

BLACK JUSTICE IN THE PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

- THE RISE OF THE BLACK REPARATIONS MOVEMENT AND ITS WRESTLING WITH EURO-AMERICA -



INTERDISCIPLINARY MASTER'S THESIS

HISTORY AND CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS

BY ADAM JØRGENSEN, STUDENT NO.: 49853

SUPERVISORS:

JAKOB EGHOLM FELDT & RANDI LORENZ MARSELIS

ROSKILDE UNIVERSITY, WINTER 2018

4TH CANDIDATE SEMESTER

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

CHARACTERS: 179882

74.9 STANDARD PAGES

Abstract (Danish)

I dette speciale undersøges den historiske udvikling af den caribiske og nordamerikanske bevægelse for såkaldte 'sorte reparationer' : oprejsning, kompensation, anerkendelse og forsoning for det transatlantiske slaveri, undertrykkelsen efter emancipationen samt socio-økonomiske eftervirkninger. Gennem tre temporaliteter analyseres udviklingen af kravene om reparationer og disse sættes i forbindelse med udviklingen af kolonialitetens verdensorden (the coloniality of power). Jeg konkluderer at der siden 1600-tallet har været defineret klare krav om sorte reparationer i den atlantiske verden, og at fortalere for reparationer siden slaveriet og frem til i dag er blevet modarbejdet systematisk af både europæiske og nordamerikanske regeringer. Derudover konkluderer jeg at min undersøgelse af kampen for sorte reparationer har vist hvordan økonomi og eventuelt økonomisk erstatning har været afgørende for henholdsvis en 'sort' og 'hvid' tilgang til udviklingen fra slaveriet og frem til i dag. Endelig konkluderer jeg, at bevægelsen for sorte reparationer i starten af det 21. århundrede har fået tag i en bredere, international politisk offentlighed, både via FN og CARICOM's reparationskommission i Caribien, hvilket muligvis indikerer nye muligheder for reparationister i fremtiden.

Abstract (English)

In this thesis, the historical development of the Black Reparations Movement in the Caribbean and the US is investigated. This movement has demanded redress, compensation, acknowledgement and reconciliation after Trans-Atlantic slavery, post-emancipation oppression and subsequent socio-economic repercussions. Through three temporalities these demands are analyzed and contextualized with the emergence of "the coloniality of power". I conclude that clearly defined demands for Black reparations have been voiced since the 1600s, and that reparationists have been worked against systematically by Euro-American governments ever since slavery. In addition, I concluded that my investigation has underlined how economy and eventually economic redress have been crucial to Black-White relations from slavery until today. In the beginning of the 21st century the movement has reached a broader, international political public, including the Caribbean Reparations Commission and the UN, which possibly indicates new possibilities for the cause of reparations in the future.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	2
2. PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	6
3. DELIMITATION, STRUCTURE AND METHOD.....	7
4. DEFINITIONS.....	10
4.1. RACIAL TERMS: BLACK AND WHITE.....	10
4.2. REPARATIONS AND BLACK REPARATIONS.....	10
5. HISTORIOGRAPHY ON THE BLACK REPARATIONS MOVEMENT.....	12
5.1 POST-MILLENNIUM REPARATIONIST SCHOLARS.....	12
5.2 SCHOLARS NOT ARGUING FOR OR AGAINST REPARATIONS.....	15
5.3 ACADEMIC ANTI-REPARATIONIST COMMENTARY.....	16
5.4 DISCUSSION OF THE HISTORIOGRAPHY.....	18
6. HOW TO APPROACH COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL HISTORY: THE DECOLONIAL POSITION.....	20
7. CENTRAL CONCEPT: COLONIALITY OF POWER.....	24
8. ANALYSIS.....	27
8.1. PART ONE. “RECONCILE US TO THEM”: BLACK REBELS, ABOLITIONISTS, AND “EX-SLAVES”, FROM 1600-.....	27
8.1.1 SUB-CONCLUSION.....	40
8.2 PART TWO. THE COMING OF BLACK PRESSURE: RADICAL BLACK POLITICAL AND SPIRITUAL MOVEMENTS, FROM 1900-.....	42
8.2.1. SUB-CONCLUSION.....	54
8.3. PART THREE. “A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY”: THE CAUSE OF BLACK REPARATIONS GOING MAINSTREAM, 2000-.....	56
8.3.1 SUB-CONCLUSION.....	68
9. DISCUSSION.....	70
10. CONCLUSION.....	77
II. LITERATURE.....	80

I. INTRODUCTION

“Look for me in the whirlwind or the storm, look for me all around you, for, with God's grace, I shall come and bring with me countless millions of black slaves who have died in America and the West Indies and the millions in Africa to aid you in the fight for Liberty, Freedom and Life”

- Marcus Garvey

We are living in a time of massive changes. On the one hand we bear witness to an increasing level of respect and acknowledgement for indigenous and other historically oppressed groups. This is manifested for example in the US in the recent trend of changing “Columbus Day” to “Indigenous Peoples' Day” in many cities (Mitchell, 2017) and a high support for the Black Lives Matter Movement among US young White adults (Genforward, 2016). Also, in recent years anti-racist minority organizations have risen in Europe, debating the negative repercussions of colonialism publicly (Lotem, 2016; ENAR, 2014). But at the same time, we see a growing Euro-American movement of right wing nationalism (Postelnicescu, 2016; Foster, 2017), which is pulling the world in another direction, as they try to uphold “*the White Man's*” privileged position in the world. Thus there is a heightened level of knowledge and debate about such topics as colonialism and slavery, but also a demand that Black people should get over these historical experiences. To put it bluntly, some understand Blacks and other historically oppressed groups in the West as *having problems*, while others see them *as problems*. Blacks or descendants of Africans in the Western world are one group, which through the history of Trans-Atlantic Slavery are very “visible” and make up a paradox in the West: they are the heirs of the history of slavery, who have fought for a legal status as human beings, equal to Whites. How does a group which has been brought into societies as “nonhumans” become recognized as fully human? Are formal declarations and legal definitions enough or does it require more radical measures to repair centuries of racial hatred, violence and oppression?

In this thesis, I use the term ‘the Black Reparations Movement’ collectively for the movements which are advocating redress, acknowledgement, reconciliation and compensation for these historical atrocities and systems of dehumanization against enslaved Africans and their descendants. This movement is interesting to study, as both history, morals and politics are implicated in their endeavors. Also, their case is an unambiguous example of how writing and using history are complex and potentially crucial practices. Needless to say, we cannot judge the past with the spectacles of the present. But what we can do, is to investigate how the claims for reparations have been understood, and if, or how, the problematic past of Euro-American racism and exploitation lives on in different levels be it culturally, socially or politically. Through such an investigation we can try to find appropriate solutions to great societal problems.

There is precedence in international contexts for providing redress for victims of historical atrocities and oppression – and their descendants. One example of reparations granted to survivors was that of Japanese-Americans after their internment in the US during WWII. Survivors were paid \$20.000 individually in 1988 for their suffering at the hands of the US authorities in the 1940s (Celermajer, 2009:32). One of the best known reparatory programs is that of international payments to Jews for the Nazi Holocaust. These payments coming from the governments of Germany, France, Austria among others, have since the 1950s been targeted at Jewish survivors and their spouses (Brooks, 2004:107; Brennan, 2015), and in some instances descendants (Weintrob, 2015), being a form of reparations not generally contested. But there are also examples of grand-scale reparatory measures to descendants of the wronged. In 1993, Canada handed over a large piece of land, to indigenous Canadians and Inuits, the territory now called Nunavut (Hicks & White, 2015:3).

Thus, the call for Black reparations for slavery, colonialism and subsequent forms of oppression is one among many global initiatives, aiming for a more just world in the aftermath of Euro-American violations against different groups since the 1500s.

Recently, the demand for Black reparations has come from a new stratum of society. The Caribbean Community (CARICOM), which is the international union of English speaking Caribbean States, claimed reparations from a number of European countries, being the historical heirs of their former enslavers and colonizers. CARICOM's demands included ten different points, which the Caribbean governments found entitled to be "repaired" by the European former colonial governments. Not only limited to apologies or payments, the demands basically claimed more wide-ranging changes to repair the massive inequalities between European and Caribbean countries, pointing to these region's interconnected histories. This marked a new turn for the movement, which until now has not been successful in getting its demands petitioned on a broadcasted, inter-governmental level. But what is the historical origin of these claims, who has demanded similar (or other kinds of) claims earlier, and how has the intellectual history of the Black Reparations Movement developed over time? This thesis revolves around these questions.

Historians have been effective in both muting and enabling voices throughout the times, and thus history encompasses both the potentialities of oppression of specific groups, as well as radical empowerment. As this thesis endeavors to make clear, historical knowledge of the past may indeed have great importance to present debates, if debates about reparations should not end in semi-philosophical and/or ahistorical dead ends. While both reparationists and anti-reparationists may agree that the demands for reparations represent a call for repairing the irreparable, compensating for what cannot be compensated, and reconciling who has never been fully united, there are very different perspectives on why these should still be pursued or not. One argument being used again and again in contemporary debates about Black reparations, is that of obsolescence, stating that slavery and other oppressive Euro-American practices happened too long ago for Euro-American governments to provide redress for (Brennan, 2017:189; Beckles, 2007:19). But how strong is that argument, if the reparations movement is not of recent emergence, but rather a long established intellectual, spiritual and political tradition in Black Caribbean and US contexts, since slavery?

The central subject which is addressed in this thesis is thus the impact of the histories of colonialism and slavery on present power-relations, focusing on how Black reparationists have understood this since slavery. The academical problem inherent in the study of the Black Reparations Movement is the disagreements about how to interpret and handle the colonial past, the postcolonial past and the present. The present case for Black reparations have been dealt with in a number of publications in recent years, underlining the international scholarly interest in reparations as a historical, social, philosophical, legal and political phenomenon. What is less known, is the historical development of Black reparationist thought in the Caribbean and the US, and the movement's intellectual history. I claim that our historical judgment of cases, such as the demands for Black reparations, must rely on a level of factual historical information, and not just opinions, otherwise the historian's work is pointless. On the other hand, "*history*" is not the judge, people are. But what these considerations implicates for my study, is that I have chosen to focus on the perspectives of the enslaved, the colonized and their descendants, trying to grasp how the Black Reparations movement has developed and understood itself throughout different times. I want to take reparationists seriously, study their demands and visions, and try to understand the historical movement as an entity composed by a number of diverse elements. This leads me to my problem statement:

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

In this thesis I will shed light on how the Black Reparations Movement in the US and the Caribbean has emerged, and what the movement entails. In this context I will explore the following questions:

Through an investigation of the emergence of the Black Reparations Movement in the US and the Caribbean in three different temporalities, I will ask which historical patterns have occurred in addressing the cause of Black reparations since slavery, and which changes have occurred in these patterns? And how are the atrocities and the oppression of slavery and post-slavery world orders (coloniality) problematized by reparationists through time?

To direct my study I will focus on the following sub-questions:

- ◆ How has the Black reparations cause been based in moral terms?
- ◆ How have reparationists and anti-reparationists reasoned historically?
- ◆ In what way does the two parties' stances differ, and what does this say about their respective uses of history, memory and politics? How does these different stances relate to “coloniality”?

3. DELIMITATION, STRUCTURE AND METHOD

In this chapter, I will provide an account of my methodological considerations, my main focus on voices in the US and the Caribbean, and the structure of the thesis. The history of the movement for Black Reparations is spanning over several centuries and has evolved on different continents, under many different historical circumstances. Therefore a study of this movement must take into account the temporal and spatial complexities inherent in the subject.

There have been Black movements and individuals fighting for redress, restitution or reparations through different means all over the Black Diaspora. Throughout South America, “Maroons” or societies of the runaway enslaved, has existed. These include Quilombos of Brazil (Anderson, 1996; Kent, 1965) and Palenques of Colombia (Valencia, 2015) and Mexico (Vasquez, 2010), some of which are still existing. As I will argue later in this thesis, all these examples of resistance and self-empowerment by the enslaved can be understood as a central part of the early development of ideas about reparations. Unfortunately there are less written sources by writers in these societies historically, and also I do not master Portuguese or Spanish. Generally speaking, what we now understand as the Black Reparations Movement has inherited most of its intellectual history from North America and the Caribbean. Granted, it is important not to forget, or underestimate the importance of Black resistance to colonialism and slavery in South America. But because of the above reasons, I have chosen to delimit my study of the movement primarily to North America and the Caribbean. Also, I have chosen not to engage the history of reparationist calls from the African continent, as these have another history (Howard-Hassmann, 2008), while there are also many similarities. Therefore African claims requires focused studies in their own right.

