Stoler, Ann Laura. "Epilogue – In Carceral Motion: Disposals of Life and Labour." A *Global History of Convicts and Penal Colonies*. Ed. Clare Anderson. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018. 371–380. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 25 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350000704.ch-013>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 25 April 2023, 23:24 UTC.

Copyright © Clare Anderson and Contributors 2018. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Epilogue – In Carceral Motion: Disposals of Life and Labour

Ann Laura Stoler

If transportation touched almost every continent of the globe, as Clare Anderson rightly reminds us, one of the many striking insights that we gain from reading this collection of chapters is that it did more than touch the fundamental institutions associated with European ‘progress,’ ‘development,’ ‘modernization’ and the imperial ventures of capitalist expansion.¹ ‘Transportation’ and the varied forms of forced convict labour it enabled provided a crucial node in a carceral-military-industrial complex of a long durée, and on a global scale (John Heinsen’s chapter indeed notes a specific ‘proto industrial complex’ taking form in Copenhagen’s prison workhouses as early as the turn of the seventeenth century).

This is not to suggest homogeneity either in time or space in how that complex operated; that is, in the weighting of its different elements, the specific forms of investment and destruction on which it counted, uniformity in the populations recruited – or where the profits would ultimately rest. I take my task here not to be one of ferreting out generalizations but rather one of drawing conceptual sustenance from some of the marked similarities that these contributions bring into relief as well as drawing out less articulated threads of patterns that such a collective project suggests. While respecting the carefully delineated specificities of these chapters, there are some strong resonances, deeply etched patterns – as well as more thinly traced ones – worth perhaps pressing further.

Punishment as labour, labour as punishment, and the curative and coercive forms they entwined were neither limited to an old regime of governance nor invented for new ones: the moral and political economy that weds labour and punishment remains the bedrock of our religious, educational, military, familial and judicial systems to this day. We would do well to understand how they have formed, how they have changed, and how they continue to work to affect the possibilities and constraints on so many people’s lives. This collection goes far in making more visible and more legible both the substantive and subjacent forces – and mutations – in those processes of profiting-making, war-making, depoliticization and duress.

Christian G. DeVito and Alex Lichtenstein’s recent volume *Global Convict Labor* begins with a breath-taking bibliographical chapter that makes further rehearsals of

the temporal and spatial stretch and import of convict labour redundant.² But there are still issues raised in that collection and in this one (numbers of the contributors appear in both) that demand further reflection, not least because they so fly in the face of what was for so long a separate and guarded treatment of carceral forms, capitalism, and the practices attributed to the space and time of what constituted the 'modern'.

We might begin by observing that changes in sites of incarceration and the specific types of hard labour performed were rarely determined by the priority of punishment alone, nor by what was imagined to be commensurable with the severity of what was considered a crime. The distribution of carceral institutions and the matrix of movement that gave reason to carceral locations were responsive to and geared toward other equally pressing priorities. Their configurations allowed for an effective – if not agile – mobilization of deployable, disposable labour, and what I would call '*precariously able*' men (a point to which we will return) to perform the work required for expanding the domains for capitalist growth, for enabling the empowered swelling of militarized states, and to serve as both agents and instruments of the imperial dispossession of racially marked peoples throughout the world. Ryan Edwards rightly points to the fact that large penal networks were 'pragmatic undertakings' designed to 'develop the frontiers of burgeoning nations'.³ They were equally strategic and pragmatic undertakings designed to develop the imperial and transnational frontiers of capitalist enterprises and the infrastructures that would sustain them.

The intricately established and frequently revised legal codes that distinguished among types of transportation and the categories of those transported – and the dispersion and separation of them – from petty criminals to renowned political insurgents – belie practices on the ground that ignored those typologies and distinctions when they were in the way. Legal limits on the extraction of convict labour (hours per day of labour, days per month of work, years committed to transportation) could be and were made irrelevant under conditions deemed of political and economic urgency by those with power to ignore such juridical intrusions (remembering too that the law more often condoned and abetted than limited or alleviated the harshness of transportation). Such was clearly the case when there were new colonies to be settled, forests to be quickly felled for settler homesteads, land to be cleared for commercial crops, urban riots to be squashed in metropolises and their elite and subaltern participants expelled, cut off from community and communication – and removed from politics.

