l’homme, sous le regard de Dieu’ (improvement of man by the earth and earth by man, under God.) There is perhaps no better summation of the ideology of modern domestic colonialism than this one sentence since it succinctly expresses both the ethical dimensions of colonization (improving man) and economic benefits of colonization (improving the earth and hence creating value), both anchored in agrarian labour. The colonies, as Ann Stoler notes, were “‘seedbeds’ to raise honest citizens and hardworking laborers with limited aspirations, by removing them from the unhealthy immoral cityscapes of indigent adults and by investing their time in soil and soul.” (Stoler, 2011b: 25) The colonie agricole became the dominant way of addressing juvenile delinquency in France in the second half of the 20th century. Historian Stephen Toth argues: ‘the Mettray agricultural colony spawned the establishment of 50 other agricultural colonies [in France] during the 1840s and eventually led to the passage of legislation in 1850 that made the private agricultural colony the most common form of incarceration for
juvenile criminals... By 1853, half of the minors under correctional care lived in agricultural colonies.’ (2006: 5) Mettray also became the model for countries outside of France as DeMetz built a ‘Hotel Colonie’, outside the gates of Mettray to accommodate visitors who wished to visit and study it. Delegates came from Britain, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and the US. (Chassat, Forlivesi and Pottier, 2005) But even with all of its fame during the 19th century, Mettray became even more famous in contemporary social and political thought due to the central role it plays in Michel Foucault’s Discipline and Punishment, where he famously argues in his final chapter that Mettray opened represents the very essence of the carceral system: ‘Were I to fix the date of completion of the carceral system...I would choose ... 22 January 1840, the date of the official opening of Mettray.’ (Foucault, 1995: 293)

Thus while Tocqueville deploys an imperialist defense of French colonization in Algeria rooted in the principles of national glory and domination, he deploys a colonialist defense of Mettray in France, rooted in the principles of improvement of land (economic benefits) and young people (ethical benefits) through agrarian labour. Which brings me to a key point – that while Pitts, and others are correct to describe Tocqueville’s defense of Algeria as ‘empire’s law’ (Kohn, 2008:255) that is a manifestation of imperialism, his colonialism, at least in its domestic manifestation is rooted not in domination but agrarian labour.

2. British home labour colonies

In the early 19th century, debate over colonization in Britain was organized around three competing paradigms pauper emigration, systematic colonization and home colonies. The first understanding of colonization, pauper emigration, was
championed by Sir Robert Wilmot-Horton, the Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies (1821-8) who, according to Robin Ghosh was ‘the leading advocate of colonization’ during this period. (1964:385) Wilmot-Horton viewed the purpose of *external colonization* as ridding Britain of its paupers and criminals overseas.

Transportation became Great Britain's foremost criminal punishment...After Parliament passed the Transportation Act in 1718...courts made punishment the leading penalty for property offenses, the most common variety of crime...At the Old Bailey...more than two thirds of all felons from 1718 to 1775 were ordered for exile. (Ekrich, 1985:184)

In explicit and direct opposition to Wilmot Horton, Edward Wakefield championed a second colonial paradigm - *systematic colonization* - arguing British colonies should not be used to solve the problem of urban poverty and crime, but in the service of an imperial policy designed to extract the greatest economic and political profits. Wakefield’s argument won over Wilmot-Horton and his imperially oriented form of colonialism became synonymous with British foreign imperial policy at the end of the 19th century. It was Wakefield’s understanding of colonization which Karl Marx, amongst others, used to inform his own theories of colonial and imperial power (which in Wakefield and Marx's analyses were inextricably linked).

Overlooked in this mid 19th century debate is the historical reality of a third paradigm of *domestic colonization* whose proponents argued colonies should be located *at home* rather than overseas. Thus, British philanthropists, religious organizations and individuals such as Rowland Hill, William Atkinson, and John
Burn proposed ‘home colonies’ in the 1830’s and 40’s to solve urban poverty⁴ - the most famous home colonist however was utopian socialist Robert Owen. In 1840, Owen, helped to form the British Home Colonization Society to raise funds and publish materials to convince others of the benefits of domestic colonization. In 1841, a year after Mettray Colony was established, Owen published, through this society, a blueprint for home colonies in his essay entitled, *A Development of the Principles and Plans on which to Establish Self-Supporting Home colonies*.