Inspired by Jordheim's reading of Koselleck's notion of “*multiple temporalities*” (2012), I have chosen not to construct autonomous historical periods in a linear pattern. Instead, I have structured this study by treating the development of Black reparationist thought and action through three temporalities, or times, which are understood as overlapping each other. As far as concepts or ideas are

continuously employed or developed through time, these temporalities can simply be understood as being extended and not replaced or taken over by another “period”. Thus through Koselleck's perspective, historical times should be *“organized in the form of temporal layers that have different origins and duration and move at different speeds, as an alternative to the linear and empty time of periodization”* (Jordheim, 2012:170). The ideal should be creating a historical representation, that is more *“complex and multilayered”* (Ibid.) than the common simplification of periodization. I believe that multiple temporalities allows not falling into historicist traps of oversimplifying the development of the movement, for example underlining that Garveyists does not only belong in the 1920's.

The first temporality I have defined, “Reconcile Us to Them”, includes Black reparationist claims since colonialism and slavery until the time immediately after Emancipation in the US and the Caribbean. The second temporality, “The Coming of Black Pressure”, relates to the emergence of Black political and spiritual movements advocating Black reparations since the beginning of the 20th century beginning with Marcus Garvey's Black Nationalism. The third and last temporality, “A Crime Against Humanity”, focuses on the developments in the 2000's, after the Durban Conference of 2001 up until the present. To underline why I have chosen this structure, it is not to make a traditional equation of “a turned into b which turned into c”, rather it is emphasizing that a, b and c all comprise valuable inputs to the present intellectual conceptualization of reparations. This will become clear as we turn to the last temporality, where credit is given and homage is payed to ideas developed in the earlier temporalities. Thereby, this thesis both focuses on developments of the movement through time, but also the interwoven relation between organizations and individuals across times.

With offset in these three temporalities, I will study the diverse demands and underlying logics of Black reparationists, by highlighting central passages of reparationist speeches and written works. It is important to underline, that I have in no way sought to include all reparationist materials, as this would not be possible in a single thesis. I will then analyze relevant statements through defined

concepts, which will help bring out dimensions to understanding the implications of the statements. I have chosen the statements through a thorough research of many known, and a few lesser known, texts, wherein I have found statements with a reparatory aim. The criteria for selection were a) relevance to my main scope, b) clarity and c) a broad representation of the many different perspectives on the matter through time. Therefore the reader will find both examples of implicit and explicit expressions of reparatory intentions, secular and spiritual arguments, as well as statements by male and female authors. What they have in common is a sense of Black (or “*Negro*”) identity, and the contexts of slavery or post-slavery conditions for Blacks. After the analysis of these statements in the three temporalities defined, I will discuss the emergence of the movement, from the basic propositions since slavery and through patterns and changes in patterns. This will include a discussion of the movement's relation to “White” Euro-America, and questions about obsolescence of claims for Black Reparations, as well as possible futures in reparationist visions.

4. DEFINITIONS

4.1. Racial terms: Black and White

Today, the scientific basis for racial distinctions between people does not exist (Yudell et. al, 2016). Therefore, the continued uses of racial terms are solely social constructs, connected to specific groups. In this thesis, however, I will have to use racial terms, because socio-economic conditions rooted in notions of race, are central to discussions about Black reparations. It is not my intention to offend anyone, and I am conscious that not all Africans or descendants of Africans find the term “Black” appropriate, just as not all Europeans or European descendants identifies as “White”. An investigation of the demands for Black reparations through time takes offset in a reality where race possibly was the key category for classification of people, at least in Euro-America. Therefore, I have chosen to use these terms, in order to capture nuances of the reparatory demands. At the same time “Blackness” has been conceptualized and “reclaimed” by many, being central to some groups' identity formation in the African Diaspora (Price, 2003:31). I have chosen to capitalize racial terms, to underline these signifiers' actual meaning in addressing “peoples”, just as continental labels such as Europeans and Africans. I am conscious that the terms “Black” and “White” are not unproblematic, but I hope the reader will understand the use of these in their contexts.

4.2. Reparations and Black Reparations

In order to analyze a number of demands for Black reparations, it is necessary to give a short account of what reparations, and indeed Black reparations are. I understand reparations as an attempt to reconcile a victim of a crime (whether individual or collective) to a perpetrator (whether individual or collective). Often this will be in the form of redress, in one way or another. As Verdeja states, different kinds of reparatory demands can be conceptualized via two axes; that of symbolic/material components, and that of collective/individual measures (Verdeja, 2006:454). Thus, fundamentally there can be many different ways of repairing different violations.

What does “Black reparations” mean, then? Black reparations refers specifically to the history of Euro-American colonialism and slavery. The calls are centered around the relation between Blacks and Whites, how to reconcile these groups, and how Blacks in the Western world can be provided adequate redress, socially, economically or otherwise. “Black reparations” could also include African reparationists demand compensation for colonialism in Africa, but this movement is in many ways separate to the Caribbean and US movement and has other histories. I solely investigate the movement in the context of slavery and colonialism, including its aftermath, in the West. While reparations are most often paid directly to victims while they are still alive, the case of Black reparations for chattel slavery and continued oppression in the Americas are both relating to the present and a more distant past. As we shall see, reparationists see redress as a means to achieve a higher level of justice in an unjust historical and political situation.

5. HISTORIOGRAPHY ON THE BLACK REPARATIONS MOVEMENT

In the following, I will provide an account of the historiographical tradition with regards to the Black Reparations Movement. As the subject of reparations touches aspects of disciplines as diverse as history, law, critical studies, social and political science, sociology, economics and even religion, I have had to delimit my reading considerably. Given that my main area of knowledge and interest is the historical emergence and claims of the Black Reparations Movement I have focused my reading around works of history, law and social science. Also, I have delimited my reading to texts directly relating to the Black Reparations Movement in the US and the Caribbean. In order to discuss the historiography on the subject I will introduce three categories of scholarship, which I have identified within the literature. These are

1. Post-millennium Reparationist Scholars
2. Scholars not arguing for or against reparations
3. Academic Anti-Reparationist Commentary

Categories 1 and 2 are what I understand as the center of scholarship on the movement, tracing this historically with different interpretations and scholarly scopes. Category 3 is not strictly written into the same academical contexts, but is included to illustrate the socio-political debates in which academics participate. After presenting these three different categories of scholarship I will discuss differences, disagreements and general issues identified in the reviewed literature.

5.1 Post-millennium Reparationist Scholars

As the movement for Black reparations did not become a semi-unified movement, until the latter half of the 20th century, earlier enquiries have focused on specific individuals and organizations more than the sum of their endeavors. Therefore, most of the relevant academic literature focusing on the Black Reparations Movement as a historical entity is of a rather recent date. In recent years, especially after the Durban Conference of 2001, a number of publications on Black reparations have been published. The pattern in these works is that they provide both an introduction to the socio-philosophical idea of reparations and to the historical movement, and at the same time position themselves as part of the

movement, by taking clear sides in the debate. Thus their works are in a sense both a source on the reparations movement and a source of the reparations movement. The works of Adjoa Aiyetoro & Adrienne Davis (2010), Hilary McD. Beckles (2013) and Nora Wittmann (2013) are three examples of this trend, each with their separate foci. While the works of these scholars can be categorized together there are also basic differences in how their studies have been executed and what their scopes are. Being African Americans, Aiyetoro & Davis are speaking directly into the US context, and their main investigation is into US history and the reparations movement there. On the other hand Beckles, a Bahamian historian, is focusing specifically on the relation between Britain and its former Caribbean colonies. Lastly, Wittmann is focusing on “*Global Africa*”, meaning all descendants of enslaved Africans as well as Africans in general as European colonialism in Africa is also a cause for discussions on reparations. I will now introduce and discuss these scholars' respective works on the movement.

In this category, I will take offset in Aiyetoro & Davis' account, as their text may be closest to what my scope is in this thesis. Aiyetoro & Davis' contribution is focused on the formation of The National Coalition for Reparations in America (N'COBRA), which is just one of the organizations in the US pursuing African American reparations. The two law professors Aiyetoro and Davis have put much effort into tracing the movement in America in detail, as antecedents to N'COBRA, thereby creating a cohesive account of this history in the US, approaching “*reparations as a social movement with a rich and under-explored history*” (2010:2¹) which among other things helps to make clear “*significant and under-attended ideological differences among reparations advocates*” (Ibid. 4).

They trace the early US movement from David Walker in the 1830's, to Callie House's petitioning in the 1890's (Aiyetoro & Davis, 2010:6 and 13). In the 20th century, they emphasize the importance of Queen Mother Audley Moore (2010:16), along with James Forman, who is dubbed “*the most successful advocate for widespread Black reparations*” (2010:22). On a short note, Marcus Garvey and the

1 As Aiyetoro and Davis' work is in fact a paper from a collection without numbered pages, I have chosen to number their pages from the first page of the first chapter, in order to reference these adequately.

UNIA, W.E.B. Du Bois, the Nation of Islam, the Black Panther Party and other groups are mentioned as either thinkers who inspired the movement or part of the movement (2010:24). The conclusion of the historical chapter on the Black Reparations Movement is that it *“has been part of a long-standing alternative Black political tradition”*(Ibid.). Aiyetoro and Davis' work is very thorough, and the authors do not hide their sympathies with the movement. Aiyetoro & Davis' text is an example of scholars studying the movement while in effect at the same time being a part of it, as Aiyetoro is working as Chief Legal Consultant to the N'COBRA (UA Little Rock, n.d.).

In the work of Hilary Beckles, a Barbadian historian, he studies the history of the Black Reparations Movement in the former British West Indies, and argues strongly for the need for reparations from the UK to Black descendants of enslaved Africans. Beckles is also directly involved in the political struggle for European reparations to the Caribbean, being the chairman of the Caribbean Community's Caribbean Reparations Commission, formally demanding reparations from European former colonial governments in 2014, the year after the release of Beckles' book. While Beckles' book is very strong in its account of British atrocities, oppression and profits from slavery, it is not very in-depth in its treatment of how exactly the Reparations movements began in the Caribbean. In his historical genealogy of the Caribbean Reparations Movement, Beckles begins with the resistance of both indigenous Caribbeans and Maroons, which were runaway former enslaved groups, establishing small societies throughout the Caribbean (Ibid. 211). Beckles does not cover the time period from the middle of the 17th century to early 2000's. This may be due to Beckles' greater emphasis on the political legitimacy of the cause, rather than on historical particularities about how the movement began and evolved. Yet, very important in Beckles point of view, are the writings of Trinidadian historian (and later statesman) Eric Williams, who according to Beckles paved the way for the Caribbean reparations movement with his *“Capitalism and Slavery”* (1944). In this book, Williams did not directly advocate reparations but established that *“Britain's magnificent, enviable industrial civilization emerged from the foul waters of colonial slavery”* (2013:4). In Beckles' perspective, European suppression of the cause of the Reparations Movement, is

understood as a continuation of colonial patterns of European interventionism and/or a colonial mindset, and he traces this up until the present. While Beckles' account of the movement may provide some introduction to, in particular, the more recent history of the movement in the Caribbean, he only shortly mentions anecdotally earlier roots of the movement like *"the Rastafarian representatives who had advocated for reparations for many years"* (225), and does not provide details about the intellectual history of the Caribbean Black Reparations Movement overall.

In a thorough exposition of the international (or "Global African") Black Reparations Movement, Nora Wittmann (2013) traces the demand for reparations, from resistance and revolts by Black people during slavery, to the most recent official demands. While her assessment only serves as her background for elaborate arguments for Black reparations, it underlines how accusations of reparations being equal to victimization needs extensive evidence to be disproved. With a background in law, Wittmann's strength lies in her discussions of contemporary law regarding reparations, in relation to the historical patterns of white supremacy and colonialism, and her historical treatment of the Reparations Movement is based upon the works by other authors. But her overall scope is not unlike that of the present author. Although a White European by descend, Wittmann writes herself directly into the radical traditions of Garveyism and Rastafari, both of which shall be touched upon later in this thesis.

While Aiyetoro & Davis focus mainly on the movement in the US, Beckles focus on the case for British reparations to former Caribbean colonies, and Wittmann tries to encompass both Caribbean and US historical movements for Black Reparations. Yet, with all differences aside, all these mentioned scholars seem to position themselves more or less as a part of the historical, legal and political debate about present claims for Black reparations.

5.2 Scholars not arguing for or against reparations

There is also academic literature studying the movement, without taking clear sides. The key difference between this and the first category of scholarship, is that scholars of this category are not directly agitating for the cause in their works.