Circumvention of the law and legal codes that enabled the recruitment and use of convicts offer alerts: convict labour in its early eighteenth- and nineteenth-century forms was already a valuable commodity in the very early Iberian Portuguese presidios that was to become an increasingly racialized one under the extensive leasing of convict labourers (many of whom were 'freed' former slaves) to build the railways, dig the dams, harvest Florida's 'turpentine forests', and mine the quarries for private industry and 'public works' in the USA in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁴ Vagrancy laws and legalized peonage in that period coupled with 'fenced enclosures' of black workers in lumber camps where debt and gambling were encouraged and no visitors were allowed makes it difficult to distinguish such conditions from the forced labour of prison camps.⁵

The production of the precarious poor

As many of these chapters provocatively suggest, the availability of unfree convict labour was not a minor supplement to the making of imperial formations and capitalism's expansions but a key element in their mutual sustenance and growth. But none of this was possible, I would argue, without a groomed landscape of inequality and the production of a precarious, unprotected poor on whose ready displacement, and dislocation, large infrastructural projects would depend. Not only was the legal apparatus of states often in the service of enabling transportation, with sentencing varying widely for the same crimes. More importantly, what constituted 'crime' itself was parasitic on a prior fear and definition of those who might be included in the 'dangerous' classes, considered 'vagrant', a logic that targeted the disempowered and dispossessed, and/or the politically recalcitrant.

The use of convict labour – as legally and morally sanctioned punishment – was not so much exempt from public scrutiny, as endorsed by it and deemed unworthy of further attention (except as spectacle when chained men were paraded through cities and countryside or as entertainment when colonial crowds congregated on the docks to gape at the chained cargo disgorged from convict ships as they landed in French Guiana).⁶ If the uses to which convicts were put were relegated, as were those convicted, to the peripheral vision of civic attention, neither were marginal to the tactics of a legal and administrative order bent on governing the poor.

We need not resort to a presentist reading of the past to endorse Loïc Wacquant's description of today's incarceration regimes as a strategic apparatus for 'punishing the poor'.⁷ Transportation and convict labour have long been part of a modular complex of projects for doing just that. Both are elements in the structures of violence and dominance. They are neither reducible to the excesses of liberalism gone awry, nor to the excesses of totalitarian regimes, but actively organic and operative in both.

Civil wars on the poor, as Eric Alliez and Maurizio Lazzarato so cogently argue, combine the production of class and racial enemies – assaults on the poor that are neither aberrancies of less civilized 'moments' in liberalism's histories, nor part of empire's embarrassing and regrettable past.⁸ As Didier Fassin underscores, there are 'social conditions of production of penal history' of which the mobilization of convict labour is a longstanding and contemporary part.⁹

If the vocabulary has somewhat changed, the political semiology has not: incarceration continues to feed off selectively racialized populations rendered as society's 'internal enemies' against which the state construes its primary task as defence of society, its good citizens and itself. Michel Foucault and Karl Marx offer not so much contrary theories in an interpretive analytics of how carceral machines work but complementary ones. Together they provide an understanding of what it is to be subsumed by categories and conditions that narrow one's choices if not seal one's fate. Both address the conditions of possibility of different sorts – definitions of criminality, what constitutes adequate punishment, how a 'surplus' population is formed – that render some parts of the population more available and susceptible to policing, conviction and prolonged sentences than others.

This issue is a crucial one: to what extent transportation and convict status were actually *enabled* by a social taxonomy that assumed the inherently dangerous proclivities

of those unemployed, itinerant, designated as 'vagrant' and/or impoverished? Definitions of 'crime' and the biographies of those subject to those definitions tell us something else on which these chapters insist: namely that transportation and years of convict labour could be death sentences but also episodes in lives damaged by coercions, ill-health, and diminished by privations and containment. Convicts were used and abused for sundry purposes, some unvoiced but shared: degradation was fundamental. Labour regimes for convicts subscribed to dire physical and psychological treatment, untenable work quotas and punishment for not meeting them that stretched the limits of what counted as 'inhuman' conditions of work and put those limits to its test.

The 'slow violences' of a life 'primed' for petty crime and vagrancy that could lead to overseas convict labour suggests how deeply carceral conditions and exclusions pervaded the social life of the poor.¹⁰ These institutions are often portrayed as the extreme, excesses of corporal punishment, outside the norm, rather than intensified refractions of what fortified 'normality' and the norm itself. The making of 'disposable' (*'jetable'*) persons, as the French philosopher Bertrand Ogilvie has argued, is part of the *structural violence* of a global economy and world order that demands and depends on that making.¹¹ Convict labour is often thought of as comprising those who were 'superfluous' and a danger to the smooth order of civil society. One need not be an avid reader or devotee of Karl Marx to appreciate the extent to which a 'situation of exclusion leads by its very nature to violence', as Etienne Balibar among others has argued.¹² The point is that the production of superfluity is an historical act: people are not superfluous ontologically, they were and are made so, rendered inadequately schooled or skilled for civil life, some already the equivalent of sub-citizens before transportation ensured their removal from the polis all together.