**William Booth, the Salvation Army and Protestant domestic colonialism**

The most famous and influential British domestic colonialist at the end of the 19th century was William Booth, founder of the Salvation Army, who published a book, *In Darkest England: The Way Out* in 1890 that laid out his ambitious domestic colonial plan for the globe. While today the Salvation Army is known for its urban based centers that provide food and shelter to the very poor and homeless, in Booth’s original plan, these ‘city colonies’ as he called them were meant to be mere conduits to the central feature of his plan: the farm colony. Booth begins his book

---

⁴Atkinson’s 1832 essay entitled, *A Plan of Home Colonization for gradually liquidating the National Debt, reducing Pauperism, and giving to the Destitute the means of obtaining comfortable provision by their honest labour* defended it as a means of reducing the cost of the poor to public authorities while making the idle into honest labourers. Like other colonialists, Atkinson views uncultivated land as key chiding Wilmot-Horton and ‘advocates of Foreign Colonization and their partisans’ for suggesting Britain must go abroad to find ‘empty’ land when there is plenty of uncultivated ‘waste’ in England to absorb the idle poor. ‘Though the population should increase 400,000 annually, many years must elapse before the land is too strait to employ and sustain its population’. (Atkinson, 1832: 7) Rowland Hill, who invented the postage stamp, also published a paper on ‘Home Colonies: Sketch of Plan for the Gradual Extinction of Pauperism’. In it he argued, like Tocqueville in France (and around the same time) that ‘It is proposed to established in this country, Colonies similar to those in Holland and Belgium….These people were placed on waste soils, which they have brought into a state of considerable fertility….They supply nearly all of their own wants and have a considerable surplus for sale’. (Hill, 1832: 15)
by making a direct parallel between darkest Africa and the ‘submerged tenth’ or idle poor of England or ‘darkest England’, focusing on the role that bad habits play in the darkness encountered by both the ‘negroes in the Equatorial forest’ and the idle poor in the streets of London. ‘Just as in Darkest Africa...so with us, much of the misery of those whose lot we are considering arises from their own habits’. But ‘for Darkest England, as for Darkest Africa, there is a light beyond’. (W. Booth, 1890: part 2, chapter 1, Section 2.)

The light in both cases is colonization, but rather than arguing over the merits of home versus external colonization as was done in the debate in the 1820’s – 40’s, Booth combined the two in a single scheme, creating a tripartite colonial model: a) city colonies to gather the idle poor in urban centers and transport them to, b) ‘farm colonies’, where they would be trained in agricultural skills and improve their moral character: ‘Here [in the farm colony], the process of reformation of character would be carried forward...especially including those forms of labour and that knowledge of agriculture’ and then on to labour on farms in England or else transportation to: c) overseas colonies where they could be settled. (W. Booth, part 2, chapter 1, Section 2.) At the very heart of the scheme and therefore the frontispiece of the first edition of this book is the farm colony.

In essence, Booth, like Tocqueville but unlike Owen, combines a Christian ‘progressive’ view of idleness as a failure in one’s moral character and ‘benevolent’ and ‘liberal’ view which preferred rehabilitation over punishment for the poor with the colonial principles of segregation, agrarian labour and improvement. Booth’s domestic colonialism, however, was embedded within a transnational colonial
network through which the poor of Europe were to be transformed via the domestic
farm colony into an industrious agrarian settler could be resettled either at home or
overseas. As Booth developed and implemented his scheme in the 1890’s, he
believed it could solve poverty worldwide. As such, for Booth, colonization was
primarily a social policy developed to solve domestic problems rather than an
imperial policy (even though it had foreign and settler colonial implications).

Booth’s arguments echo those of Locke in his reliance on liberal notions of
progress and improvement, Protestant Christian ideas of redemption through
labour but also in the emphasis on cultivating ‘empty’ land and the creation of
wealth. Thus, Booth argued there were ‘millions of acres of useful land to be
obtained almost for the asking, capable of supporting our surplus population...were
it a thousand times greater’ (echoing Locke’s references to land in America that
could hold ‘a hundred thousand times as many’ if cultivated). Booth concludes in
addition to securing land for farm colonies in Britain: ‘we propose to secure a tract
of land [overseas] ... prepare it for settlement... settling it gradually with a prepared
people [i.e. trained in agrarian labour] and so create a home for these destitute
multitudes’. (Part 2, chapter 1, Section 2) In assuming there was ‘terra nullius’ land
‘overseas’ to be settled, Booth like Locke embraces settler colonialism.

Booth’s ideas were widely disseminated: ‘Darkest England was a great popular
success, selling roughly 115,000 copies within the first few months...In addition,
Booth received strong support in the British press’ (Haggard, 2001:73) and his ideas
were promoted and implemented by supporters in England, Scotland, America and
Canada. He was challenged by conservatives in Britain who saw his scheme as
socialist. 'Booth lost credibility among conservatives when several of his strongest supporters – T.H. Huxley, Ben Tillet and the editors of Reynold’s Newspaper – argued that his system of colonies ... promoted socialism in Britain.’ (Haggard, 2001:73)

One of his greatest critics was conservative Herbert Spencer, to whom Booth responded in 1894: ‘I am not discouraged by anything Herbert Spencer may have said about such colonies...there is not a liberal in the present [British] government who is not in hearty sympathy with me’. ('In 70 New World Cities’, 1894)