John Torpey, who is professor of sociology and history, is one of these scholars. In his article he does not choose sides as explicitly as Beckles and the other scholars mentioned above, but his sympathy for the movement is evident throughout, especially in the end of the text, where he discusses how or if the Reparations Movement may become successful in achieving their aims, implying that they indeed have ethics on their side. He concludes that the idea of reparations is “*one of the most important developments in recent human rights discourse*” (2002:184). Torpey, not unlike Aiyetoro and Davis is solely examining the US movement, and traces its beginning to General Sherman's promise of “*40 acres and a mule*” (Torpey, 2002:173). In the same line of reasoning and scope we have Martha Biondi, professor of African American Studies and History at Northwestern University (n.d.). She traces the movement back to “*former slaves*” while not referencing any of these specific cases, and continues with listing her genealogy of the American Black Reparations Movement: Henry McNeal Turner, (Queen Mother) Audley Moore, Martin Luther King Jr., James Forman along with the organizations The Black Panther Party, Republic of a New Africa and N'COBRA (2003:7). Similarly to Torpey's article, Biondi does not delve into much detail about the specific contexts of the emergence of the movement, but is more interested in present actuality and viability of the demands for reparations. Biondi is not directly endorsing Black reparations, but it is still clear that she supports the basic propositions of the movement:

“The philosophical and tactical brilliance of reparations lies in its synthesis of moral principles and political economy ... reparations represents the culmination of a long African American human rights struggle” (2003:5).

Torpey and Biondi are not explicitly activist-scholars, but they are both implying support for the movement. Still, these texts are not explicit in their individual judgments on how (and if) reparations should be implemented.

5.3 Academic Anti-Reparationist Commentary

While not much, if anything at all, has been written academically about the history of the Black Reparations Movement by sceptic, conservative or anti-reparatory authors, I find it meaningful to introduce two very different texts written by US authors against the present claim for reparations. For while works

on the movement often directly support the movements claims, there is also a considerable public debate about the idea of reparations, and academics of different backgrounds comment on this debate.

The first I will introduce here is the American conservative scholar David Horowitz. In his book (2002), to be termed political science rather than history, he argues for a number of problems (many of them historical) inherent in the idea of Black reparations, as well as what he understands as a dominant left-wing bias, with a concomitant focus on unnecessary or even discriminatory concerns for minorities in the US. Thus, his book is an attack against the Black Reparations Movement, American liberals and liberal educational institutions.

Another anti-reparationist academic is Harvard professor Henry Louis Gates Jr., who is an African American historian well-known for his scholarly works centering around African American history. Gates has not written extensively on the subject of reparations specifically in academic contexts. However, in 2010 he published a newspaper piece in the New York Times wherein he argued against reparations primarily because of what he understands as wide scale African involvement in the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. His solution to the “*slavery blame game*” is to

“attribute responsibility and culpability where they truly belong, to white people and black people, on both sides of the Atlantic, complicit alike in one of the greatest evils in the history of civilization” (Gates Jr, 2010).

Gates is an example of an African American scholar who does not accept a concept of a basic opposition between Whites and Blacks when it comes to reparations. While there is obviously a difference between peer-reviewed historical works, and newspaper pieces I have chosen to include Gates' perspective in this account, as the historical debate over Black reparations is not isolated to academic circles. Rather the debate is very much alive in the public debate in the US. What both Horowitz and Gates exemplifies are the conservative and liberal forces in academia who are not really interested in the intellectual history or the general history of the Black Reparations Movements, but rather entering the present political debate on the basis of their scholarly

authorities. They both conclude that, through historical arguments, Black reparations is morally wrong and impossible.

5.4 Discussion of the Historiography

I have now reviewed examples of the multifarious literature on the Black Reparations movement. As we have seen, the Black Reparations Movement has been studied to a relatively high extent, however mostly in the US context. Quite a number of scholars of law have studied the movement, and have put some work into their historical chapters. This includes Aiyetoro & Davis and Wittmann. Generally speaking, studies directly about the movement with a focus outside the US appear, but these studies does not enjoy the same level of distribution globally as the ones centered around the US dittos, in widely read journals etc. Beckles' book, which focuses on the Caribbean case, is one example of these texts. Only a small portion of the historiography is about the Caribbean. This might be due to (1) the specific racial history of the US and the recent claims by Black individuals and groups in this country, making it more relevant to both researchers and readers. And (2) the relatively higher level of interest in American history and matters compared to the interest in the Caribbean ditto. While I find it applaudable that many of these scholars study the question of reparations in the US context, I think the point is missed, if interest in reparations is limited to one group of Black people in one specific society. As Africans were taken captives from different African societies, likewise they were dehumanized and enslaved in different European colonies, including different parts of North America, the Caribbean as well as South America. Thus a broad study of the transnational movement should not only include "African Americans" but as Wittmann suggests, "*Global Africa*".

The gallery of different organizations and individuals engaged in Black Reparations through time is very diverse and sometimes contradictory to each other in their views and aims. Yet in the academic field studying this movement there is a large majority of supporters and a minor group of non-positioned scholars of the movement, either tracing it to revolts of the enslaved during slavery, to free Black people pre-Emancipation or as emerging parallel to

Emancipation in the US. In the Caribbean, Beckles also interprets revolts as the earliest form of claims for reparations in the Caribbean. The scholarly group which I have called the “anti-reparationists” have not really entered the historical discussion at the same level as the two other groups, but they are engaging in the present socio-political discussion on reparations, thereby being examples of the disagreement which exists in the populations of the US and the Caribbean. At the same time it is striking how the history of the Black Reparations Movement is largely ignored by most conservative historians, while being well documented by historians sympathizing with the cause. It is clear to see that the subject of the Black Reparations Movement is largely understood as a politicized subject, and therefore accusations of ideology and political bias are not uncommon in the public sphere. Yet in my view, studying a subject which has obvious socio-political implications is not a problem, as long as it is done academically sound.

My study contributes to the field in a number of ways. While most studies have a national focus and often tend to put more focus on the most recent debates, I am connecting the US and the Caribbean parts of the movement as a transnational entity and I am focusing on the development of the intellectual history of the movement and its reception. Also, I will use a number of sources which has not been drawn upon in other works about the movement. I understand my own scope in this thesis as being most in line with the scholars Aiyetoro & Davis and Wittmann in their combination of a solid empirical basis from the time of slavery until the present, as well as a critical position towards both the political and Euro-American cultural status quo which is understood as being based upon colonial narratives, institutions and logics. In this manner the perspective becomes two-fold, as it not only focuses on the conditions for people in former times, but also puts this into the context of present conditions and debates in relation to Black reparations. While my specific focus is new in a way, the problematics of writing history about colonialism, postcolonialism and former enslaved groups has been addressed in different academic fields. In the following I will provide an account of my academic position in this thesis.

6. HOW TO APPROACH COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL HISTORY: THE DECOLONIAL POSITION

“Until the lions have their own historians, the history of the hunt will always glorify the hunter”

— *Chinua Achebe*

In this chapter I discuss the problem of writing history about a people and movement, which has not had “history” on their side so far. Quite a significant number of “canonized” historians and scholars of related traditions have promoted the idea of Europe and Europeans as a specifically progressive place and group; a model for the rest of the world. Just to mention a few, Karl Marx, Max Weber (Blaut, 2000), and more recent historians such as Eric Hobsbawm, have all relied on strongly biased ethnocentric propositions in their historical analyses, and they all have had significant impact on the practices and interpretations of the evolution of our present world and the source of global “modernity”. To illustrate my point I will quote the late Hobsbawm from his work “The Age of Empire” (1987):

“Everything that distinguishes the world of today from the world of the Ming and Mughal emperors and the Mamelukes originated in Europe – whether in science and technology, in the economy, in ideology and politics, or in the institutions and practices of public and private life. Even the concept of the «world» as a system of human communication embracing the entire globe could not exist before the European conquest of the western hemisphere and the emergence of a capitalist economy. This is what fixes the situation of Europe in world history” (Cited in Rüger, 2013:419).

While Hobsbawm is a known Marxist and definitely has not set out to bash all non-Europeans, his interpretation equals to stating that without Europeans, the whole world would be “backwards”. It is self-evident that the European continent has contributed to the emergence of the present order of world politics, science etc., maybe especially because of colonialism as Hobsbawm underlines, but the notion that “modernity's” way of being is due only to Europeans is really a fantasy. Other historians have deemed Africa irrelevant to human history per se, such as the Oxford historian Eric Jones (1981:153 and 154). Of course in more

recent historical works, these racial-ethnic biases is not as widespread, as the historical field as a whole has become more globally-oriented and less motivated to deify Europeans as the main actor throughout human history. It has become less legitimate to propose these Eurocentrist beliefs blatantly. Yet, the examples of Hobsbawm and Jones underlines the fact that general histories of the mainstream have been extremely Eurocentrist until recently, which has led scholars to suggest that Eurocentrism is still an issue in academia (Maeso & Araújo, 2015:2). Especially when it comes to what is not brought forth in the light, what is omitted in Euro-American history-writing (Keita, 2000).

So in what manner are we to treat the Black Reparations Movement through time, for the study to be both adequate and fruitful academically? To put a label on the positional lens, which I believe I am interpreting the historical reparations problematic through, it can be termed “decolonial history”. With this I mean a historical inquiry which takes offset in a critical analysis of structural and cultural phenomena with roots in European colonialism, and which thus focuses attention on the unjust social, cultural and political effects of such. In this manner, decolonial history can be seen as a near-relative to postcolonial history. Of central writers in the latter field, Dipesh Chakrabarty's call to “*provincialize Europe*” (2000) and Robert Young's expansive discussion of the problem of Eurocentrist history (1990) has contributed significantly. A central part of their endeavors is to deconstruct the notion of a mythic Europe as the central agent, and bringer of modernity in the world. This academic perspective has been rooted in the Indian experience. Decolonial history-writing on the other hand takes offset in the Latin American experience. Here, a logical consequence of the fundamental critical diagnostic of “history” is that academic studies are to counteract and transcend the damaging effects of colonialism, through what Walter Mignolo calls “*delinking*”, thereby exercising “*epistemic disobedience*”:

“Epistemic disobedience takes us to a different place, to a different “beginning” (not in Greece, but in the responses to the “conquest and colonization” of America and the massive trade of enslaved Africans), to spatial sites of struggles and building rather than to a new temporality within the same space” (2011:45).

This means that the carrying out of decolonial research presupposes a certain normativity, that of taking present power relations and knowledge hierarchies serious and therefore actively “*decolonizing*” academic studies. This should not be confused with rejecting all academic methods or notions of scientificity. Rather, as a scholarly position, decolonial history-writing is an account of our common world, but with the very important pre-understanding of the voluminous negative effects of colonialism and all its forms of violence, hatred and oppression, up until the present, based upon the experiences of the former colonized. It could be seen as an attempt to critically revise the Eurocentrism of colonial history and ultimately to enlighten the enlightenment. Thus “*epistemic disobedience*” is not disobedience to all epistemology as such, but to what is the dominant Eurocentric way of knowing. This understanding entails a higher sensitivity to the voices and interpretations of the racialized, indigenous or subaltern agents in the world. In other words, from the position of decoloniality we “ought” to let the perspectives of the (former) colonized and enslaved inspire and direct the ongoing study of their own situation in the world today, instead of falling into easy explanations or established Eurocentrist narratives of history. In my particular context this will refer to the possibilities in understanding reparations, not just as a political claim of a minority, but as an example of a knowledge and social consciousness which has been subdued and fought through time. Also, it highlights the nature of history as an identity-sensitive discipline, and how the past is understood and “used” very differently by different groups. This choice of lens not only reflects a need to academically position my own study but also an attempt to heighten the level of the historical discussion on the reparations movement through decolonial angles.

Another element, which I consider central to my approach for studying the Black Reparations Movement, is an understanding of intergenerational continuity and responsibility. Notions of historical continuity or discontinuity are fundamental elements in all historical research and political discussion. Australian-based philosopher Jana Thompson identifies three ways in which societies are intergenerational at a foundational level. Thompson states that firstly, it is evident that generations overlap. Skills, values and practices are passed on from older to

younger members of a community (Thompson, 2009:204). In this manner cultural elements live on through time, having profound impact on formation of identities across generations. Secondly, Thompson underlines how there are interests across generations. Concern about the well-being of descendants, survival of one's community and values, and even demands for the action of descendants. Agreements, contracts and wills are all examples of the norm of intergenerational interests (Thompson, 2009:205). Thirdly, Thompson suggests that the act of building, maintaining and reforming institutions all rely on an intergenerational identity, as opposed to what she calls "*the myth of the social contract*" as "*political institutions cannot be built from scratch in each generation*" (Ibid.). According to Thompson these points entail that intergenerational communities "*gives intergenerational duties to its members*" (Ibid.) - even when it comes to historical obligations to past generations. Thus she argues for the possibility, or indeed the appropriateness of working towards repairing unjust acts in the past as well as their continued after-effects.