While we might think of convict labour as occupying the outer margins and excesses of how capitalist economies based on wage labour run, more evidence suggests that transportation and convict labour are well within its conventional parameters and prevalent logics. Penalty adheres to a moral economy of suffering and retributive resolution. As Didier Fassin notes, over-exploitation of labour is a normative principle in the political economy of capitalist growth. The carceral machine feeds off the production of the poor and depends on both. Foucault was undoubtedly right that punishment was not intended to stop infractions but rather 'to distinguish them, to distribute them, and use them'.¹³ The phrase is a favoured one among those of us who attend so carefully to his words, but in the case of penal colonies and transportation – two issues he chose not to address – it is quite clear that 'use' was a first order priority, distinctions were elaborated, collapsed, or reformulated to serve specific projects and ends.

Within the normative narrative of punishment, one could easily imagine transportation to be a response to a crime but one could turn the issue around and ask whether punishment was not necessarily a response to a *past* action, but the anticipation of a future, potential one. It is an argument I have made for sometime with respect to imperial regimes of security, where punishment anticipated who might be, who had an inclination to be, who was in the category of those already imagined to be criminals by nature and in the making, and to which the counter-violence of the state was posed as a reasonable and reasoned response.¹⁴ In Foucault's historical schemata, punishment of a crime was superseded in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by punishment

of a criminal, a person imagined to bear features, inclinations, dispositions of what was only nascently visible or in formation – and from which society must be on the *qui vive* and defend itself. It is noteworthy that the term that serves as the title for and frames Foucault's 1976 Collège de France lectures, *Society must be defended*, devoted to the war of races and racism as foundational to biopolitical states, is anchored in the conceptual theme of the 'dangerous individual' who in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries becomes 'the principal target of punitive intervention'.¹⁵

Let us review for a moment the conditions that need to be met, and the sorts of demands that converge in the production and disposability of convict labour: (1) availability of a population rendered superfluous by the partially disabled states that their conditions of impoverished and precarious existence confer; (2) convict labour depends on the availability of a population whose reproduction is neither assured nor required. Those persons can be 'used up', and/or die and be replaced by new sources of supply; (3) they may be made up of the 'fringe' members of society, but they are also *made into a fringe*. As importantly, they are at the core, not the fringe of a global political economy parasitic on underclasses equipped with few possibilities of redress once caught in the carceral net; and (4) shorn of the physical and psychological and not least political wherewithal to make effective demands or extricate from entrapment, it is their severing from the polis which is key, as we shall see.

That convict labour demands may depend on those rendered as fringe members of society but central to the moral and political economy of carceral regimes is a point Timothy Coates' thoughtful examination of convict labour in the rise of global capital and Portugal's strategic role makes in several ways. Coates points us to the term, '*degrado*' used for convict labourers, capturing the prior and subsequent degradations that the label invokes – both the person and punitive conditions to which they deserve to be subjected.

The overriding caveat and contribution in this volume is the warning not to flatten out the multiple tangible and intangible instruments of coercion and violence that convict transportation and penal colonies embraced. Nevertheless it is difficult not to see the 'carceral archipelago of empire' (a term I have long used to extend and mark the breadth of infrastructural and institutional practices that exceed Foucault's more constricted parameters) as representing 'degrees of unfreedom' (a term that Lisa Lowe introduced with respect to empire in North America) mirrored in other labour regimes dependent on isolation, violence and containment.¹⁶ When pushed up against one another as in these chapters, the contrasts between the conditions of duress of disenfranchised, propertyless wage workers, for all intents and purposes removed from the polis as participants, and those subject to convict labour seem to express qualitative gradations of unfreedom rather than a stark contrast of kinds. The constellation of delimitations that make up the spare freedoms of a (bare) life resonate with those Achille Mbembe describes for the 'colony':

a place and a time of half-death-or, if one prefers, half-life. It is a place where life and death are so entangled that it is no longer possible to distinguish them, or to what is on the side of the shadow or its obverse:

'Is that man still alive, or dead?'