Booth established a 3,200 acre farm labour colony at Hadleigh, Essex in 1891 along with five city colonies and eighteen labour bureaux in London all designed to feed people into the farm colony. (Haggard, 2001:72) In contrast to Owen’s scheme but consistent with both Locke and Wilmot-Horton’s original idea, the Hadleigh colony sought to train farmers who would become private property owners. As Brown says of the Hadleigh colony and two others at Laindon and Hollesley Bay: ‘the aim was largely land reform ... providing work for the unemployed but also ... giving them the necessary training in agriculture to allow them to become small-holders’. (1968: 357) Both the ethics (improve the men themselves) and the economics of colonization (raise revenues in the short run for the care of the poor and or turn the idle into productive citizens in the longer term) were at the forefront of any discussion in the media about Booth’s scheme and central to Booth’s defense of them. Thus, the headline of an article in the Pall Mall Gazette, in 1892 reads, 'Will the General’s Farm Colony “Pay”?’ and the author argues, 'The two points everybody is interested in are – Are the colonists better men...second, is the colony going to pay?’ Or to put it another way – are the ethical and economic benefits worth the
investment in (domestic) colonization?  The answer according to Booth to both questions, as it was with Locke trying to convince English public opinion of the merits of investing in foreign colonization, is a resounding yes, rooted in the principles of agrarian labour and improvement. (1892)

3. Farm Colonies for the Mentally Disabled in Canada

The two leading defenders of domestic farm colonies for the mentally disabled in America were Charles Bernstein in New York and Walter Fernald in Massachusetts. For both men, the colony model required segregation of the mentally ill or disabled in a rural location on ‘uncultivated soil’ to engage in agrarian labour and ‘improve’/transform themselves into productive members of society as far as possible and create agricultural produce to provide revenues for their upkeep. In other words, the three principles of domestic colonialism were again deployed to make the case for the economic and ethical benefits of the colony over the more popular institution at the time; the asylum.

While Fernald was a eugenicist and defended the colony as a place for permanent custodial care and sterilization (at least earlier in his career), Bernstein wrote in strong opposition to permanent custody and sterilization, arguing colonies ought to be temporary locations to teach farming skills to the mentally disabled so they could re-enter society and denounced sterilization in both articles and pamphlets. Fernald, was eventually convinced by Bernstein’s model and adopted the labour and parole system. Both were important to Canadian domestic colonialism because their arguments were explicitly and repeatedly used to justify farm colonies in Canada – the former used by those who believed in eugenics and
sterilization, the latter by those who opposed them. The farm colony model grew in popularity in the first three decades of the 20th century for the mentally ill and disabled and farm colonies were established in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

3 (a) Ontario farm colonies: Helen McMurchy

In 1907, the Legislative Assembly of Ontario created its first commission to produce a census of the feeble minded in Ontario and make recommendations as to their care. The report repeatedly quotes Fernald as it speaks to the ethical (therapeutic) and economic (revenues) benefits of colonization:

When we consider the Institutions for the permanent care of the feeble-minded, the first, and we might also say, the greatest State Institution in America is the Massachusetts School of the Feeble Minded...of which Dr. Walter Fernald is the Superintendent. Dr. Fernald is known all over the world as one of the foremost authorities on the feeble minded, and renown brought to the Institution by the great success of his methods in teaching and training them. It has about 700 inmates and there is a farm colony...a tract of land three miles long by one mile wide affords...their own improvement and training, but often with an economic result. (1907: 62)

The report emphasizes the economic and ethical benefits to Canadian society, ‘every consideration of humanity, of wise statesmanship, of good public policy, combine to sanction and enforce the cause...there is nothing which, done rightly, will help so much to diminish the drain on the pockets of the taxpayers as the wise and prudent care of these unfortunates [in farm colonies].’ (1907: 18) It concludes the 4000
‘idiots, imbeciles and feeble-minded persons’ in Ontario have only one institute (the Orillia Asylum) that should be expanded to introduce a farm colony. ‘Institutional care is the only way to deal with the Feeble-Minded. Farm Colonies with Industrial and Agricultural Training and Employment are the most successful.’ (1907: 63)

Dr. Helen MacMurchy, Inspector of the Feeble Minded in Ontario from 1906-1916, agreed with the report’s findings and visited the Orillia Asylum for Idiots in 1912 to publicly announce the creation of a provincial ‘farm colony for the feeble-minded’. (Orillia Packet newspaper May 15, 1912: 1) In 1920, MacMurchy published a book ‘The Almosts: A Study of the Feebleminded’ in which she defends the farm colony in ethical terms as a form of ‘freedom’ when compared to traditional asylums which constrain patients: ‘Farm colony life for mentally defective persons is intended to give them the maximum of freedom and development’ via agrarian labour but MacMurchy also believed, like Fernald in the permanent care of the disabled. (1920: 129)

