

The Empire at Home

The Empire at Home

Internal Colonies and
the End of Britain

James Trafford

PLUTO  PRESS

First published 2021 by Pluto Press
345 Archway Road, London N6 5AA

www.plutobooks.com

Copyright © James Trafford 2021

‘A Virtue of Disobedience’ by Suhaiymah Manzoor-Khan, © 2019, Verve Press; ‘British Values’ by Suhaiymah Manzoor-Khan, © 2019, Verve Press; ‘Calais, onward’ by Asiya Wadud, © 2018, Nightboat Books; ‘Displaced Development’ by Shareefa Energy, © 2019, Burning Eye Books; ‘Home’ by W. Shire, © 2015, Warsan Shire; ‘Migrant Among Us’ by Marie Ponsot, © 2011, Knopf Doubleday; ‘River’ by Kalulé, Kalimba, © 2019, Guillemot Press; ‘River’ by Petero Kalulé, © 2019, Guillemot Press. Every effort has been made to trace copyright holders and to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material in this book. The publisher apologises for any errors or omissions in this respect and would be grateful if notified of any corrections that should be incorporated in future reprints or editions.

The right of James Trafford to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 0 7453 4099 9 Hardback
ISBN 978 0 7453 4100 2 Paperback
ISBN 978 1 7868 0674 1 PDF eBook
ISBN 978 1 7868 0676 5 Kindle eBook
ISBN 978 1 7868 0675 8 EPUB eBook

Typeset by Stanford DTP Services, Northampton, England

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiv
1 The Mouth of a Shark	1
2 Extractive Entanglements Across Alien Territories	23
3 Policing Empire after Empire	50
4 Homeland Warfare and Differential Racism	81
5 Extinction Politics	114
6 The End of Britain	142
<i>Notes</i>	162
<i>Indicative Bibliography</i>	193
<i>Index</i>	198

1

The Mouth of a Shark

no one leaves home unless
home is the mouth of a shark.

[...]

make a refugee camp a home for a year or two or ten,
stripped and searched, find prison everywhere
and if you survive and you are greeted on the other side
with go home blacks, refugees
dirty immigrants, asylum seekers

(Warsan Shire, 'Home')¹

This is my home
this thin edge of
barbwire.

(Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La frontera: The New Mestiza*)²

IN THE SHADOWS OF FLIGHT PATHS

In the visitors' room at the largest immigrant detention centre in Britain there is a mural of a shark. From the vantage point of stained board-backed chairs and tables adorned with a sharpie-scrawled numbering system, the shark – with bared teeth – stares panopticon-like over the head of the guard who checks you into the room and assigns tables. Somewhat indecorously, a large clock sits within this mural.

When you have insecure immigration status, you don't have life. Your life is not considered important. It should not be like this. Human life is more important than immigration status.

The clock haunts this space that is so fraught by time, a space of detainment without sentence or conviction. The 'tuck-shop' is closed again, staff disorganised as if caught off-guard. Today the room is opened an hour and a half late. A small crowd tensely waiting is now shuffling

together into the tiny anteroom whilst one door locks before another can open. 'It's like we're going into prison,' someone quietly remarks.

Just imagine, just walk in my shoes once. You have a normal life and then they detain you. Take you away from your family and your kids. It's not normal. If you're going to detain you like an animal – how can you expect them to live a normal life. It's going to be ruining their lives for ever.

This cold, dank-smelling, exhausted space of visitation is at once secured, apprehensive, anxious, but also brimming with love, desire and ache. Enfolding in the tenderness of emotion and presence, lovers, mothers, fathers, children, friends – sucking in air in the vicinity of one another, capturing fragrances of scalp, neck, spirit.

The treatment we are getting here is not right. On our anniversary my husband travelled to see me. While we were kissing they came to me saying that we are not allowed to kiss. My husband just started crying because we being treated as criminal and making life hell for us.