Thompson's hypothesis is drawn up against those theorists and politicians who assert that the present institutions only has to deal with issues from their own lifespans. This group, which intersect with anti-reparationists, Thompson polemically dubs "*ahistorical liberals*" (2009:197). She define their basic propositions in the following manner:

"[1.] the institutions, principles and ideals of citizens of a liberal democratic political society can be justified without reference to their historical past ...

[2.] citizens of such polity have no collective historical obligations or entitlements" (Ibid.)

These propositions could be seen as the general socio-philosophical orthodoxy in Euro-American societies concerning present institutions of power and historical injustices (Thompson, 2009:200-201). Thompson's theorization of the adequate basis of acting with respect to the past works as a backdrop to the historical claims of reparationists through time in this thesis.

7. CENTRAL CONCEPT: COLONIALITY OF POWER

In this chapter I will present a concept with relevance to the discussion of the historical development of the reparations movement and its dialogue with Euro-America. The question of present and historical power dynamics between (former) colonizer or enslaver and (former) colonized or enslaved has been addressed from many angles in academia, especially since Edward Said's "*Orientalism*" (1978). In the following section a short presentation of the concept "*coloniality*" is given, as this will be used throughout the rest of the thesis. At a practical level the role of the concept in this thesis is that of providing a contextual frame around the subject of the reparations movement and the debates this movement initiates and takes part in, and at the same time I employ the concepts to help interpret and organize my findings.

I base my general reading of the problem of reparations on the concept of "*the coloniality of power*" (Quijano, 2000). This concept was coined by Aníbal Quijano, who is a Peruvian professor of sociology and a humanist scholar, who has worked with colonialism and imperialism at least in the last four decades. He is considered a central scholar of the emerging decolonial studies tradition as well as within Latin American subaltern studies circles.

At a basic level "*the coloniality of power*" relates to the observation that the present world order is defined by hierarchies of power, which was built by Europeans since the 1500s. As Quijano states, the power dynamics and racial division of the world is of a "*colonial origin and character, but it has proven to be more durable and stable than the colonialism in whose matrix it was established*" (2000:533). According to Quijano, coloniality is characterized by the modern conceptualization of "race", which did not exist prior to European colonialism. This notion of race, was based upon Eurocentric knowledge production, created deliberately to support and uphold European colonialism, through a racial hierarchy of power. In effect the racism and power dynamics of coloniality outlived colonialism, and is thus more powerful in the world than present Euro-American colonialism, as socio-cultural effects of colonialism and slavery are still influencing the lives of people in many parts of the world.

Quijano argues that the expanding “*white culture*” developed modern capitalism through control of the markets. Through this new western European group identity, Europeans dominated the world market for centuries as a geopolitical entity. As one example of the historical traces from colonialism, Quijano connects the pattern of payed white labor and unpaid indigenous or Black labor during colonialism and slavery with the present so-called “racial wage gap”:

“... the lower wages “inferior races” receive in the present capitalist centers for the same work as done by whites cannot be explained as detached from the racist social classification of the world’s population—in other words, as detached from the global capitalist coloniality of power” (2000:539).

Accordingly, the present global situation of economic inequality is understood as a continuation of colonial roles. But European dominance was not only developed through economical means, or even raw violence. To a high extent coloniality was created in a socio-cultural sense, especially when it came to ideas of modernity connected to race:

“Europeans imagine[d] themselves as the exclusive bearers, creators, and protagonists of that modernity. What is notable about this is not that the Europeans imagined and thought of themselves and the rest of the species in that way—something not exclusive to Europeans—but the fact that they were capable of spreading and establishing that historical perspective as hegemonic within the new intersubjective universe of the global model of power” (2000:543).

This simultaneously meant that oppressed populations (indigenous as well as the enslaved) not only were denied their humanity, but also their own knowledge production. European norms were erected as the standard. According to Quijano, the colonial setup of a racial hierarchy with White people in the top and Black people in the bottom, combined with advanced weapons, control of the world market and appropriation of the Eurocentric notion of modernity has lived on in present power structures. This is *the coloniality of power*. Taking the analysis of Quijano's *coloniality of power* seriously leads to a clearer understanding of the legacy of colonialism, its long-term influence on the world, in how it has produced centers and peripheries of power and patterns of what is legitimate and what is not in both social and political spheres. These patterns seem to appear very clearly when it comes to the question of reparations. When Jamaica, an economically unstable former colonized society with a Black majority, directed a

demand for reparations to their former colonizer, the UK, in 2015, the British Prime Minister Cameron could bluntly dismiss discussing the possibility or legitimacy of reparations, urging Jamaica to “*move on*” (Riley-Smith, 2015) and thereby urge them to accept the present gap between the two countries in wealth and power. I understand this relation as *coloniality of power* in practice, as the official British position not only accepts the current situation, but also refuses to change these colonial patterns of power. While the concept is not directly addressing the demand for reparations, the *coloniality of power* relates to the intergenerational reality, reparationists speak into. Thus, through Quijano's perspective a discussion of reparations as a legitimate position can be opened.

In the third temporality, I will engage Ann Laura Stoler's concept of *colonial aphasia* (2011). This concept relates to the problem of Europeans struggling to link past and present inequalities when it comes to former colonized groups. As this is a theorization of empirical attitudes towards historical intergenerationality in the postcolonial context, I do not understand this concept as being central to all parts of my analysis. Instead, the concept is introduced and discussed in the analysis of the third temporality, in its right context.

8. ANALYSIS

8.1. Part One. “Reconcile Us to Them”: Black Rebels, Abolitionists, and “Ex-slaves”, from 1600-

In the 16th and 17th centuries, Europeans expanded their political dominion over vast areas of land as well as over other people, in the effort to generate massive amounts of wealth. Before Africans were imported as enslaved workforce the great majority of the indigenous populations were either slaughtered or infected by European diseases causing millions of deaths. The decision to systematically import captives from western Africa, first pioneered by the Catholic kingdoms of Spain and Portugal, marked the beginning of a new chapter for the Black Diaspora and for racial politics as such (Parris, 2015:2).

The import of enslaved Africans would become the largest case of forced migration in known human history (Hawthorne, 2010:1). According to present consensus an estimated 12,5 million people was transported from Africa to the Americas by Euro-Americans in the span of Trans-Atlantic slavery (Eltis & Richardson, 2010; The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database, n.d.). But this estimate only considers people who were transported over the Middle Passage. The total number of enslaved Africans in the Americas was much higher. For example the North American colonies (which were to become the US) imported about 300.000 enslaved people from Africa from 1626 to 1875 (The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database, n.d.). But at the US census of 1860 the number of living enslaved Blacks registered in the country was 3.953.760 (US Census Bureau, 2006:132). Thus chattel slavery did not affect 12,5 million people only, but many more.

I need not dwell too much on the innumerable misdeeds done to Black people during slavery, yet as these atrocities lies at the heart of claims for reparations, it is necessary to outline some tendencies in how the enslaved were mistreated and dehumanized. While many different slavery-institutions have existed since antiquity, Euro-American led chattel slavery differed fundamentally from earlier

forms of slavery globally, as this practice effectively dehumanized millions of people over hundreds of years, and legitimized this through new racial theories of White superiority and Black inferiority (Beckles, 2013:18). Also in its permanency, this institution was different from African, Arab and other forms of historical slavery, as children of the enslaved would be born free, and theoretically the enslaved in these systems in most cases could enjoy some level of social mobility or even become a part of the household, they formerly were enslaved by, which was not the case in Euro-American chattel slavery (Adu-Boahen, 2012:168). In other words, the term “*slave*” did not signify the same status in the Euro-American colonies and in West Africa, where most enslaved people were brought from. While “owners” of the enslaved and proponents for the brutal system often painted an idyllic picture of the system, sources from former enslaved people have described their everyday lives in detail (Brooks, 2004:25, 30).

The nightmarish transportation of the Middle Passage where many people died due to sickness and suicide was followed by the breakup of families at the auctions, where the enslaved would be removed from his or her family or friends. After being bought, the enslaved would meet general dehumanization, as they had no rights, and would not get trials if they were suspected of a crime, and generally they would be abused as beasts of burden. Physically, the condition for most enslaved Blacks would be that of malnutrition and/or starvation, extremely violent punishments such as whippings (the most widespread and frequent form of punishment), amputation and branding just to name a few (Dunn, 2012:240, Berlin, 1998:150). Rape and forced pregnancies were also a premise for many enslaved women (Dunn, 2012:253). Adding to all this was the general loss of original names, as new names were given in most cases (Burton, 1999:41) as well as the loss of contact to the birthplaces and/or places of origin of the enslaved. Finally, the enslaved were generally being kept away from information, in order for them to be easier to control. While there were variations in the treatment of the enslaved, and some planters were treating the enslaved more “humanely” than others, the general picture was that of hell for the enslaved. Thus the history of the assault of the Trans-Atlantic trade in enslaved humans and slavery in the colonies marked the first stages of the experience of coloniality for the enslaved.

But these conditions were not accepted by the enslaved. In reality, there were always Black people fighting the institution of Euro-American chattel slavery, and for self-determination, operating with certain ideas of justice to right this massive wrong. Rebellions of the enslaved were not only about Black self-worth and humanity. It was also about racial justice. Thus, the intellectual history of the Black Reparations Movement can in fact be traced back to the earliest era of European colonialism and Trans-Atlantic slavery. Numerous examples of rebellions throughout the colonies testify the broad contempt for the hellish institution. As Winbush states, in North America alone, there were more than 250 documented rebellions of the enslaved before the American Civil War of 1861, on average more than one every year, but the true number may have been much higher due to the tendency to suppress information about these rebellions because of White economic and political embarrassment (Winbush, 2009:19). An explicit claim for reparations was not on the table. Instead, the high level of insurrections, escape, anti-slavery polemics and sabotage by enslaved and free Black people in this era bear witness to the reparatory stance of the enslaved. In most areas and times throughout North America and the Caribbean, the enslaved were forbidden to learn reading and writing, especially the latter, in the slavers' fear that they might utilize these skills to rebel (Hager, 2013:31). Therefore, unfortunately we do not have many written sources by Black rebels or Maroons in the early struggle for redress. But we have some important writings, especially of Black abolitionists, which were spread to a large audience and eventually influenced Black and White opinion.

Many insurrections were not moved by hopes for reconciliation as much as anger and hatred for their inhumane treatment. Gabriel Prosser, a Black enslaved blacksmith planned a rebellion in Richmond, Virginia in 1800 which would eventually fail. But his encouragement for taking part in the uprising was *“to fight the white people for freedom”* (Quoted in Bay, 2000:140), and this fight was a very physical one. This violent response to the extremely violent slavery-system was not unique. Employing the racial rhetoric of Euro-America at the time, Black people would fight again, as rebels at the Jamaican Morant Bay Rebellion of 1865

were reported to have said: “*We will kill every white and Mulatto man in the bay ... I must cleave from the whites and cleave to the blacks*” (Quoted in Price, 2009:22). These insurrections could be understood as attempts to destroy the order of coloniality. But there were other forms of resistance to the emerging system of racial coloniality.

Beginning in the 16th century some individuals and groups managed to escape from their oppressors, forming societies of their own. These people were called Maroons. Maroon societies existed throughout North and South America, including the Caribbean, virtually everywhere plantation slavery were in effect. In a certain sense, their endeavors to turn their situation into something acceptable could be understood as “taking” reparations, as they would occupy a piece of land in colonially “owned” territory and institute their own laws and societal structures. Also, they would steal goods such as food and weapons as well as they would liberate enslaved people from their former “*masters*”, showing both a socio-political claim for self-government, and material claims to uphold such government. Maroons especially became notorious for their guerrilla warfare tactics against the colonial system, showing a high level of military discipline (Kopytoff, 1978:288). Throughout the 18th century a number of Maroon societies eventually signed treaties with the European colonial powers, in order for them to maintain autonomy. But these treaties authored by the Europeans also forced the Maroons to help suppress rebellions of the enslaved and to return all new “runaways” to the plantations, paradoxically making them on the one hand self-governing Black societies, who fought for their freedom, but in effect also collaborators of the colonial system (Bilby, 2012:42). Nonetheless, Maroon societies can be understood as a part of the early Black struggle against slavery and colonialism, maintaining a Black identity under a system of massive dehumanization and implicitly fighting for redress. Lockett argues that Maroon military victories against colonial forces would have far-reaching consequences, as an anti-slavery statement eventually inspiring British abolitionists such as William Wilberforce and others in their work (1999:7).

Whereas rebellions and *maronnage* were not centered around explicit claims for reparations, as much as being direct evidence of anti-slavery sentiments and a

drive for compensatory measures among enslaved Blacks, Black abolitionists were more clear in their demands towards Euro-America for redress.