Farmland was purchased to create the farm colony in Orillia in 1911 but work on it did not start until after WWI: ‘It was not until 1922 that anything resembling the proposed colony plan was established [at] Orillia. Known as the farm colony… the colony…was 660 acres in extent, with 318 acres under cultivation.’ The economic benefits were viewed as advantageous from the beginning: ‘[a] very important aspect of the economy of Orillia…the farm boys lived segregated from the main population in Cottage ‘F’’, also called Farm Colony House.’ The economic revenue from the farm colony was not insignificant. By 1940, ‘there were 96 head of cattle, with a dairy milk production of 2,500 pounds, 131 swines and 13 sows and
1000 chicks’. (Park, 1995: 67, 70) Thus, once again, the farm colony is justified in terms of both its economic (less cost to the state) and ethical benefits (improves the individuals).

In December, 1916, at hearings held by the Toronto Board of Education on the problem of the feeble-minded, ‘one of the largest deputations that ever appeared before a body in the city council chamber’ recommended farm colonies for Toronto (the group led by Dr. C.J. Clarke, president of the Toronto Branch of the Ontario Association of the Care of the Feeble Minded also included Dr. MacMurchy, Dr. Conboy and eighty representatives of the Toronto branch of the Provincial Association for the Care of the Feeble Minded). The Toronto World newspaper reports: ‘Mental defectiveness in all of its various phases, including...the urgent necessity of arresting its progress by the establishment of farm colonies was the subject of speeches delivered’.\(^5\) Using the principles of both colonialism (‘educate the defectives’) and eugenics (‘segregate the sexes’), the Board of Education ultimately ‘endorsed a farm colony plan of looking after the feeble minded children of Toronto...near the city's industrial farms’\(^6\) but this plan was also put on hold, like Orillia, due to WWI.

3 (b) Farm colonies in Western Canada

Farm colonies were also proposed in the Prairies. The Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene conducted a survey of ‘mental abnormality’ in Manitoba in 1918 and Saskatchewan in 1920, publishing their findings in the Journal


of Mental Hygiene, in 1922. At the conclusion of the eighty-page report, the recommendation was to introduce farm colonies explicitly using Bernstein as the model for a colony where ‘colonization of defectives has been carried on with great success’. (382) Quoting Bernstein at great length, the report defends colonies using ethical arguments for ‘rehabilitation’ rather than permanent custodial care: ‘From now on, we should devote our energies toward enlargement along the lines of colonization, to rehabilitate as far as possible the patients that come to us and to return their services to the state.’ The emphasis was labour on ‘empty’ land - using ‘various parcels of state-owned land and on abandoned or undeveloped farms’. (384)

In British Columbia, farm colonies were established in the 19th century while it was still a British colony and after it became a province of Canada. The intersection of domestic and settler colonialism is discussed by Roman et al. who note, in the case of farm colonies for the mentally ill/disabled in Victoria and Coquitlam, the intersection of different kinds of colonial processes has been generally overlooked in the literature. ‘Processes of medical colonization involve multiple and interrelated forms of colonial and medical rules – both the institutional confinement of the so-called ‘medically unfit’ and their confinement on stolen land...that they have rarely been analyzed [as such] is quite stunning.’ (2009: 19, emphasis added)

In 1878, the Public Hospital for the Insane was opened in New Westminster and in his annual report of 1883, the provincial Medical Officer argues for a farm colony: ‘There are about four acres of ground immediately in front...which ought to be fenced in and brought under cultivation. This would ... have a most beneficial
effect on a large portion of the patients... to have them a portion of the time employed in cultivating vegetables'. In 1905, a farm colony was created at Riverview (a new facility built at the beginning of the 20th century to accommodate the overcrowding at Woodlands). The farm colony grew so rapidly that 'by the second decade of the twentieth century [it was] the largest colony in Canada... designed to accommodate 560 patients...on a tract of 1000 acres suitable for diversified farming purposes.' (Park, 1995: 253) The hospital and its attached farm colony in one form or another remained a key feature of the mental health system in BC until its closure in 1984. A small portion of this land continues to house the BC Forensic Psychiatric Hospital and the remainder of the land, reflecting its domestic colonial history, is now known as Colony Farm Regional Park.