Just beyond a grey business hotel, sitting at the other side of a dual carriageway to a drive-through McDonald's, are the Heathrow Immigration Removal centres. Like many others, the running of Harmondsworth is outsourced to Mitie, a company now infamous for its subsumption business practices and the paucity of conditions of its immigration centres.³ Ostensibly a holding ground for asylum hearings, Harmondsworth is a prison that witnesses sickness, mental health crises and suicide. The people detained there are often refused access to medical care, and sent away with paracetamol regardless of ailment.

We are locked up like dogs. Even animals in this country have their rights. Detention is not supposed to be like a prison. But we are treated worse than prisoners. Where is the humanity in this country, where is the human right in this country.

Harmondsworth lies in the elongated shadows of flight paths, positioned for proximity to planes that extend its carceral reach. Rebuilt and expanded in 2001 under New Labour, it was the first purpose-built detention centre in the UK. It was brought into being by the 1968

Commonwealth Immigrants Act, which had removed the right of entry for British Commonwealth citizens and made precarious the rights of many already residing in the country.

*The people that they deport, and put on the charter flights. Those people lose their lives. Everything gets worse for them.*⁴

The centre symbolises violent attempts to refound the authority and integrity of Britain in a post-colonial world that would ultimately resurrect colonialism inside, and neo-imperialism without. Their corporate facia of hostility is intertwined with strategies of containment and punitive bordering that extends far beyond national territories – outwards across Europe and Africa, and inwards across health services, education and housing.

Britain – as nation-state – is colonialism

Put bluntly, this is the proposition and argument of this book.

Whilst this is a book that is largely about Britain, this is a Britain that is not limited to its island shores. This is because Britain has never been independent – there is no ‘island nation’, as Gurminder Bhambra puts it.⁵ Britain was established in 1707 with the formalisation of England’s annexation of Scotland forming a ‘united’ kingdom. By the early twentieth century, its empire dominated around one quarter of the Earth’s lands, one fifth of its people, and half of all Muslims. Britain ruled over 100 colonies, protectorates and dominions, with 52 forming the later Commonwealth. Britain-as-empire involved the annexation of lands, settler colonialism, chattel slavery, extraction, genocide and expansionist commerce.

Imperial empire had been built in opposition with its ‘others’, making stolen land into property and commodity, and Indigenous people into a commodified reserve. This was the condition of Britain’s wealth and sovereign political power. The British state was built upon inestimable wealth that was extracted across empire through forced taxation, dispossession, enslavement and forced labour. But Britain’s dependence on its colonies was not limited to economy and political might. There is a paradox at the core of Britain’s insistence on liberal freedoms, which empire brings to light. Defining the universality of liberal freedoms had relied on the creation of an ‘other’ against whom they could be measured. Not the

product of an internal European character, liberal values of liberty and equality in the British metropole (the ‘parent’ state of its colonies) were produced through violent divisions of the world in its colonies.⁶ The very image of liberal Britain rested on freedoms that were won by expropriation and enclosure, exploitation and extermination.

The ‘end’ of empire was a long, slow and violent process, which stuttered through counter-insurgency, uprising, installed governments, enforced trade deals and post-colonial migration. What emerged was a system of neo-colonial imperialism built through the hard-fought domination over the territories, politics and economies of newly sovereign states. The formal independence of post-colonial states was intertwined with ongoing subordination that would later become embedded in multilateral organisations and international law.

The end of Britain’s formal colonies was seen by politicians like Enoch Powell as the possibility for its rebirth as a singular nation. However, at the same time that Britain fought to retain its imperial directives amidst global decolonising forces and world-making struggles, its borders were necessarily opened to inflows of capital, people and commodities. Prompted by domestic labour shortages and the desire to maintain commonwealth power, the British Nationality Act of 1948 gave some of Britain’s colonial subjects the right to travel to and work in the metropole through incentivised guest-worker style schemes. These were supposed to promote the temporary movement of labour from colony to metropole, forming precarious communities whose citizenship status was in question from the start. Also under Heathrow’s flight path, after the violent partitioning of Punjab by the British in 1947, Southall became *Chota Punjab* – Little Punjab. Not completely jokingly, one reason for settling there was that ‘if the *gooras* [whites] ever kicked us out, it would be easy to get on a plane and return home.’⁷