To lay a foundation for understanding the intellectual and religious climate wherein early claims for reparations were often raised, I will introduce the socio-religious current of Ethiopianism. Both in North America, the Caribbean and in Africa Ethiopianist ideas spread throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, forming an important component of many Black people's identities, while not being professed by the majority of the Black Diaspora (Price, 2003:37). This socio-religious perspective was based upon, and was indeed a reaction to, the Black experience of Euro-American colonialism and slavery through a biblical African-oriented Christianity. The designation “Ethiopianism” refers to the role of Ethiopia in a biblical perspective, and came to signify a common Black identifier and a source of empowerment for Blacks being oppressed by White Christians. The prophetic and polemical elements of the movement constituted a significant promise to its proponents:

“Ethiopianism was millenarian and messianic from the outset because it predicted the fall of slavery in the West, the rise of Africa in the future, the return of Blacks to their imaged glory in precolonial Africa, all under the direction of a coming Black Messiah and redeemer” (Price, 2003:36).

Thus during slavery, Ethiopianism was an inspiration and a point of mobilization for Black Christians in Africa and the Black Diaspora, and also a basis for critique of the White hegemony of power, *coloniality*, and what was seen as hypocritical, bigoted and ahistorical White Christianity. These currents would become a central element of inspiration for movements such as Pan-Africanism and Black spiritual movements such as Rastafari and Black Nationalism (Price, 2003:48). As we shall see many early advocates for reparations were also Ethiopianists, and many later reparationists were inspired by Ethiopianists.

As mentioned above, among the early direct calls for reparative measures, many were Black abolitionists. One of them was Ottobah Cugoano, born in the country now known as Ghana. At age 13 he was taken by slave traders, and was shipped to the French colony of Grenada in the Caribbean, where he was enslaved.

Eventually he was brought to England by an English merchant. In 1772, following the Sommerset's case, where inland chattel slavery was outlawed in the Britain, Cugoano was set free and then began working as an abolitionist, organizing in the Black abolitionist group of educated free Blacks, The Sons of Africa (Wheelock, 2016:26). In 1787 he published his *“Thoughts and Sentiments on the Evil and Wicked Traffic of the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species”*, a work in which he argued against colonial chattel slavery and for the emancipation of all enslaved Blacks. As many other Black and White abolitionists, Cugoano's account was rooted in a Christian perspective, but he was in no way impressed by Euro-American Eurocentric Christianity, critiquing European's misappropriation of the Scriptures in the arena of colonial politics. Besides Christianity, Cugoano's work was arguably inspired by Enlightenment ideals and concepts. These two milestones are very clear in the following quote, where Cugoano presents his views on Trans-Atlantic slavery, which was called

“wholly and totally inimical to every idea of justice, equity, reason and humanity. What I intend to advance against that evil, criminal and wicked traffic of enslaving men, are only some Thoughts and Sentiments which occur to me, as being obvious from the Scriptures of Divine Truth” (Cugoano, 1787:3).

After an account of his own life and arguments for why chattel slavery was morally wrong, Cugoano advanced his proposal for some manner of reparation from the Europeans. He asked directly for teachers and priests, as bringers of European science and Christianity to areas in West Africa:

“This would be doing great good to the Africans, and be a kind restitution for the great injuries that they have suffered. But still I fear no good can be done near any of the European settlements, while such a horrible and infernal traffic of slavery is carried on by them” (Ibid. iv).

As much as European-style education and christianization of Africa might not seem as a adequate solution to the problem of colonialism and racial slavery according to today's common sense, what is interesting here is the fact that Cugoano took for granted that *restitution* is due to Africans. To Cugoano the claim of reparations was a given, which he supported with the Bible, while he also stressed the importance of former enslaved people's necessary Christian forgiveness for the enormous sins of the European world in relation to Trans-Atlantic slavery. Cugoano's proposal was then a peaceful attempt to initiate a

British discussion on the possibility of some sort of reparations, but his idea was never listened to by the British in power.

A contemporary to Cugoano situated in Boston, had more radical visions for Black people in the Diaspora. Prince Hall, who was formerly enslaved, also fought in the American Revolutionary War and formed the first “African” Freemason Lodge. He was an ardent advocate of the emerging “*Back-to-Africa movement*”. In the same year as the publication of Cugoano's “*Thoughts and Sentiments*”, Hall directed a petition to the general Court, backed by seventy-five signatures, displaying a strong sense of African identity and claim to return to Africa:

“We, or our ancestors have been taken from all our dear connections, and brought from Africa and put into a state of slavery in this country ... we find ourselves, in many respects, in a very disagreeable and disadvantageous circumstances; most of which must attend us so long as we and our children live in America ... This, and other considerations ... induce us earnestly to desire to return to Africa, our native country ... where we shall live among our equals and be more comfortable and happy” (Hall [1787] in Kaplan, 1973:186).

Hall and his group's idea was to establish a colony somewhere in Africa, where to formerly enslaved Blacks from North America could repatriate. The idea was to choose selected Blacks from the US to be pioneers and establish agricultural projects and other initiatives, in order to break free from the US:

“this shall be effected by a number of Blacks ... This leads us to observe that we are poor and utterly unable to prosecute this scheme or to return to Africa without assistance. Money is wanted to enable those who shall be appointed, to go to Africa, and procure lands to settle on; and to obtain passage for us and our families; and to furnish us with the necessary provisions, and the utensils and articles that have been mentioned” (Ibid. 188).

Whereas Cugoano asked for help to develop African countries, Hall and his group desired help to detach from the US system of chattel slavery. While the petition was understandably written in a diplomatic tone, it is evident that the underlying premise for Hall's proposal was the problem of White injustices towards Blacks, and therefore a clear sense of entitlement to the funds proposed. Like Cugoano, Hall also stressed the need for establishment of Christian institutions, but the significant difference was that in Hall's proposal, these

religious initiatives was to be implemented by Blacks. Thereby, Hall's call to US-funded Black repatriation to Africa was both a call for compensation from the US, but also for acknowledgement of Blacks as Christian equals despite race. One thing Cugoano and Hall had in common was the fact that neither of their proposals were even considered by the White authorities they tried to influence.

Not long after Cugoano and Hall's writings, Blacks in Haiti would shock the Euro-American colonial powers to their foundations. The Black majority in the French colony of Saint-Dominique turned against their colonial rulers during the unstable times of the French Revolution. After many battles with shifting allegiances between Spain, the UK and France, the Black rebels turned out victorious, resulting in Haiti's declaration of independence of 1804 (Ghachem, 2012:2). The Haitian Revolution of 1791-1804, and the subsequent establishment of a Black republic in the Caribbean created a new sense of hope among enslaved and free Blacks in the Caribbean and the US. Being the only really successful and lasting rebellion of the enslaved, as well as a Black state formation in the Caribbean before “decolonization”, the revolution and establishment of the Republic of Haiti signaled a world of new possibilities for Blacks in the Atlantic world. If Maroon settlements were in a sense “taking reparations” as I have argued above, the establishment of the Haitian nation was a consolidation of the taking of reparations, creating a new law abolishing not only chattel slavery, but also racial hierarchies categorically.

The victory of Black Haitians did not come for free, quite on the contrary. In 1825, not long after Haiti's independence, the French king Charles X enforced Haitian president Boyer with military power to sign a treaty, binding Haiti to an indemnity of 150 million francs² to France to cover losses of the enslaved work force and the colony itself, for Haiti in turn to be acknowledged by France as a legitimate State (Schuller, 2007:149). Haiti paid off on this debt until 1947. In this way, the colonial power stated that breaking the colonial order would not be tolerated without a counter-demand for massive reparations for the loss of

² The amount was later changed to 90 million francs corresponding to approximately \$20 billion in present value (Remington & Garcia-Zamor, 2016:242).

enslaved workers. The major debt evidently was a stumbling block to the newborn State, necessitating large loans from French banks. France was not the only country hesitating to accept the legitimacy of the Haitian state. The US would not acknowledge Haitian independence before 1862, almost sixty years after the country's declaration of independence (Alexander, 2010:77). In other words, Euro-America had a hard time coming to terms with this new phenomenon, a genuine Black State in the West, established by former enslaved people. Yet, Haiti was not stopped in their endeavors to nation-build the country. Indeed throughout the 19th century it became an example of Black achievement, in spite of the fierce stunting of their economy by the French. Haiti became a beacon of hope for many Blacks, as an example of Black self-empowerment and self rule, and therefore it also became a popular destination for emigration of free Blacks from North America (Power-Greene, 2014:18).

In 1816, the establishment of the American Colonization Society (ACS), complicated the reparationist case for Black resettlement in Africa. This White-led organization sought to repatriate free Blacks in the US to the West Coast of Africa, to a colony which would become the state of Liberia in 1848. While the ACS was a multifaceted venture, with many different internal views on slavery, the organization's main goal was to remove free Blacks from the US (Maffly-Kipp, 2010:50). The society counted members of the highest slave-owning US elites, including president Thomas Jefferson (Spooner, 2014:562), and was thus a reflection of this segment's persuasions. While a number of Blacks were repatriated by the ACS, among many Blacks the organization was not trustworthy. Indeed it may have been hard not to be suspicious of this new White willingness to help free Blacks emigrate, when these same Blacks had just begun enjoying a minimum of ideals and rights which the US was formally based upon. Because of this, many US-based Black abolitionists turned away from advocating repatriation or emigration to Africa (Maffly-Kipp, 2010:157).

As mentioned earlier, the worldview of Ethiopianism with its critique of White Christians and claim of a glorious future for Blacks would characterize many early reparationists. One man who arguably was inspired by these currents and

who came to be a defining figure in the early calls for Black reparatory justice was the fiery character of David Walker. Walker was born a free Black in 1785 and was shocked at an early age by the practices of “slave-owners”, as he traveled through several US states. In the 1820's he settled in Boston, and set up a second-hand clothing shop. He organized as an abolitionist and became a well-known anti-slavery speaker. In 1829 he wrote his “*Appeal to The Colored Citizens of The World...*” which became an important mobilizing tool advocating freedom and justice for Black people in the US and the whole world (Crockett, 2001:306). In short, he declared the need for Black self-government, criticizing Euro-American racism and slavery as well as promoting a reparatory model for reconciliation between Whites and Blacks. While Walker drew a clear line between the racial groups of Whites and Blacks in the US, he insistently called Blacks “*Citizens*”, thereby stressing their rightful status as equals in the US, but at the same time he called Blacks, or the “*Colored ... the most wretched, degraded and abject set of beings that ever lived since the world began, down to the present day*” (Walker, [1830]2011:6). This was in no manner meant as an defeatist or essentialist self-diagnosis, rather it was a critique of the racist system which claimed to be lovers of liberty, but in reality were being firmly grounded in forced labor and dehumanization. In Walker's appeal, Black people had the humanity and the industriousness to succeed as a respectable group, but White Christian Americans on the other hand were condemned in harsh terms

“the white Christians of America, who hold us in slavery, (or, more properly speaking, pretend to Christianity,) treat us more cruel and barbarous than any Heathen nation did any people whom it had subjected” (Ibid.)

This passage, obviously being more of a message to other Blacks than an invitation to White-Black discussion displayed the anguish and pain of living in a country where a whole social/racial group was being dehumanized. Calling white Christians *pretenders* underscored the difficulty for Blacks (especially Christians) reconciling central Biblical notions as the commandment to *love the neighbor* and different nation's common *one blood* with US racism and slavery. The terms heathen and barbarian which had been used as a part of the colonialist and racist vocabulary of enslavement by Whites, were turned against the same, making

obvious the moral problems of White America of the day. Indeed, Walker was sure that the Almighty God would avenge the oppression of the enslaved:

“the God of the Etheopeans, has been pleased to hear our moans in consequence of oppression; and the day of our redemption from abject wretchedness draweth near, when we shall be enabled, in the most extended sense of the word, to stretch forth our hands to the LORD our GOD ... When God Almighty commences his battle on the continent of America, for the oppression of his people, tyrants will wish they never were born” (Walker, [1830]2011:6 and 47).

This Ethiopianist, apocalyptic prophecy of Walker portrayed God as being on the side of the Blacks, and being directly engaged in freeing the Blacks from the Whites as the Biblical narrative of God's redemption of the Israelites from the wicked Egyptians. Indeed, in Walker's perspective, the God of the Bible was the “*God of the Etheopeans*”. Insinuating a violent end of the racial oppression of Blacks, Walker envisioned a final *battle* where the White *tyrants* would be overthrown by the wrath of God.