What death does one die 'after the colony?'¹⁷

Removal from the polis

One of the most striking features of the status of convict labour is what it does to the personhood subject to it. Degradation we know is an essential element, something clearly described throughout these essays, but about which the reader wants to know more. But I would argue that there is another strategic feature of conviction, confinement and exile that attempts to transform the polis from one that tolerates dissent from one that does not, that removes those who might mobilize their resentments to political ends.

One need not fully embrace Aristotle's claim that humans are political animals by nature to question the status of sociality that remains in the absence of a possibility of making a demand or a claim. Carceral sites are neither extra-legal, nor outside the bounds of the state. However, when its occupants are placed outside political participation in the demos, this condition calls into question how much the reduction to occupying a political no man's land confers a status which can waiver between the sub-citizenship and the sub-human, where the intensity of extraction and exaction is put to the test. The 13th Amendment to the United States Constitution in 1864 – ostensibly designed to forbid slave labour instead did something else, as many historians have documented: it placed 'convict labour' outside the pale of protection from enslavement and ironically outside the moral economy of the law.¹⁸

Transportation puts the political being out of commission. Participation in the polity is often severed (even if we know from the correspondence of many 1870 communards sent to New Caledonia that for them it was not). This does not mean that other forms of sociability, refusal and agency are not possible.¹⁹ But it does mean that the 'right to have rights' – there and then – is not only the excluded middle of transportation but one of its primary *raison d'être*. In defining extreme violence, Etienne Balibar points to two modalities of the destruction of the capacity to act: one which reduces the person to 'the status of things that can be eliminated or instrumentalized at will in a world of commodities'.²⁰ But I would argue that the most significant aim is what Balibar in turn calls 'the destruction of the conditions of possibility of politics'.²¹ In the case of convicts and penal colonies, 'destruction' takes another form; removal from the conditions of possibility of participation all together. Balibar is concerned with the capacity to act on one's own behalf. Transportation does not freeze out the possibility of such assertion but it makes the stakes of retort, of claim, and of non-acquiescence very high: subjection to more intensified violence, increased degradation, torture and/or death.²²

Disposabilities

Hamish Maxwell-Stewart's chapter on convict labour in the seventeenth-century Atlantic is in some ways a cautionary tale against too readily writing history off the legal documents that were to distinguish among labour regulations if not labour regimes. It too adds to the cumulative weight of the volume as a whole which calls into question again whether the global political and moral economy in which convict

labour was enmeshed represents not the extremes of labour exploitation but rather an intensity of unfreedom along a continuum in which convict labour, as Maxwell-Stewart writes, was ‘surprisingly difficult to distinguish’. By his account, some forms of convict labour in the seventeenth-century Atlantic were ‘positively benign’ when compared to ‘metropolitan alternatives for punishing prisoners’.

Still, his evidence of arbitrary sentences that by-passed the courts, convictions issued ‘by a head of state or one of their subordinates’ suggests that conviction and transportation operated within the law as often as outside it. And even within the law, few rules applied. Which leads us to ask why punishment and banishment in the non-legal sense of the term, and the consequences of both, exceeded legal constraint again and again? His observation is important: ‘practice muddled all the boundaries’ precisely because the distinction from other forms of unfree labour was often ‘paper thin’ and could not be specified or clearly defined. And was this not part of a strategic dispositive in the coercive and corrosive regimes that were responsive to the timing and duration of disposability?

At issue is how we understand the historical specificities of ‘disposal’. If we take ‘disposal’ to be both the act of throwing away and the state of being ready for use, we might see these definitions not as contradictions but as the crystallization of a process in which both elements are at play in a carceral regime: a ridding of social and political ‘detritus’ and a making available what is left of the convicted able-bodied for something else. The carceral machine distributes degraded beings, produces and counts on their able-bodied degradation.

The cumulative power that such a volume accrues from its broad temporal and spatial stretch is to remind us too why global history can neither be sought in the abstract nor reduced to detailed descriptive inventories. It is in the patterned but distinctive rhythms and paces, in the conjectural moments of what I have elsewhere called ‘managed mobilities’ and the specific directionalities of them, that the multiple political rationalities to which carceral systems were tethered come into play.²³

While prototypic features of all transportations and all convict labour are not to be made, there are defining features that bear more of what Wittgenstein might have considered a ‘family resemblance’ rather than a fixed list of attributes. What this collection allows us to see with unusual clarity is worth saying again: (1) that convict labour has not been on the outskirts of the nation-state formation, nor a peripheral form of capital accumulation, nor as an extreme form of punishment but exemplary and paradigmatic sites in which these practices were honed; (2) convict labor and transport were fundamental, and constitutive dispositives for ensuring the strategic removal of some from the polis, the abrogation of civil rights, and exile (internal or external) from access to a prior community from which one might get support and to which one might belong.