This brought tensions and tactics of colonial control into the heart of the metropole. Much of this book is concerned to show that these tensions and tactics underpin both the idea and the reality of Britain as island territory and neo-imperial state since the end of formal empire. From the embers of empire, Britain was rebuilt as the continuation of colonialism. I will argue that the history of post-war Britain is also the history of colonial strategies and techniques deployed ‘at home’. In tracing this deployment of *internal* colonialism, I aim to show that this was not just driven by the desire to rebuild Britain’s labour force, economy and global position. Britain has been politically, economically

and existentially dependent upon its colonies and their re-formation inside the metropole. To put this somewhat glibly, as existential horizon and nation-state machinery, Britain *is* colonialism.

Of aliens and universals

In the summer of 1948, Britain saw both the *Empire Windrush* bringing around 800 Jamaican people to the port of Tilbury *and* the inauguration of the National Health Service (NHS). Both were symbolic of compacts between citizen and state, with the nascent welfare state rooted in liberal citizenship as universal entitlement. The edges of this universal compact were transparent – it was never meant for the others, which British empire held within. Further still, its universalism was written *through* this exclusion and as a means of its protection. Whilst trajectories in the metropole had progressively shifted towards welfarism, leniency and equality, their colonial counterparts were subject to genocidal violence and torture against anticolonial resistance; the scrambling efforts of the colonial office to hold onto power; claims over resources preserving unequal flows of trade.⁸

The emergence of a universal compact through social reforms had been underpinned by eugenicist arguments against the likely social degradation and perishing of the British nation.⁹ The National Insurance Act in 1911 sought to prevent the degeneration of Anglo-Saxon stock through social hygiene – intervening in living standards through health and unemployment provision for certain workers. Whilst advocating universalism, Beveridge's infamous 1942 report relied on a similar logic to argue that at the present rate of reproduction, the 'British race' could not continue. With eugenicist credentials and a firm belief in the pride in Britain, Beveridge understood that its continued imperial quest required intervention to install a national minimum living standard: 'good stock should be allowed to breed while bad stock would be ameliorated through state intervention'.¹⁰ As Robbie Shilliam writes, Beveridge saw the possibility for 'the preservation of empire in the universal provision of social insurance and welfare in Britain'.¹¹ This welfare capitalism was financed by continuing colonial exploitation such as the reduction of plantation workers' wages in Malaya by 80 per cent, with resistance to the cuts leading to the British setting up resettlement camps.¹² In this sense, universal provision was not just a weapon of exclusion, it was a

weapon for the maintenance and protection of freedoms that had been built upon exclusion.

For Britain the decolonising world was a fragile state of affairs, with the commonwealth held together largely by a trusteeship system of colonial administration that would guide nations towards their own self-determination.¹³ Though the 1948 act meant that commonwealth immigrants had rights to British nationality, in reality migration was neither unrestricted nor spontaneous. With concerns over declining British stock, a waning post-war economy and labour shortages, the government formed a working party to manage the movement of labour from its prior and extant colonies. In order to incentivise limited movement, the Colonial Office organised a scheme that would select the best colonial subjects for migration under direct control of the office. For example, the Indian administration required proof of financial status and literacy through a series of checks before emigration was possible.¹⁴ Relying on colonial governments and extra-territorial immigration and border controls at ports of departure allowed Britain to circumvent nationality laws, so they would not have to implement border controls at port of entry.