While Walker certainly professed Ethiopianist beliefs, and being what could be termed a radical proto-Black Nationalist, he did not desire for the Black Diaspora to be returned to the African continent. He criticized the White-led initiative of the American Colonization Society, which sought to send former enslaved Blacks to Africa. Not because Africa was not a place which the Diaspora could turn back to, but because of the lack of reconciliation between Black and White people, and because free blacks according to Walker should not leave enslaved people of their own race in US *barbarity*. In the following passage of his appeal, Walker's notion of reparations was presented:

“Oh! I ask them, where is the most barren spot of land which they have given unto us? ... the plot [of sending free Blacks to Africa] is not for the glory of God, but on the contrary the perpetuation of slavery in this country, which will ruin them and the country forever, unless something is immediately done. Do the colonizationists think to send us off without first being reconciled to us? Do they think to bundle us up like brutes and send us off ... ? ... Have they not to be reconciled to us, or reconcile us to them, for the cruelties with which they have afflicted our fathers and us? Methinks colonizationists think they have a set of brutes to deal with, sure enough. Do they think to drive us from our country and homes, after having enriched it with our blood and tears, and keep back millions of our dear brethren, sunk in the most barbarous wretchedness, to dig up gold and silver for them and their children?” (Walker, [1830] 2011:15 and 67).

Walker lamented the fact that nothing was done for Blacks, and that chattel slavery seemed only to be strengthened in his lifetime. What was central to Walker was neither money, nor symbolic gestures such as apologies. Rather, his perspective was focused on the interrelation between Whites and Blacks, wherefore he stressed the importance of reconciliation before anything else. Therefore, Walker did not advocate repatriation, as he would rather have all Blacks set free in the US, and a grand national reconciliation program set in motion which ultimately would have the aim of making peace and creating another kind of society. The very comprehensive vision in Walker's appeal indeed was an ambitious one, and maybe rather than being a part of a dialogue with White America, it was a tool of mobilization and radicalization for free Blacks in the US working for abolition and reparations, being distributed to a relatively high extent. A negative side effect of Walker's *Appeal* was the ban on anti-slavery works both in the US North and South as well as prices on Walker's head dead or alive (Smith, 2003:23). Walker's mysterious passing in 1830, not long after the publication of his "*Appeal*" is still contested, but most historians agree that he was most likely poisoned by people of the pro-slavery lobby for his advocacy as a central Black abolitionist (Crockett, 2001:307). A hardcore radical of his time, Walker's appeal for racial reconciliation and Black self-government was the beginning of a long tradition of radicalism within reparationist circles.

Since the 1830s, through pressure from different sides, the Euro-American colonial powers began to issue declarations of emancipation of the enslaved in their territories. The reasons were more cynical and economic than humanist, but truly the outlawing of slavery was welcomed by the enslaved as well as White abolitionists. Thus the UK abolished slavery in its colonies in 1833, being in effect from the year after (Gross, 1980). France first outlawed slavery in its colonies in 1794, yet Napoleon I annulled the abolition in 1802. France then declared abolition of slavery in its colonies a second time in 1848. The same year, Denmark declared slavery outlawed. In the 1860's Spain, the Netherlands, the US and Portugal abolished slavery. Abolition of slavery in Brazil, independent from Portugal since 1822, would not come about before 1888 (Lovejoy, 2011:288). The formal freeing of the enslaved was a severe economic problem for

the colonial system, as the enslaved were seen by the colonial powers as objects with a monetary value. Therefore economic compensation to former “*slave-owners*” were very important to Euro-American authorities. There were different methods of compensating the loss of enslaved labour. The first was governmental payments, the second periods of continued forced labour by the enslaved, called “*apprenticeships*”, and finally and most rarely, land payments (Beauvois, 2016:1 and 2). In this manner, after abolition the UK paid £20 million in compensation to former “*slave-owners*” with apprenticeship-periods of 4-6 years. France paid what equaled to £5 million and Denmark paid no more than a total of £0,2, but plus a period of apprenticeship of 12 years (Beauvois, 2016:6). As money had been the central reason for establishing chattel slavery, money was the main concern in Euro-American debates about emancipation, being a concern for most Whites implicated in the chattel slavery system. Thus as Beauvois writes, economic compensation for the loss of enslaved workforce was really “*one of the essential components of emancipation*” (Beauvois, 2016:3), and were arguably a premise for the abolition of chattel throughout the Americas.

In the wake of abolition in the US, there were one very pressing problem for Black former enslaved people, “*freedmen*” or “*ex-slaves*”, as they were sometimes called. No form of compensation was paid to them, the victims of the inhumane and condemned institution. But in the end of the 19th century, Black voices began claiming compensation through law. One of the most well known examples of this was Callie House, a former enslaved Black woman active in the late 19th century and early 20th century in the US South. Through the organization she would eventually become the leader of, *The National Ex-Slave Mutual Relief, Bounty and Pension Association*, House and her partner Isiah H. Dickerson petitioned the federal government for payments in the form of pensions for former enslaved Blacks (Berry, 1972:223). Whereas most other reparationists throughout the 18th and 19th centuries formulated their demands for redress through religious morals, enlightenment ideals or direct militancy, “*ex-slave*” associations such as House's were strictly working within the terrain of law. At its height, this Association alone was counting membership of 300,000 “*ex-slaves*” (Wittmann, 2013:313). As House's association was only one among many similar initiatives (Hill, 1996:9),

these numbers underscore the relatively high Black support of compensation or reparatory measures in the US in the immediate aftermath of slavery. House was popular among some segments of southern Blacks in the US, but her success did not last. In 1918, after being deemed a threat to US authorities, House and other leaders of the Association were convicted of mail fraud, and for insinuating to their members that compensatory payments were imminent. House and the other leaders were found guilty, imprisoned, and the pension movement was halted (Berry, 1972:228, 230). House never reached the goal of state-funded reparations to former enslaved Blacks, but her association, along with the other similar initiatives, paved the way for future organizations' continued struggle for reparations. Also, the organizations working for compensation or pensions for former enslaved people, was different to all the earlier mentioned examples of advocates for reparations. In the 1890's, for the first time, claims of reparations were not based upon present oppression, but upon oppression in a recent past. At the same time new manifestations of White racism towards Blacks emerged, leading to the fact that racial oppression and disenfranchisement were really not in the past.

8.1.1 Sub-conclusion

While rebellions during slavery were violent racial politics of retaliation and compensation, others such as Maroons sought to take reparations from the colonialists and protest the White racist system through sabotage, but was eventually entangled in the same racial slavery-system, they themselves had escaped. Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries a strong undercurrent of explicit advocates for Black Reparations emerged, as in the examples of Cugoano, Walker and House, in some instances gaining a large following. The spiritual inspiration of Ethiopianism provided a link between White colonial society (the English translation of the Bible), Black self-identification and self-acknowledgement. The Bible was in most instances quoted to dismiss the religious and racial doctrines of White Euro-America and uphold the principles of the early reparationist's concepts of (divine) justice and equal rights between “*races*”. Central ideas of Black reparations in this time included taking land and materials, leading warfare against White establishment to obtain freedom or recognition,

petitioning for repatriation, demanding land, institutions and reconciliation, as well as boycotting the ACS as a way of upholding reparatory claims of equal rights. In many cases, in these early stages of the struggle for Black reparations, demands were formulated in a very humble, friendly or diplomatic tone, as in the cases of Cugoano, Hall and House, while there were also more radical voices like the many rebels throughout the US and the Caribbean, as well as Walker, criticizing *coloniality* more directly.

In the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries the Euro-American system of *coloniality* was initiated, expanded and institutionalized, defining racial relations in Europe and in the colonies. In most cases, racial hierarchies were at the center of human interaction. *Coloniality of power* in its dehumanizing commodification of life developed, and over time it was cemented. All of the selected examples of early reparatationists were in reality attempts to change, destabilize or even destroy *coloniality* (in the form of colonialism and slavery). *Coloniality* created a new way of being; blackness, the antithesis to White modernity, being always outside an imagined cultural or racial border. A Black minority which was not powerless or insignificant, did fight the system and its inhumanity or its racial theories from the beginning of the assault through resistance and claims of reparations. And these reparatationists in different times, forms and places were fought against severely by the Euro-American establishment; whether through war (as in the case of Maroon societies), execution (of rebels), forced economic debt in the case of Haiti, surveillance and possibly murder (Walker), being outrightly ignored (as Hall's proposal was), or law (as in the incarceration of House). Ironically, in a way the American Colonization Society sought to use repatriation, which were by many seen as a key element of reparations, as a means to prevent further claims of reparations, sending "home" the free, while millions were kept as chattel. The bans on antislavery works sparked by the distribution of Walker's appeal, the violent Euro-American reactions to rebellion, as well as France's monetary demand in the aftermath of the Haitian revolution, and also the ACS's scheme to get rid of free Blacks underlines the cognitive dissonance among Euro-American governments in understanding the problems of the institution of chattel slavery in relation to both European Christian and secular ideals.

8.2 Part Two. The Coming of Black Pressure: Radical Black Political and Spiritual Movements, from 1900-

At the dawn of the 20th century, Black people were now formally emancipated in North and South America and the Caribbean. But still there was a widespread feeling of bitterness and a sense of unfulfilled desires among Black people because of the continued oppression and racism. As the famous Black academic W.E.B. Du Bois commented in the context of the US:

“The Nation has not yet found peace from its sins; the freedman has not yet found in freedom his promised land. Whatever of good may have come in these years of change, the shadow of a deep disappointment rests upon the Negro people ... The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line, - the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea ... No sooner had Northern armies touched Southern soil than this old question, newly guiseed, sprang from the earth, - What shall be done with Negroes?” (Du Bois, 2012 [1903]:4 and 9)

While Du Bois to a large extent was seen as a radical by US Whites in his time, his critical diagnosis of the situation of racial inequality and “*prejudice*” (racism) in the US did not convince him, that reparations nor racial separatism as a solution. One of his great intellectual opponents, Marcus Garvey, on the other hand gained widespread popularity, and notoriety, among Black people for just that.

Marcus Mosiah Garvey, who dubbed himself “*a Negro leader*”, and was indeed considered such by many Black people globally in the early 1920s, had a radical, yet somewhat complex view on racial power dynamics and reparations in the beginning of the 20th century. The Jamaican born descendant of Maroons, coming from a humble background socio-economically, turned out to be a highly esteemed orator and thinker. He was especially popular by Blacks in the US, while he was feared and condemned broadly by White people. Mobilizing Black people in the Diaspora as well as in Africa, through the Universal Negro Improvement Association, Garvey sought to gather the “*Negro race*” and to build up a Black super power in Africa. The foundation of this plan was to inspire black people to “*be black, think black, buy black*” (Garvey, [1925] 2014), meaning to think of themselves as a dignified racial group by themselves and not seeking support or

help from the former (or present) oppressor, Euro-America. Next step was the mass repatriation of descendants of enslaved Africans to the continent of Africa, building up a Black government and economy. This of course also necessitated the taking of political power from European colonialists. With Garvey as a strong front figure, being treated among many Black people as a president for the Black “race”³, the movement gained a massive global following of Black people on all continents in the millions⁴ (Levine, 1982:121). Its newspaper, *The Negro World*, was distributed all over the world, thereby spreading Garvey's teachings on Black nationalism, repatriation, anti-colonialism, Black self-awareness and self-reliance. Generally speaking, among the Black poor and the Black lower middle class, Garvey's message was popular, but among the Black elites in the early 20th he was seen as “*ignorant*” and “*dangerous*” (Stein, 1986:167). Commenting on the fact that both White governments and publics at large felt intimidated by Garvey and the UNIA, he laid out his views on reparations in a speech to his organization in New York in 1923:

“They [Euro-American governments] cannot crush the spirit of the Negro by holding a club over his head ... I do not see why the world should be worried about the Universal Negro Improvement Association and worried about Marcus Garvey. If the world has not done anything to Negroes why should it be worried about the activity of Negroes? The world must know that we as a people are not seeking to create any disturbance – to affect the peace of communities and the harmony of races. We are not disposed that way. We are too appreciative of other people's rights to go out of our way to offend them. We are too considerate of other people's happiness to go out of our way to create disturbance; therefore the world of honest people need not be afraid of us; but if there are any dishonest people in the world who have held or are holding what is belonging to other folks – if they have anything belonging to Negroes naturally they will be disturbed because Negroes are going after those things” (Garvey, 2004 [1923]: 155-156).

While Garvey did not voice a direct demand for reparations, the message of this speech clearly implied a debt to be paid by the Euro-American nations to Black people, and formulating this with clear economical undertones, as Black people was said to be going after “*things*”. The implicit manner in which Garvey stated

3 1920, UNIA held its first International Convention of the Negro Peoples of the World. At this convention, Garvey indeed was elected “*Provisional President of Africa*” (Stein, 1986:86).

4 Due to a lack of a centralized counting of members, the accurate number of members of the UNIA is unclear. Garvey himself claimed a total of 6 million members of his Association (Levine, 1982:121).

this message points to the fact that European colonialism in Africa as well as US segregationist Jim Crow laws were in effect, and no time is wasted on flattery for these violent and hateful practices. Without naming anyone directly Garvey successfully called White critics of his Black nationalism “*dishonest*”, implying Black people's moral upper hand in the historical situation. From this speech one gets the impression that Garvey's first priority was not seeking racial reconciliation or “interracial” friendship. Rather his focus on Whites *holding what is belonging to* Black people shows a conception of early post-slavery reparations with an emphasis on material goods, whether that be land on the African continent or monetary compensation for the many decades of forced Black free labor.