This was certainly not *always* the case. However, it may be worth pushing this point to understand yet another feature: namely, (3) how much transportation and convict labour were active processes of ruination that produced diminished wherewithal, that depended on psychological and physical duress whose toll would be further disabling, exposure to more violence for not being ‘able’ enough, predation of others, a weakened bare state and death.

But the lessons we might glean from this collection are broader still: if we ever imagined a linear story of modernity that has moved from coerced to free labour, the varied forms in which transport has been called upon to place convicts where they were most needed and when, disrupts that narrative. As we learn from Mary Gibson and Illaria Poerio's chapter as well as those of Hamish Maxwell-Stewart's and Clare Anderson's, slavery and indentured labour followed transportation and convict labour – not the other way around. The commitment to punishment, the rise of capitalism, and the technologies of warfare rested on development of a vast infrastructure that invested heavily in the joint venture of securing sites of confinement and enabling the strategic movement of convicts at the same time. The clearing of forests and jungles, the making of roads and railways, logging, mining and other work tasks depended on able and disposable bodies where they were needed, and for however long.

The conventional notion that capitalist expansion was forged on the backs of waged labour long has been undermined by historians who have argued that slavery and racism were at its emergent core.²⁴ The contributions to this volume suggest another revision that runs against the grain of claims that early liberalisms and later democracies are forged on increasing freedom. Coerced, punitive, convict labour has played a major and sustained role in building the infrastructure of what we take to be the hallmarks of what is modern: e.g., the Dockyards of Bermuda and Gibraltar, and the port city of Singapore. Convicts built major sections of the Trans-Siberian railway that would transport latter generations of convicts to mine gold in the farthest northern arctic regions of the Soviet Union in the 1930s. And turning to a longer *durée* from an earlier moment, a key feature of these contributions, as Timothy Coates notes, is that convicts were not only at the forefront of Portugal's expansion into North Africa in the fifteenth century: convicts provided 'emergency manpower' – for two projects: military service and/or a settler empire.

Penal colonies and work camps were not haphazardly placed in far off islands or in isolated locations from convicts' places of conviction: 'the carceral archipelago of empire' was a strategic mapping of resource extraction, plantation investment and colonial settlement. As the chapters in this volume show, this was the case across a range of locations including Australia, Hokkaido, the Bay of Bengal and the Russian Far East. In the USA, Georgia's Bellwood Quarry was not an exception: the convict camp was 'developed around the extraction of granite'.²⁵

If everyone imagined that modernity heralded the end of torture, degradation and debasement, the convict complex does more than contravene the fiction of that tale. We now know not only that commodified free wage labour was only one form of commodified labour control, a point that De Vito and Lichtenstein make so well. As importantly, we find ever more evidence that vacillating unfreedoms – intensified, redistributed, in motion, frozen, reinforced – are the currents of capitalism and the cross currents of empire stilled, arrested and in motion. They are the fundamental features of modernity, not its exception.

But perhaps the most chilling feature of this profusion of work on the imbricated histories of the carceral machine and capitalist innovation is timing: the fact that there is more historiography on their nexus and more scholars are focusing on that nexus than ever before. Is it our present that befits this urgency, that compels this work, that

accounts for why this is a crucial history of the present and why it obsesses us now? The answer may be too obvious – incarceration is a deeply lucrative profit making machine and an eminently racist one. It is today the site of ‘racecraft’, as Barbara and Karen Fields would call it, the crafting and honing of racial discriminations and the categories of unworthiness into which different ‘social kinds’ are assigned.²⁶

As a history of the present, the histories we are offered dating back to the fifteenth century alter the optics within which global networks are lodged. The contemporary carceral machine is big business: for private investors, contractors, state coffers and public works. This volume makes the strong case, not only that the carceral complex is and has long been the lynch pin of the proto industrial military complex but that it is a treacherous ‘safety’ net in the supply and demand for labour, a dispositive of pacification, and a machine historically and deeply implicated in securing the distributions of inequity which racial formations create and on which they thrive. Not least we should be compelled to reach further into these histories to track the juridical forms that were complicit and remain complicit in meting out who and what is an infraction – and thus where sentencing still can be traced through the lineaments of race.