As 'children of the empire' increasingly found their way to the mother nation and as the temporary arrangement began to give way to settlement, this did not herald a universal post-colonial welfare system, but rather a series of immigration restrictions, buttressed by increasing anti-immigrant resentment. If social and economic welfare movements in Britain were grounded in racialised nationalism, then as Satnam Verdee writes, 'the golden age of welfare capitalism and the social democratic settlement was also the golden age of white supremacy'.¹⁵ Migrant people from the old colonies found themselves in a Britain that was differentiated, living and working in zones of dis-location that operated out of sync with the universal compact surrounding them. Then, as now, they were forced to carry the colonies on their backs. Uneasily traversing the spatio-temporal connections that supposedly made Britain *post*-colonial, these zones were spaces of precarity and permanent temporariness – shaped for those 'never sure whether or not he has crossed the frontier'.¹⁶

Britain's universal compact, which had been built against and in protection from its others, now required new strategies that could maintain the 'British race' against colonial subjects *inside* territorial shores. This required a seismic shift away from a fixed relation of political belonging

between state, citizen and geography and towards flexible strategies and technologies of citizenship. New battle lines were drawn, with migrant people and those with migrant heritage configured as aliens who could lead to the destruction of the nation. The close management of their economic, social and political inclusion and exclusion provided the state with legitimacy. Drawing this picture of a Britain under siege was central to Britain's new self-image as a unified nation whose ends were its maritime borders.

COLONIALISM DIRECTED INWARDS

There has been much written about the role of imperial states and corporations in the global periphery, postcolonialism and the role of development, aid and security.¹⁷ However, these approaches have sometimes omitted the role that the global periphery played in the constitution of nation-states in the imperial core. They highlight how colonialism continues to shape the current configuration of interests manifested and often violently enforced in the context of global governance. Nonetheless, whilst centring its after-effects, colonialism is often understood as something that was done *by* Europe *to* the rest of the world. It is the remnants and legacies of empire that continue to influence the treatment of those people who were once colonised. This rests on both methodological nationalism and Eurocentrism. Contemporary forms of governance are understood to have been endogenously produced in the imperial core rather than through historical and ongoing colonial processes of accumulation, exploitation and control.¹⁸ In tracing the movements of colonialism inwards we can rectify this lacuna to foreground the transnational relationships that have given shape to the political, economic and cultural forms of power through which nation-states and global governance have manifested.

Colonial entanglements

Rebuilding Britain in the wake of a decolonising world was dependent on a combination of military support for insurgencies and wars that devastated infrastructure and peoples together with regimes of indebtedness put in place through post-Bretton Woods institutions. The latter would recognise the political authority only of those nation-states that met certain criteria allowing external access to resources. Multilateral aid

packages became a necessary response to aggressive integration into the global economy via World Trade Organization (WTO) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) rules, sanctions and loans, and the ensuing petrodollar-caused debt crisis. Structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) were put in place as conditions on aid and lending from the early 1980s. These benefitted the political and economic institutions that sponsored loans awarded by the IMF, and whose control is heavily weighted in favour of the United States, Japan, Germany, France and the United Kingdom.

The expansion of Europe and the 'development' of the colonies had bound the two together. As Walter Rodney wrote, after formal decolonisation 'many of the territories incorporated into the overseas empire were locked into providing primary products for the UK'.¹⁹ Britain is still reliant on the extraction of labour, rents, raw materials and resources for industrial processes, and industrialised farming. Free trade agreements continue to shape export prices and wages, whilst militarised commerce and the offshoring of industry effectively subsidise our living standards and our purchasing power. This echoes across the neo-imperial relations that are now even more firmly etched than when Mississippi plantations and Manchester factories were forged into an unequal world economy.²⁰

We can see this from the vantage point of Harmondsworth. Charter flights, which were introduced under New Labour in 2001, typically take place in the dead of night at the edges of airports like Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted. The aeroplanes that are used for these violent deportations have been made using materials extracted through imperial intervention in parts of the world that Britain may never have formally colonised. Take Mozambique as example. Formally colonised by the Portuguese, British control of the wider region had been present during that period, felt acutely through the Mozambique Company, with the country joining the commonwealth in 1995. In Mozambique's capital, Maputo, lies Mozal, an aluminium smelter partially funded by UK investment and the World Bank. The smelter has been exempt from tax on profit and VAT because the investment is counted as development. Yet for every dollar the Mozambique government made from the venture, \$21 is extracted from the country.²¹ In total, the UK has received \$88 million from the development project in addition to the original loan repayment. In 2014, Mozambique was the largest recipient of foreign direct investment in the continent. But this uneven and extractive development has created

massive liabilities for Mozambique, leaving it the poorest country in the world in 1993 and second poorest in 2017 by GDP.