Garvey's radical movement, with overt Black pride and implicit calls for reparations was not ignored by the White establishment. Garvey and UNIA literature was banned throughout the colonies, including in Africa, but was still distributed secretly (Martin, 1983:54). In the late 1910's, J. Edgar Hoover would become head of the “Radical Division” of the Bureau of Investigation (which would later become the FBI). His job was to identify threats among radicals in the US and neutralize them. In 1919, in a memo reported to his superior, he wrote

“[Marcus Garvey has] been particularly active among the radical elements in New York City in agitating the negro movement. Unfortunately, however, he has not as yet violated any federal law whereby he could be proceeded against on the grounds of being an undesirable alien, from the point of view of deportation. It occurs to me, however, from the attached clipping that there might be some proceeding against him for fraud in connection with his Black Star Line propaganda”
(Hoover, [1919] in Hill, 1983:72).

Hoover's fear was both based upon Garvey and the UNIA's rhetoric of racial empowerment, but also upon a suspicion of Communist ties, the latter being untrue. Nonetheless, Hoover's suggestion that Garvey was to be deported on the basis of charges of mail fraud would actually come to pass. Not unlike Callie House before him, Garvey was tried and wrongfully imprisoned before his deportation to Jamaica in 1927 (Martin, 1983:112). And not unlike the case of House's Association, the UNIA slowly fell apart without the leadership of Garvey, on whose charisma the movement was largely built.

The UNIA had spiritual aspects, but its main concern was the politics of Black nation-building. But Black spiritual movements in the Caribbean has been central to the formation and development of the contemporary movement for Black reparations, and is seen as an important resource for the movement today (Andersen, 2017:141; Soomer, 2016). The Rastafari Movement is arguably one of the most defining elements in this picture. Inspired by Garveyism and the coronation of the Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie I in 1930, this socio-spiritual movement grew out of Ethiopianist Christian groups in Jamaica. From the early developments of the movement by such leaders as Leonard Howell and Robert Hinds, Rastafari were discriminated against violently by both the colonial government and the Black public. While the movement of Rastafari openly criticized the Euro-American powers since the early years of the movement in the 1930s, it was not before 1940s that a leader took the issue of reparations through repatriation to the next level of direct correspondence with the colonial powers. In 1948, the prominent Rastafari leader Prince Emmanuel would visit the Brigadier General of the British Army at Up Park Camp in Jamaica, “*to seek out the Rights of the Suffering Slave Children*” (Edwards, 1992:1). This took place the same year as Haile Selassie I's grant of land in Shashamane, Ethiopia to people of the “*African Diaspora*”, who had supported Ethiopia in the second Italo-Ethiopian war against Fascist Italy in the 1930s (Chevannes, 2011:568). Ten years later, in march of 1958 the Rastafari leader Prince Emmanuel Charles Edwards hosted the first “*Rastafari Universal Convention*” where hundreds of Rastafari people from all over Jamaica communed in the church of the Coptic Theocratic Temple in Kingston and discussed different matters, from defining rituals to the next step for the movement (Price, 2009:73). At the end of the Convention, Prince Emmanuel sent a telegram to Queen Elizabeth II with the following message:

“*We the descendants of Ancient Ethiopia call upon you for our repatriation, for this is the 58th year. Emergency answer*” (Quoted in Van Dijk, 1995:83).

The 58th year referred to an interpretation of biblical history, as the biblical Israelites' exile in Babylon was ended after a period of 58 years in 532 B.C. (Ibid. 82). In this manner, Prince Emmanuel articulated a strong critique directly addressed to the British empire's symbolic head, indirectly calling her kingdom

and government “*Babylon*”, which in biblical interpretation is understood as the heathen and violent government being in contrast to the Israelites, God's chosen people. At the same time his own people, descendants of enslaved Africans in the Caribbean was seen as the biblical Israelites. The telegram was not received nor answered by the Queen, as it did not live up to the tact of diplomacy. Prince Emmanuel, who was later referred to as King Emmanuel, continued pressing the issue to world leaders, including US, British and Jamaican presidents, prime ministers, royalty and government officials as well as through the UN, until his passing in 1994 (Smith, 2012:46).

While King Emmanuel was indeed one of the most central figures in this temporality within the movement, the Rastafari call for Black repatriation to Africa was articulated through many different “houses” or groups. For example Philmore Alvaranga and Dougie Mack, calling themselves the “*Rastafari Brethren of Jamaica*”, in 1961 wrote a letter to Queen Elizabeth II, calling for repatriation:

“We Rastafarian Brethren of Jamaica do earnestly and sincerely desire your Royal Highness, to ... free all Black People within your Commonwealth, from political, economical, and Religious slavery to which we are subjected in this present time ... The U.N.O. Charter on Human Rights states: That any displaced people be repatriated to their respective borders should this be their desire. Therefore we the Descendants of Ethiopian (African) slaves, who were forcibly brought to this Western Hemisphere, do desire Repatriation to our ancestral and antecedents borders”
(Alvaranga and Mack, [1961] 2013:n.p.).

It is clear that the Brethren's appeal to the Queen was not just a question of formally changing nationality, but for the British colonial government to provide repatriation and integration for Black descendants of the enslaved in the British colonies. The Brethren's invocation of human rights shows how, especially after the Jewish Holocaust and in the aftermath of WWII, racialized groups' fight for reparations had changed. This blend of biblical trope, or prophecy combined with human rights discourse is very common in Rastafari thought. With both the spiritual and political elements, being a kind of two-edged sword, the plea for repatriation, and thereby reparations, pleaded to be taken seriously. Yet there is no record of an answer to the letter by the British monarch.

In 1961, the Jamaican colonial government agreed to send a delegation to Africa with the unofficial aim of disillusionizing Jamaican born descendants of the enslaved in their goal of returning to Africa. Led by Jamaican academics and politicians, and including some Rastafari leaders such as Alvaranga and Mack, the attempt to delegitimize Rastafari doctrine and demands, would however show to have the opposite effect. All the African countries visited, being Ethiopia, Nigeria, Ghana, Liberia and Sierra Leone, were open to welcome Western-born descendants of enslaved Africans (Leslie et. al., 1961:1-2). The Rastafari leaders even achieved meeting “Ras Tafari” himself, the Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie I, who invited them for a private audience at his palace and showed appreciation of their work (Niaah, 2014:72).

The year after the “Mission to Africa”, Jamaica gained its independence from the UK, but political and public harassment of Rastafari people continued (Barnett, 2014:6). A few years later, in 1966, Haile Selassie I visited the Caribbean, including Jamaica, where he declared among other things that “*Jamaicans and Ethiopians are blood brothers*” (Prunier & Ficquet, 2015:153), speaking directly into the context of pan-Africanism and the dialogue about Jamaican emigration between the Jamaican and Ethiopian government. Also, the Emperor exalted the Rastafari, inviting prominent Rastafari leaders such as Prince Emmanuel, Alvaranga and Mack to Kings House, the residence of the Governor-General of Jamaica, and awarded them gold medals for their work. From that point Rastafari people were treated more humane, while violent incidents still occurred, but in time the spiritual tradition became more accepted or even appreciated as a central part of Black culture in the Caribbean. All in all, Britain's and Jamaica's early government's campaign against the Rastafari had the opposite effect than desired, as it actually demystified the Rastafari movement's spiritual aspects and strengthened repatriation sentiments in the Caribbean.

Not all leading Black reparationists in this temporality were men. The persevering personality of Queen Mother Audley Moore, was central as a reparationist activist in Black Power circles in the US in the 1950's until her passing in the 1990's. She was raised in a poor household, with living former enslaved relatives, and the violence of Whites very present in her own life. For example her grandfather was lynched by a White mob (Aiyetoro & Davis, 2010:17). Moore began her activism in Garvey's UNIA in the 1920's, but as mentioned earlier, when Garvey were deported, the movement slowly fell apart. In the late 1920's and early 1930's she then became affiliated with the Communist Party, as this party promoted radical racial politics at this time, including aims of Black sovereignty in the South. She left the party in 1950, but continued working for equal rights, as well as other matters such as gender equality and against lynching and police violence. In 1955, Moore began her work as a reparations activist with a pamphlet titled "*Why Reparations? Money for Negroes*" (Aiyetoro & Davis, 2010:17). In this elaborate text which was both promoting reparations and establishing a theoretical outline for such, according to Moore, reparations were to be demanded to counter the effects of "*slavery, lynching, segregation, police brutality, rape, poverty, psychological distress, and poor schools*" and she cited human rights as legal foundation for her demand (McDuffie, 2010:187). In 1962, through a Reparations Committee Moore demanded \$500 trillion in reparations from the US government to 25 million Blacks in the US, for the damages of chattel slavery (Ibid.). According to Moore, these money were to be paid over four generations (Aiyetoro & Davis, 2010:18). There is supposedly no report of an answer given to her demand.

Throughout the years, Moore was affiliated with a number of organizations. Among other causes, she supported decolonial movements in Africa, and linked their fight with her domestic fight for reparations to Blacks in the US (McDuffie, 2010:188). Moore's work cannot be said to have moved the White masses in the US, but her ceaseless advocacy for Black reparations throughout the 1950's and 1960's inspired many in the Black Power Movement, of which she was an educator. Indeed in Black radical circles, Moore popularized the demand for reparations.

One of the central advocates for reparatory justice in the 1960s, who is not often mentioned in the public debate as a reparationist is Martin Luther King Jr. Interestingly, King's more radical sides are seemingly often deprioritized or ignored, although these aspects may plausibly be the background for the amount of white hatred eventually leading to his assassination. In his work from 1964, titled "*Why We Can't Wait*", King argued for the economical and social reasons making redress necessary and appropriate for Blacks in the US. And in no manner was he promoting acceptance of economical or social inequalities in the US with roots in chattel slavery:

"Certainly, the Negro has been deprived. Few people consider the fact that, in addition to being enslaved for two centuries, the Negro was, during all those years, robbed of the wages of his toil. No amount of gold could provide an adequate compensation for the exploitation and humiliation of the Negro in America down through the centuries. ... The ancient common law has always provided a remedy for the appropriation of the labor of one human being by another. This law should be made to apply for American Negroes. The payment should be in the form of a massive program by the government of special, compensatory measures which could be regarded as a settlement in accordance with the accepted practice of common law. Such measures would certainly be less expensive than any computation based on two centuries of unpaid wages and accumulated interest. I am proposing, therefore, that ... America launch a broad-based and gigantic Bill of Rights for the Disadvantaged, our veterans of the long siege of denial" (King, Jr., 1964:137)

While most advocates for Black reparations focus mainly on reparations to Blacks, King's proposed bill included poor Whites as receivers in such programmes, as this group, according to King, were to a certain extent in the same boat as Blacks throughout the US. In relation to King's reason for Black reparations, while based upon centuries-long racial oppression, King sought to focus more on his present and the future, than on the past. Therefore his calculation for reparations were not based on slavery as such, as much as the after-effects of slavery.

Through King's public work as a central civil rights leader, he was radicalized increasingly as a reaction to the ongoing and broad White opposition to him and his movement's demands. In 1967, commenting on his famous vision of peaceful co-existence between racial groups in his "I Have A Dream"-speech three years earlier, King expressed that "*that dream that I had that day has in many points turned into a nightmare*" (Franklin, 2013). Just a few weeks before his assassination, King

formulated his demand for reparations even more directly, in a speech given to a Mississippi crowd in 1968, where he described how the US had supported poor Whites in a manner of ways. He commented:

“today many of these people are receiving millions of dollars in federal subsidies not to farm, and they are the very people telling the black man that he ought to lift himself by his own bootstraps. And this is what we are faced with, and this is the reality. Now, when we come to Washington in this campaign, we are coming to get our check” (Quoted in Gates, Jr., 1998).

In the perspective of King, the US government had put a lot of financial support into building the White middle and upper classes, while it had totally neglected the Black population. Therefore, while his focus was on both Black and White poverty in the US, King underlines the need to correct the historical wrongs committed against Blacks first and foremost. What these statements by King illustrates, is the fact that he was in no way the “agreeable” figure to the White US, as he has been ‘reconstructed’ to be in retrospect. Indeed, in the last years of his life, his advocacy for Black reparations, as well as financial support for poor Whites, was at the center stage of his political mission. In fact, the “dream” of his could not be obtained without Black reparations, in an economical and legal sense.