The intersection between settler and domestic colonization which began at this farm colony's inception continues to the present day as the Forensic Psychiatric Hospital located on the unceded traditional territory of the Kwikwetlem people who have 'for more than a century opposed having a mental hospital on...its territorial land'. (Dhillon and Bailey, 2012: S1) Like the Victoria lunatic asylum, this ‘farm colony’ established on indigenous territory was a space of dual containment of disabled and indigenous peoples deliberately located at some distance from the white metropolis of Vancouver. In an article published in The Globe and Mail in December 2012, it is noted that while the Colony Farm engaged patients in agrarian labour for therapeutic reasons and provided food for the Riverview Hospital for the
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7 Annual Report on the Provincial Hospital for the Insane, Department of Health Services and Hospital Insurance, Mental Health Services Branch, January 12, 1883, cited in Roman et al. 2009, p. 33.
Insane until 1983, it was a constant problem for the Kwikwetlem people from its inception until now. ‘For more than 80 years, the Kwikwetlem First Nation people have lived within walking distance of the Forensic Psychiatric Hospital at Colony Farm...Chief Kwikwetlem William – the man for whom the suburban community of Coquitlam is named knew firsthand the perils of living near a hospital for the mentally ill [as he]...was attacked by a pitchfork-wielding patient at Colony Farm during the 1930s.’ (Dhillon and Bailey, 2012: S1)

While Bernstein and his followers in Canada thought they were proposing a progressive alternative to the inhuman practices of constraints in asylums or sterilization, the reality of such ‘colonies’ over time, was widespread abuse. I would argue that the ideology of colonialism particularly the principles of improvement and segregation provide fertile theoretical ground for abuse to occur and be justified by those engaging in it. The principle of ‘improvement’ from within (where the patient must recognize they are ‘defective’ and learn to be more industrious and productive) leads inexorably to the violation of boundaries as superintendents and their staff seek to improve the minds and bodies of those living within the colony. Abuse could be justified as trying to alter how the ‘backward’ think ‘inside’ their heads or behave ‘inside’ their bodies. This is compounded by the principle of segregation which allows superintendents and staff who wish to abuse to do so with impunity due to both the vulnerability of the populations and the lack of oversight from such a complete separation from society. The ideology of colonialism, as I have defined it, thus carries a particular and insidious/potentially abusive form of internalized power.
In its most profoundly negative form, such colonial power is manifested in residential schools as indigenous children were made to change from within by being asked to recognize themselves, through ‘education’, the defectiveness of their own customs and language and to change their ‘backward’ ‘ways modes and notions’ (as Locke famously first articulated it) so they might ‘improve’ and become citizens. This process of change from within begins with segregation from their own people and territory. Both residential schools and farm colonies held in common a tendency toward the physical and sexual abuse of extremely vulnerable populations because, as suggested above, the principle of the ‘improvement’ of bodies and minds gives license for the violation of physical and mental boundaries while segregation and lack of oversight gave impunity to staff to abuse without repercussions. But while colonialism helps explain abuse in both, the residential school involves a distinct form of abuse because it alone was genocidal in nature – seeking to extinguish indigenous peoples as peoples. As horrific as abuse was in farm colonies for the mentally disabled, the focus remained on changing individuals and not directed at eradicating peoples as peoples.

The extent of abuse in both farm colonies and residential schools has been documented in great detail in recent years often as the result of law suits launched by former residents. The ‘Orillia Farm Colony and Asylum for Idiots’ later renamed the Huronia Regional Center was subject to a $1 billion lawsuit by former residents based on the documented abuse they suffered while living and class action suits

were also launched by survivors of Riverview and Woodlands. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Residential Schools, also a result of a lawsuit by survivors, likewise provided evidence of the enormous level of abuse – including not only physical and sexual abuse but cultural genocide.

Thus, farm colonies for the mentally ill and disabled and/or farms were defended by leading medical experts in North America as the best form of treatment for the first half of the 20th century using the principles of segregation, engagement in agrarian labour and improvement to justify the colony model as a way to improve rather than simply constrain or punish the mentally ill and disabled in asylums and transform them into ‘rational and industrious’ citizens through agrarian labour while raising revenues. This domestic colonialism could be combined (by the followers of Fernald) with eugenicist ends to justify permanent segregation and/or sterilization; or (by the followers of Bernstein) as a way to resist sterilization and permanent segregation. In Canada the latter is manifested by McMurchy in Ontario and Saskatchewan and in Alberta and British Columbia, the only two provinces in Canada where sterilization was practiced and often by superintendents of colonies. Regardless of such theoretical variations, the principles of segregation and improvement provide fertile ground in practice for abuse to occur across the board.

4. Doukhobor utopian colonies

The history of the Doukhobor people in Russia is a long and complicated one but by the second half of the 19th century, Nicholas II of Russia having tried to conscript Doukhobors into the military on repeated occasions and failing to do so, forced them into internal exile. As staunch pacifists, the Doukhobors decided they
would be better off leaving Russia and settling elsewhere – the Canadian prairies quickly became the strongest possibility for resettlement. Tolstoy, the Doukhobors’ main defender and benefactor together with Kropotkin enlisted James Mavor, professor of Political Economy at the University of Toronto, who was also a leading proponent of labour colonies in Scotland and Canada to be the liaison between the Doukhobors in Russia and the Canadian state.