These material, economic and social practices operate transnationally to differentiate access to housing, food, land, resources and healthcare. As Tania Li puts it, they are practices that ‘let die’ in order to ‘make live.’²² It is in part for these reasons that Mozambique is so vulnerable to changes in climate that precipitate extreme weather. In early 2019, the tropical cyclone Idai led to massive-scale devastation in Zimbabwe, Malawi and Mozambique. Almost the entirety of Beira, the fourth largest city in Mozambique was destroyed, flooding demolishing entire villages, winds and floods affecting more than 2.6 million people, and taking over 1,000 lives. As Idai makes stark, climate crises are increasingly making life in the region unsustainable, whilst the destruction caused by climate change is inseparable from ongoing capitalist plunder in the name of development. However, it is likely that the Shark at Harmondsworth will never see any of those whose homes are made in the mouth of a shark. Not only do our draconian asylum regimes make no allowances for so-called climate refugees but they are increasingly securitised, enhanced and expanded globally.

These inequities and interconnections reverberate across Britain, where shifts from colonial to neo-colonial nation brought about new relations of geographical enclosure through differential citizenship and plastic strategies of exclusion. Underfunded and overpoliced, this made entire communities subject to supposedly colour-blind technologies of finance and debt, credit scores, surveillance and algorithmic and pre-emptive policing – providing the façade of anti-racist science that has led to hierarchical outcomes.

Domestic colonies

I use the phrase internal colonialism to centre the production and reproduction of colonial relations through the intensification and reproduction of societal structures and hierarchies, differential access to resources and normative limitations. Its strategies have redeployed structures that facilitated and legitimised slavery, exploitation and extermination and frameworks that suppressed dissent and resistance to them. Considering colonial entanglements in this way both draws on and differs from theories of domestic colonialism that were primarily focused on the US. Their visibility relies on a long tradition of activist and academic analysis

of segregated areas (ghettos) as an internal colony in the US including activists such as W.E.B. Du Bois, Kenneth Clark, Malcolm X, Kwame Toure, Harold Cruse; and sociologists such as Robert Blauner, Robert L. Allen, Charles Pinderhughes.

In *A Negro Nation Within the Nation*, W.E.B. Du Bois argued that African Americans in the depression era required the creation of institutions whose economic and political self-determination might circumvent Jim Crow segregation. Central to his analysis was the articulation of twelve distinct features that drew together the experience of colonial subjects and African Americans as 'semi-colonial' people:

1. Physical and psychological violence
2. Economic exploitation
3. Poverty
4. Illiteracy
5. Lawlessness and crime
6. Starvation
7. Death
8. Disaster
9. Disease
10. Disenfranchisement
11. Cultural inequality
12. Exclusion from political participation.²³

Tying together the transnational experiences of colonial subjects was core to the development of this account of semi-colonial people in the US. This was also instrumental in the making of a pan-African movement that would be directed towards the mass emancipation of Black people across the world. As Amy Ashwood Garvey stated at the 1945 Pan-African Congress in Manchester, the movement would be 'supported by the semi-colonial people in America'.²⁴

What is specific about domestic, or internal, colonialism was that the biopolitical and geopolitical management of people and land occurs within the borders of an imperial nation.²⁵ Initially, the understanding of internal colonialism had originated from Latin American analysis of unequal terms of trade between dominant and subordinate nations as analogous with those between dominant and subordinate groups within nations. Taken up by writers in the US, the concept of a nation within a nation was mobilised to develop theories of domestic colonialism as a

geographically contiguous state whose symbolic form was the ghetto.²⁶ In 1962, Harold Cruse used the phrase domestic colonialism to describe the problem of the underdevelopment of African American communities. The ghetto was understood as the major device for persisting anti-Black colonisation. Its underdevelopment had produced the conditions of colonialism in the US that centred on geographical segregation and the subordination of a differentiated population.