Notes

- 1 Clare Anderson, ‘Introduction: A Global History of Convicts and Penal Colonies’, in this volume, p. 1.
- 2 Christian G. De Vito and Alex Lichtenstein, *Global Convict Labour* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).
- 3 See Ryan Edwards, ‘Post-Colonial Latin America, since 1800’, in this volume, p. 250.
- 4 The ‘proper’ use of convict labour not as ‘collateral’ for profit-making was a contested issue in the USA for decades. See, for example, Joseph Hyde Pratt, ‘Convict Labor in Highway Construction’, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 46 (1913): 78–87.
- 5 On the ‘manufacturing of convicts’ to provide cheap, coerced labour, see Jerrell H. Shofner, ‘Forced Labor in the Florida Forests 1880–1950’, *Journal of Forest History* 25, no. 1 (1981): 14–25.
- 6 Richard Price, *The Convict and Colonel: A Story of Colonialism and Resistance in the Caribbean* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).
- 7 Loïc Wacquant, *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009).
- 8 Eric Alliez and Maurizio Lazzarato, *Guerres et Capital* (Paris: Editions Amsterdam, 2016).
- 9 Didier Fassin, *Punir: une passion contemporaine* (Paris: Seuil, 2017), 138.
- 10 Rob Nixon, *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013). This term shares many features with that of ‘imperial duress’. See Ann Laura Stoler, *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in Our Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016).
- 11 Bertrand Ogilvie, *L’homme jetable, Essai sur l’exterminisme et la violence extreme* (Paris: Éditions Amsterdam, 2012; orig. 1995).

- 12 Etienne Balibar, *Violence and Civility: On the Limits of Political Philosophy* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2015), 54.
- 13 Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 317.
- 14 See Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009); and Stoler, *Duress*, 205–236.
- 15 Michel Foucault, 'About the Concept of the "Dangerous Individual" in 19th Century Legal Psychiatry', *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, no. 1 (1978): 1–18. See also, Michel Foucault, *Il faut défendre la société* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976).
- 16 See Lisa Lowe 'The Intimacy of Four Continents', in *Haunted by Empire*, ed. Ann Laura Stoler (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006). On 'the carceral archipelago of empire' see Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain*, 130–139; and with more extensive treatment, Stoler, *Duress*, 68–121.
- 17 Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002), 197.
- 18 The 13th amendment reads: 'Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction'. See Akhil Reed Amar, 'A New Birth of Freedom', in *America's Constitution: A Biography* (New York, NY: Random House, 2005); and condemned more strongly in Leon Litwack's earlier masterful treatment in *Been in the Storm so Long: The Aftermath of Slavery* (New York, NY: Random House, 1980).
- 19 Clare Anderson, 'A Global History of Convicts and Penal Colonies', p. 21–2. On New Caledonia's Communards see Alice Bullard, *Exile to Paradise: Savagery and Civilization in the South Pacific, 1790–1900* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000). Unfortunately, the 'counter-history' of prisons and concentration camps as sites of mobilization, politicization and 'concentrated' cosmopolitanism does not have much of a presence in this volume. See, for example, Peter Zinoman, *The Colonial Bastille: A History of Imprisonment in Vietnam, 1852–1940* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001); and Rudolf Mrazek, 'Boven Digoel and Terezín: Camps at the Time of Triumphant Technology', *East Asian Science, Technology and Society: An International Journal* 3, no. 2 (2009): 287–326, on the 'concentrated modernity' of those imprisoned at the Boven Digul prison camp first under Dutch colonialism and then for those alleged communist activities under Indonesia's Soeharto military regime.
- 20 Balibar, *Violence and Civility*, 141.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 142.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 136.
- 23 Ann Laura Stoler, 'Colony', *Political Concepts: A Critical Lexicon*, 1 (2011) www.politicalconcepts.org.
- 24 Paul E. Lovejoy and Nicholas Rogers, eds., *Unfree Labour in the Development of the Atlantic World* (London: Frank Cass, 2006); Catherine Hall et al., *Legacies of British Slave Ownership: Colonial Slavery and the Formation of Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- 25 See 'Convict labor at Bellwood Quarry', *Atlanta Rail Corridor Archive*, <http://atrailcorridorarchive.org/exhibits/show/bellwood-quarry/convict-labor-at-bellwood-quar> (accessed 23 January 2017).
- 26 Barbara Fields and Karen Fields, *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life* (New York, NY: Verso, 2012).