The origins of Doukhobor colonies in Canada can be dated back to 1897, when Kropotkin, as a guest of James Mavor was a delegate at the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Toronto. At the end of the conference, Kropotkin travelled by train to the Pacific coast, recording his impressions of the people and country. One central feature of his observations was the agrarian potential of the Prairies. ‘Kropotkin was greatly impressed by the agricultural abundance throughout the Canadian Northwest, and especially by the experimental farms in the area’. (Avrich, 1980: 6) Kropotkin after visiting Mennonite Reserves, saw them as a model for the Doukhobors resisting state sovereignty and militarism. ‘The Mennonites …refuse to take part in any functions of the State and especially in military service. Tolstoi’s name is, consequently, a subject of deep reverence among them. They also never have anything to do with justice or law…they receive no subsidy from the State, and themselves keep their schools.’ (Kropotkin, 1898c: 503) Voluntary segregation was key to the preservation of Mennonites’ way of life: ‘It is extremely interesting to see these communities holding their own, surrounded as they are by a very different civilization….It is a remarkable fact that amidst that capitalist civilization some twenty thousand men should continue to live, and to
thrive, under a system of partial communism and passive resistance to the State’.

For Kropotkin, the Doukhobors were the closest thing in practice to an ideal communist/anarchist agrarian society he envisioned in *Fields, Factories and Workshops* where he emphasizes agriculture as key to human well being – a perspective that contrasts with Marxists who saw history as moving away from an agrarian based economy to an industrial one. Kropotkin wrote in a letter in 1893 to a fellow anarchist in Australia that agrarian labour was key to his vision of an anarchist colony, noting every member of the ‘colony... works hard...[engaged in] reasoned, intensive gardening to grow all sorts of vegetables...guided by the experience of real gardeners’. Thus, agriculture was key to Kropotkin’s ideology of a radical domestic colonialism (combined with anarchism) and was manifested in the Doukhobors’ way of life. (Woodcock, 1968; Yerbury, 1984; Carmichael, 2013)

On August 31, 1898 Kropotkin in coordination with Leo Tolstoy, wrote to Mavor asking him if he could serve as an intermediary with the Canadian government to provide land for Doukhobor colonies in Canada on the following three conditions: ‘1. No obligation of military service 2. Full independence in their inner organization, 3. Land in a block; they cannot live in isolated farms.’ He added: ‘Now, can you obtain that from Canadian government?’ (Kropotkin, 1898a) Mavor contacted Clifford Sifton (Minister of the Interior from 1896 to 1905) to negotiate the terms of the Doukhobors’ settlement in segregated colonies in Saskatchewan in order to preserve this radically different way of life. While the first two conditions were met without trouble at least initially, owning land collectively was much more
difficult to reconcile with the existing 1872 Dominion Lands Act that required land be held by individuals consistent with a Lockean liberal form of settler colonialism embedded in private property.

Ultimately, Sifton devised a plan in which Doukhobors agreed to file for individual quarter section lots but would not live on those lots, as stipulated in the Act. The exact details of how this would work along with the fact that the Dominion Lands Act stipulated applicants had to swear allegiance to the Crown were never fully resolved; a decision which came back to haunt both sides. (Yerbury, 1984) The Canadian state signed agreements with the Doukhobors assuming that they would ultimately give up their collective ways of being and assimilate into Canadian society as individual property owners and citizens. In other words, they acted in bad faith because government officials did not intend to respect the terms of their own agreements with the Doukhobors. In the 1890’s, a number of groups contributed money towards the settlement of the Doukhobors. The most significant source of financing was from Tolstoy who donated $17,000 to the cause, using the royalties of his novel *Resurrection*. (Mayes, 1999: 41) The Canadian state set aside 400 thousand acres and agrarian labour was absolutely central. ‘Sifton was eager to have the Doukhobors populate the West because of their accomplishments as agriculturalists’. (Carmichael: 5)

On January 4, 1899, Sergey Tolstoy, the eldest son of Leo Tolstoy escorted 2300 Doukhobors to Saskatchewan. Many followed from Russia and ultimately over 7000 Doukhobors immigrated to Saskatchewan at the turn of the 20th century. (Tarasoff, 2006: 2) There were two colonies near Yorkton Saskatchewan (the North
Colony and South Colony) and a third one near Prince Albert. Different groups immigrated to each colony with the members of the North Colony the most orthodox and the Prince Albert Colony the least orthodox (even allowing for a mixture of land ownership as well as non Doukobour and Doukobour farmers from the outset).