The framework offered a way of thinking about life conditions for African Americans beyond simple economics and the idea of race as discrimination or prejudice. As Blauner argued, the persistence of race in America couldn't adequately be explained by class analysis, but required tracing its conditions to those produced under colonialism:

Western Colonialism brought into existence the present-day pattern of racial stratification; in the United States, as elsewhere, it was a colonial experience that generated the lineup of ethnic and racial divisions.²⁷

This provided an explanation for the continuation of spatial segregations, economic dependence, political exclusions and excessive policing.²⁸ The forms of control that had been used to maintain the colonies were now being used to ensure the enduring domination of the US nation and its white elite. Systems of exploitation and control were found to form a dynamics of domination and resistance that was structured by coexistent racial antagonism. Building on this tradition, the most prominent use of the framework of internal colonialism was in Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton's 1967 *Black Power*. Critiquing white power and locating foundational racism in the 'economic dependency of the colonised', they showed how racism constrained and shaped the lives of those contained by the internal colony. Not only descriptive, but a call to resistance on behalf of the nation within a nation, internal colonialism was developed as both theory and praxis.

Coloniality as process

Despite drawing on this lineage, the approach taken throughout this book will necessarily break with it – not least because of the substantive differences between the British metropole and the US settler colony. It should be said that the theory has not been limited to the US. Internal colonialism has been fruitfully employed to consider many contexts

including Palestine, Indonesia and Sri Lanka.²⁹ However, the contexts in which it finds a natural home are those which allow for the relatively clear demarcation of colony and host nation. Whilst I shall return to this throughout this book, these delineations have not been so clear cut in the case of Britain. The terms of segregation produced in Britain, I shall argue, have often been far more diffuse and distributive – though just as deep.

Rather than use the framework of internal colonialism to describe the territories of a colony inside the state, I want to think of it primarily as a framework for clarifying histories, understanding processes and connections, and bringing to light the interwoven movements of colonial techniques and practices within Britain's shores. By necessity of method, this both expands our remit and forces us to consider internal colonisation as an enduring set of processes. This also builds on work that has challenged assumptions – both that we exist in a post-colonial world, and that geographical, cultural, and political distinctions separate colony and metropole.³⁰ By considering the transnational circulations of colonial forms of governance and practices of accumulation, we can foreground how they have been constitutive of British nationhood, and are an enduring process across the Earth.

This is to think of the violences of colonialism not as Britain's spatial and temporal other or originary past but as its 'ongoing conditions of possibility'.³¹ As such, the analysis throughout weaves together strategies developed across empire with their later deployment both inside British shores *and* across external borders and neo-imperial territories. Telling this story unveils both the mass-scale and complex circuits of colonial capitalist power, and the often-silenced counter-discourses of its subjects. Far from passively subject to colonial relations, ongoing coloniality can only be understood through the lens of anti-colonial resistance and active political agency. Internal colonialism has largely been implemented as a reactive mechanism to a series of manufactured crises centring on the presence of the other now within.

The method offers significant explanatory reward. Through it, we are granted understanding of the persistently laminar contours of labour and property markets; why criminal justice reformism gave way to punitive militarism in the 1980s; the manifestation of differential racisms and their weaponisation against communities judged to be uncivil and criminal; how counter-insurgency projects have become normalised with all citizens conscripted as border guards; how the horizon of the

nation continues to be staged as the only permissible ground for progressive politics; how, under pressure of dwindling resources and ecological crisis, we're headed towards a politics of green nationalism underpinned by a border regime that produces temporary and highly controlled forms of citizenship for Britain's others. This throws sharply into focus the mechanisms through which the persistence of this unequally differentiated world has been made to seem like a neutral standard, and how it is protected with increasing vehemence.