While Kropotkin and Tolstoy articulated a radical and domestic defense of colonialism for the Doukhobors rooted in segregation, agrarian labour and improvement, because they were located in Canada, they were underpinned by settler colonialism. The colonies in Saskatchewan were founded on land subject to two treaty negotiations (Treaty 4 in 1874 which includes twenty first nations and Treaty 6 in 1876 which includes fifty first nations). The British Crown and Canadian state claimed they had extinguished native title through these treaties and thus had full sovereignty over the land and the people that lived on it but indigenous peoples argued they had negotiated a shared land use agreement based on peaceful coexistence but without, ‘relinquish[ing] their right to nationhood, their inherent Right to determine their own destinies, nor did they allow any foreign government to govern them’.

The extent to which a separate colony is able to withstand the forces of assimilation and the state within a larger capitalist society is a very real question in practice particularly resisting the allure of the Lockean principle of private property. Within a few years of settling in Saskatchewan, the Doukhobor colonies debated
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whether to continue to cultivate and own land collectively or adopt individual title (pressure being applied by the Canadian state for the latter). In a letter published in the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, on February 20, 1895, Kropotkin writes about the pressure to give up collective ownership in anarchist or communist colonies:

There is the difficulty with which all such colonies had to contend. All the communist colonies in America have experienced it …the colonies throw overboard the very principles of Communism and proclaim themselves individualists – small bourgeois…in which case, the communist principle having once been abandoned, the community is doomed to fail under the duality which has crept in…For a Communist colony, the very success thus becomes a cause of ultimate failure.  

In 1900, Leo Tolstoy wrote a letter to the Doukhobors of Canada via their leader Peter Verigin to remind them of the centrality of collective cultivation: ‘The will of God is expressed completely in the commandment to love. To accumulate private property and to retain it separately from others means to act contrary to the will of God and His commandment’. (Tolstoy, 1900) Thus, while initially Tolstoy, Kropotkin and the Doukhobor colonies embraced Locke’s colonial principles of segregation, agrarian labour and improvement but rejected any liberal commitments to private property and the free market, in practice when subject to the larger forces of the state and assimilation, they became divided over the latter and eventually in large part yielded to them.
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5. Intersecting domestic and settler colonialisms

In the last two case studies where colonies were located in the Americas (farm colonies and Doukhobor colonies), domestic colonialism intersects with settler colonialism. Indigenous scholar Jodi Byrd’s ‘cacophony’ and Rita Dhamoon’s ‘noisiness’ provide frames to theorize the contradictory vertical and horizontal power relations of ‘arrivants’ in these domestic colonies within settler colonies. Byrd defines cacophony as follows:

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. (2011:53)

Dhamoon, building off of Byrd’s idea of cacophony to describe noisiness, ‘draws attention to the dynamic movement, the unsettled and settling character of different and differential degrees and forms of domination and penalty’. Byrd and Dhamoon’s analysis underscore how colonization on the ground in the Americas was and is a complicated and contradictory pattern of horizontal and vertical powers underpinned by the settler colonial process of dispossession.

My analysis at the intersection of domestic colonies and settler colonization in North America, adds three important insights to this theoretical framing of the colonial as ‘dynamic’ and contradictory. First, its adds a domestic dimension within
which certain populations in Europe itself and/or as certain arrivants in North America were either forcibly or voluntarily sent and segregated in bounded domestic colonies within settler colonization. Second, within the cacophony or noise of colonialism - whether domestic or settler - were three dominant melody lines, namely the principles of agrarian labour, segregation and improvement. Third, in the case of domestic colonies, the colonial cannot be defined exclusively in terms of ‘penalty and domination’ as Dhamoon suggests. As important as domination is to imperial and penal colonies, I have argued that domestic colonies were generally set up in opposition to institutions rooted in conquest, domination and punishment – prisons, penal colonies, asylums, sterilization and/or capitalist society. For utopian socialist and anarchist colonialists, the colony was the vehicle to resist oppressive forces of capitalism, sovereign state, private property and private property. Ultimately Byrd’s central point is key – it is critical to analyze the empirical reality of colonization (rather than allow it to become a metaphor for domination of various kinds), incorporating all of its concrete contradictory and cross cutting forms of power on the ground underpinned by the primary process of settler colonization.

Conclusions:

Scholars, particularly those engaged in post-colonial scholarship, now routinely argue that colonialism and imperialism are indistinguishable in the history of western political thought and practice. This generally accepted claim is certainly true in the case of external or settler colonization where an expansive process of taking over and dominating foreign lands and peoples has involved both imperial and colonial justifications. In this article, however, I hope to have shown the
existence of domestic colonies in the last half of the 19th century and first quarter of the 20th century requires us to rethink the meaning and scope of colonialism and the importance of separating it analytically from imperialism. Domestic colonialism, rooted in the Lockean principles of segregation, agrarian labour and improvement which will create economic and ethical benefits provides an explanation for the existence of domestic colonies in a way imperialism cannot. Colonialism, moreover, in its domestic form, combined with ideologies including liberalism, Catholicism, paternalism, republicanism, socialism, anarchism, eugenics and anti-eugenics to create specific kinds of colonies for particular populations in both profoundly oppressive and radically emancipatory ways.