Faithful to its original intent, the framework of internal colonialism provides a way of thinking about Britain that is obscured by narratives that frame the last half a century through the lens of neoliberalism. I will return to these issues a few times, so here I shall just briefly consider approaches to this historical period through the lens of neoliberalism as market rationality writ large. David Harvey, for example, considers our history since the 1970s as a project that was taken up by the capitalist classes to 'protect themselves from political and economic annihilation'.³² This project to repair class power supposedly became embedded in policy by Pinochet, Volker, Thatcher and Reagan by retrenching the welfare state and demolishing labour movements. This was marked by a fundamental transformation of the role of the state, withdrawing from social provision, and supposedly intervening only when neoliberal order broke down – to repair markets, prevent challenges to capital accumulation, and resolve social crises. In this light, neoliberalism has very often been made into a universal logic whose material processes transform us all into human capital.

This narrative doesn't just obfuscate and collapse trajectories and distinctions within British history, it forces an understanding of the development of socio-political formations through the narrowing conduits of class analysis. As I'll show throughout, there is an incredible wealth lying beyond this deformation which could help us to more adequately understand our contemporary predicament. But taking up the framework offered by internal coloniality does not require simply jettisoning the explanatory traction of the mechanisms that Marxist analysis foregrounds. Rather, it refuses the delegation of race to social abstraction or ideology, and actively pursues the claim made by Lisa Tilley and Robbie Shilliam that 'race has the same kind of materiality as class does in constituting the hierarchies and eviscerations of the "social"'.³³

Internal colonialism emphasises processes of underdevelopment, differential exploitation, violence, containment and criminalisation – all

of which have been central to the reproduction and reconfiguring of racialisation around 'migrants' and the spaces in which migrant communities inhabit. In this, I take heed of Patrick Wolfe's suggestion that 'race is colonialism speaking'. The specific articulations of race and racisms that have emerged in recent British histories are produced through the underlying machinery of colonialism as it is wielded within the British metropole. In many ways this coheres with the Latin American focus on the coloniality of power, in which practices of European colonialism are intertwined with the ongoing stratification of social systems and groups. Aníbal Quijano defines coloniality not as colonialism *per se* but as the systemic structuring of culture, labour, markets, intersubjective relations and normative life experience within subordinating and racially shaped relations, behaviours and practices.³⁴ This includes the enduring intersubjective constructions of race that were produced through supposedly objective European knowledge, and that constitute not only a subordinating relation between coloniser and the dominated, but also colonisation of knowledge and imagination. As Nelson Maldano-Torres writes, coloniality survives colonialism – 'as modern subjects we breath coloniality all the time and everyday'.³⁵

This is at odds with the dominant racial formation theory of Michael Omi and Howard Winant, which rejects colonialist explanations of race. Instead, they foreground social processes through which the racial organisation of societies are produced as a complex of meanings that are under constant transformation in conditions of political struggle.³⁶ The result is a colour-blind approach that relies primarily on analysis of racist ideologies.³⁷ Their emphasis on meaning systems and ideologies fails to do justice to their material basis. In part this is motivated by a drive away from biological or essentialised accounts of race. Nevertheless, whilst denying not just that race has any biological basis but also any *material* basis, they also fail to demonstrate why racial difference constitutes a central dimension of social organisation and discourse.³⁸ So rather than gaining traction on the causal significance of the conditions that give rise to the reproduction of race, race becomes a floating signifier that is dislocated from its origins in colonial regimes. Against this, I hold that race is a technology that forms part of the machinery of colonialism. The reproduction and manifestations of race in the metropole have used frameworks and practices that had developed across empire, and led to '[s]kewed life chances, limited access to health and education, premature death, incarceration, and impoverishment'.³⁹