Recovering this agrarian based thread of colonialism as I define it rooted in Locke's early modern colonial arguments is key to understanding domestic colonialism. In contradistinction to imperial principles, progressive even radical thinkers defended domestic colonies as places to improve individuals rather than dominate, restrain or contain them. Tocqueville explicitly rejected the penal colony in favour of the colony agricole, William Booth believed the poor houses, prisons and parish relief in Britain could be replaced by farm labour colonies, Charles Bernstein rejected sterilization and permanent segregation in constraints in asylums with farm colonies and a return to society and Peter Kropotkin rejected capitalist, militaristic and individualist principles for a utopian colony that embraced collective ownership, cooperation and pacifism. The range of thinkers who defended colonialism as opposed to imperialism is thus far broader including
anarchists, socialists, republicans and liberals as well as supporters and opponents of eugenics.

Domestic colonialism, as justified by Kropotkin and Owen embraces segregation in order to allow members of the colony to protect and preserve radically different minority political or religious beliefs and way of life. Kropotkin saw the colony as a vehicle to not only preserve difference but resist and challenge society's norms of capitalism, private property, state sovereignty and militarism. Domestic colonialism was not only consistent with anarchism/socialism but provided the means (colonies) to achieve their ends. For Bernstein, colonies likewise provide an alternative to ableist and eugenicist practices of permanent segregation and/or sterilization. In farm colonies under Bernstein's model, a normative meaning of colonialism in direct opposition to domination inherent in these eugenicist practices is created. In all of these cases, colonialism can be viewed, in part, as emancipatory. Even today, writer or artist colonies where people gather in a rural setting in the countryside to engage in collective and creative work, away from an urbanized, materialist, capitalist and highly wired society are viewed in a positive and progressive light.

At the same time, domestic colonialism can also be explicitly oppressive - to the extent it served eugenicist, racist or exclusionary ends (separating out the 'unwanted' from society and locating them in bounded communities at some distance from society) and/or in practice as they became sites for physical, mental and sexual abuse, conflict and violence. Such problems for those living within the colonies were not only a problem of implementation but inherent to domestic
colonialism itself and the particular form of insidious power it embraced. Domestic colonies created as part of the settler colonization in the Americas were oppressive to indigenous peoples as they required dispossession to exist in the first place and the settler colonialism of Locke also underpins the assimilation of indigenous people as they are to be ‘improved’ and transformed into the industrious and rational.

Thus, the most important reason to distinguish colonialism from imperialism is not because of the normative variation within the former over the latter but to understand the specific power that characterizes each ideology. As discussed in the introduction, imperialism from imperare seeks to dominate others from both above and beyond (overseas) but colonialism from colonia, seeks to ‘improve’ people and land through agrarian labour both within borders and in foreign lands. Thus while imperialists, like Tocqueville in Algeria, defend an expansive form of domination over Africans exercised from the outside and above through brute force in defense of a ‘superior’ culture, defenders of colonialism use an inward focused idea of improvement via agrarian labour and ‘education’ to change the habits of ‘idleness’ or ‘irrationality’/ ‘custom bound’ from within. While imperialism viewed the racialized and foreign ‘other’ as permanently inferior to Europeans, colonialism viewed the idle and irrational whether at home or overseas as backward in relation to a universal idea of human progress and development. Which is why imperialism requires its subjects to simply obey imperial power, and colonialism requires the idle and irrational, once separated from their home communities to acknowledge the defects in their ways of being and thinking in order to change and be changed through retraining, education and agrarian labour.
In the case of settler colonialism, the ‘custom bound’ and ‘idle’ ‘Indians’ were subject to policies of assimilation and ‘encouraged’ to engage in agrarian labour in the name of ‘improvement’. In the case of domestic colonialism, the idle and irrational were required to engage in agrarian labour in remote locales. In both cases the idea of improvement from within created fertile ground for staff and superintendents to justify violating the physical and mental boundaries of those who needed to change from within. And segregation, which put these vulnerable populations beyond any oversight by society compounded the problem by allowing those who wanted to engage in abuse to do so with impunity. Thus it is this particular form of internalized power on the one hand and the potentially liberating even radical aspects of certain kinds of colonialism on the other along with the variety of people who became the targets of domestic colonialists, based on class, disability and religious belief as well as race and indigeneity which requires us to rethink the meaning and scope of colonies and colonialism as well as how it differs from empires and imperialism.