The dream of successful integration and a US free of racism did obviously look less achievable for King in 1968 compared to 1963. And while King was radicalized and expressed his more clear demands for Black reparations, he also came under investigation and surveillance by the FBI. Apparently King was seen as a great threat to US national security, and was among the targets of the newly defined Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO) operation of the FBI since 1967, led again by Hoover. In internal documents it was stated that their mission was to “*expose, disrupt, misdirect, discredit, or otherwise neutralize the activities of black-nationalist, hate-type organizations and groupings, their leadership, spokesmen, membership and supporters*” (Senate Select Committee, 1976:180). This included the likes of King, Malcolm X of the Nation of Islam and Stokely Carmichael of the Black Panther Party. The level of fear the FBI had for King's popularity and his potential in becoming a uniting force among radical Blacks, were articulated in the sense that they were supposed to

“Prevent the rise of a "messiah" who could unify and electrify the militant black nationalist movement ... King could be a real contender for this position should he abandon his supposed "obedience" to "white, liberal doctrines" (nonviolence) and embrace black nationalism” (Ibid.)

In other words, the FBI classified King and more militant individuals such as Malcolm X as being a part of the same dangerous group of Blacks. One thing which all of FBI's targets of this operation had in common was a clear sense of Black identity and a call for Black reparations. While reparatory demands were not the focus of the FBI, indeed they worked viciously to discredit and neutralize the individuals and groups having these goals. Indeed, King who today is a civil rights star, and has become canonized by Euro-American establishments as a prophet of integration, has simultaneously been neutralized in his efforts to achieve Black reparations for slavery and continued racial oppression in the US.

The year after King's assassination, James Forman, a young Black activist, made headlines across the US with what was to be known as one of the most influential calls for Black reparations in the US. Forman, who was at the time organized in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and who were also temporarily affiliated with the Black Panther Party was among the most central US Civil Rights leaders in the 1960's. In 1969, Forman interrupted a service in the popular Riverside Church of New York City to read aloud his *“Black Manifesto”*. From a strictly Black Socialist perspective, Forman defined the Black experience of life in *“Western”* coloniality. In Forman's introduction to his manifesto in the written version, he declared:

“We have come from all over the country burning with anger and despair, not only with the miserable economic plight of our people, but fully aware that the racism on which the Western World was built dominates our lives. There can be no separation of the problems of racism from the problems of our economic political, and cultural degradation. To any black man, this is clear” (Forman, 1969:1)

With these words Forman defined a Black experience of *coloniality*, and set the stage for demanding a major undertaking of reparations in the US. Thus the racism of *coloniality* was seen as a determining factor for the possibilities of Blacks in the US. Also, while seemingly not present in the thought of King, the idea of repatriation of Blacks in the US to Africa was not rejected in Forman's

perspective, rather it was postponed. According to him, the revolutionary duty of Blacks in the US to effectively put an end to its “colonial” government was more pressing than the need to emigrate (Ibid.).

Interestingly, Forman's demands for reparations were not directed at the US government or businesses known to have benefitted from slavery. His claims were first and foremost directed towards Christian and Jewish religious institutions in the US:

“For centuries, we have been forced to live as colonized people inside the United States, victimized by the most vicious, racist system in the world. We have helped to build the most industrial country in the world.

We are, therefore demanding of the white Christian churches and Jewish synagogues which are part and parcel of the system of capitalism, that they begin to pay reparations to black people in this country. We are demanding \$500.000.000 from the Christian white churches and the Jewish synagogues. This total comes to \$15 per nigger” (Forman, 1969:3).

The idea of charging the religious institutions instead of the State, was on the one hand based on the fact that most of these institutions did participate in the oppression of Blacks during and after slavery. On the other hand, the religious institutions, based upon certain ideas of morality, were considered more likely to agree to pay reparations. The proposed 500 million dollars were demanded to be used for the funding of 10 different projects, which according to Forman in total would be a significant step in the direction of Black empowerment in the US. Forman's proposed projects were the establishment of a Southern Land Bank, providing land for Black farmers, four major printing and press industries, four audio-visual networks, a research skills center and a training center. In addition, the money was to be used on support of welfare initiatives, establishment of a National Black Labor Strike and Defense Fund, the establishment of an economic initiative called the International Black Appeal and the establishment of a Black university somewhere in the US South (Ibid.). This multifaceted appeal to Jewish and Christian institutions in the US sparked a national debate on Black reparations and racism in the US (Frye, 1974:65). Yet, Forman's Socialist radicalism undeniably alienated many Whites in the US. His efforts did bear some fruits, though, as a number of Christian denominations agreed to donate

large sums to poverty programs. While this could not be termed strictly Black reparations, there were actually a level of acknowledgement on the part of some Christian churches, of the fact that their churches were a part of the system of power based upon colonialism, what I address as *the coloniality of power*, and that they needed to provide some form of redress for Blacks. In the spectrum of Black politics of the 1960's in the US, Forman could be understood as being ideologically somewhere in the middle between King's Christian-inspired integration and the militant Black Nationalism of the Black Panthers, with their goal of establishing a separate Black State. As mentioned earlier, both King and Black nationalists were considered radicals by the government of the US, and were under surveillance as threats to the nation, and Forman was too (Oppenheimer, 2012). Forman's hard rhetoric, not to mention his Socialist perspective, meant that his call was not really listened to more broadly in US society.

In the 1970's and early 1980's different organizations, groups and individuals kept agitating for the cause, but there were not much tangible progress for the movement. In 1987, almost 20 years after Forman's Black Manifesto was presented, N'COBRA was formed. N'COBRA, which stands for the National Coalition of Blacks for Reparations in America, was a new organization, trying to gather broad support for Black reparations in the US. In that same year, the US had authorized a bill for reparations to Japanese Americans who were interned in camps in the US in WWII (Aiyetoro & Davis, 2010:36), so the concept of reparations was again making headlines in the US. N'COBRA was and still is a “*multi-ideological group*”, but the founding members all came from established Black nationalist backgrounds. Members had worked in the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), the National Conference of Black Lawyers (NCBL), the African National Reparations Organization (ANRO), the Organization of Afro-American Unity, Republic of New Afrika (RNA) and the National Association of Black Social Workers (NABSW) among others. But the vision of N'COBRA was not to build a Black nationalist coalition for reparations, but a broad one, inclusive of different Black groups. Also, the organization was

open to White membership. N'COBRA were and is continually seeking reparations for Black Americans,

”for the genocidal war against Africans that created the TransAtlantic Slave “Trade” Chattel Slavery, Jim Crow and Chattel Slavery’s continuing vestiges (the Maafa). To that end, NCOBRA shall organize and mobilize all strata of these Black communities, into an effective mass-based reparations movement” (N’COBRA, 2017).

By teaming up with a number of lawyers, N'COBRA also developed a specific strategy for demanding reparations through the US legal system. Thus this movement marked a change, in its broad scope and its legal tactics. In 1989, by suggestion of N'COBRA member Ray Jenkins, the US Congress Rep. John Conyers introduced “H.R. 40”, a bill to create a commission to study reparations. Every year since 1989, Conyers has presented the bill again, but with no success (Airetoro & Davis, 2010:37). It is possible that the main reason for the unwillingness to pass Conyers' bill and study the legitimacy of the claim of Black reparations in the US, is that it could lead to actual reparations, wherefore it has been avoided.

8.2.1. Sub-conclusion

The 20th century proved to be a century of heated debates about race, segregation and racism, where reparations proved to be a defined concept of Black politics. In the beginning of the century the reparatory stance was that of the most radical and disenfranchised part of Caribbean and US societies. Yet in the 1960's the demand was being spread more effectively among both more intergrationist-oriented people such as King, spiritual minorities such as the Rastafari and the more militant Forman. All throughout this temporality, reparationists were met as national threats and misfits, both in the US and in the Caribbean, as they were understood as having a certain potential for winning supporters, and ultimately being a source of destabilization of power in the regions. Thus from Garvey to N'COBRA there was an unbroken line of Black mobilization for reparations, although in different variations with different goals.

In the 20th century there were a number of aims or tactics employed by reparationists. There were the nationalist and racialist appeals to mass

repatriation and decolonization of the African continent by Garvey and the UNIA. Then there were socio-spiritual claims of “*repatriation with reparations*” of the Rastafari. Especially in the US there was an emergence of a more political or socialist-oriented focus on equality and revolution of the political system. Large sums of monetary compensation were demanded in different instances, whether unspecified as in the Rastafari demand, \$500 trillion from the US government in the case of Moore or \$500 million from religious institutions in the case of Forman. With significant support in the millions for Garvey, or the 1 million signatures for Moore's demand, or even the petitioning of Conyers in the US Congress, this temporality was indeed a time of increasing pressure upon Euro-America. In the latter part of the 20th century beginnings of unification between reparationist groups also constituted a new trend, as calls for reparations had earlier been voiced by individuals or specific groups.

With abolition and later gradual decolonization, the *coloniality of power* changed, but it was never eliminated. While the blatantly violent sides of *coloniality's* systems became less visible, the ideological-theoretical dimensions were strengthened in the beginning of the 1900's. In the 1960's during decolonization this racist theorization lost significant power in the public, while racist structures survived. Throughout the century, Jim Crow laws, the multifarious ways Blacks were continually oppressed, disenfranchised, dehumanized and ignored, and the multifaceted ways in which reparationist were battled characterized the experience of *coloniality* for the majority of Blacks. At this point the political power behind *coloniality* (colonialism) were fought back, but the intellectual, political and cultural setup of was still in effect. These post-slavery demands for reparations were based upon very clear manifestations of the racial hierarchies of *coloniality*, that of White supremacy and Black stigmatization.

8.3. Part Three. “A Crime Against Humanity”: The Cause of Black Reparations going Mainstream, 2000-

In the 1990's discussions about minority rights, colonial heritage, racism and reparations were held in an increasing rate throughout the world, both in public, political and academic spheres. All these elements were joined in the Durban Conference of 2001, titled *"World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance"*. At this conference, the question of reparations were brought forth by different groups, and the topic was debated in different contexts. It has been argued that this conference helped ignite the most recent manifestation of the Black Reparations Movement (Beckles, 2013:6). Of central importance to the movement was the conference's final text, where the movement's longstanding plea to declare Trans-Atlantic slavery a crime against humanity were met, and both the injustices of slavery, colonialism and the after-effects of these were condemned. In a manner rather similar to reparationist discourse, the text asserted that:

"We acknowledge that slavery and ... the transatlantic slave trade, were appalling tragedies in the history of humanity not only because of their abhorrent barbarism but also in terms of their magnitude, organized nature and especially their negation of the essence of the victims, and further acknowledge that slavery and the slave trade are a crime against humanity and should always have been so, especially the transatlantic slave trade and are among the major sources and manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance" (UN, 2001:6)

These different elements, including the extreme “barbarism” of colonial slavery and the dehumanization of the enslaved, were central reparationist arguments against this institution from at least the 18th century, but were now agreed upon by an international political body. This obviously does not mean that the point is legally binding, for example when it comes to determining human rights charges and claims of reparations in retrospect. But slavery and the Trans-Atlantic trade in enslaved people's new status as a crime against humanity opened up for new discussions on reparations. Just as slavery was condemned, so was colonialism and its after-effects:

"We recognize that colonialism has led to racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, and that Africans and people of African descent ... were victims of colonialism and

continue to be victims of its consequences. We acknowledge the suffering caused by colonialism and ... We further regret that the effects and persistence of these structures and practices have been among the factors contributing to lasting social and economic inequalities in many parts of the world today” (UN, 2001:7)

Again these points underlined if not the legal case for reparations, then the moral and historical argument for committing to global engagement in providing forms of redress. Thus the conference, while short of tangible measures for positive change, were symbolically a major victory for not only the Black reparations Movement in the US and the Caribbean, but the global movement working for reparations for historical injustices. When it came to reparations specifically, the final text of the conference was quite clear in its position towards reparatory measures:

”[the UN] Urges States to adopt the necessary measures, as provided by national law, to ensure the right of victims to seek just and adequate reparation and satisfaction to redress acts of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, and to design effective measures to prevent the repetition of such acts” (UN, 2001:52)

It is clear that a genuine “urge” for States to provide reparations or redress for slavery and colonialism among other things were not the same as actual reparations. Yet, the fact that reparationist agendas were now reaching the political heights of international diplomacy through the UN marked the beginning of a time when Black reparations were no longer (only) considered a political program of Black radicals and left radicals. To a higher extent, the basic idea of repairing relations, and providing redress as a consequence of the past were now more legitimate than ever in Euro-American politics. But this did not mean that Euro-America would hasten to initiate reparatory measures.

Shortly after the Durban Conference in 2003, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, then President of Haiti, demanded reparations (or “*restitution*”) for Haiti's 90 million francs independence debt. In a calculation with interest included, but without accounting for “*penalties*” and “*slavery*”, the amount demanded by the Haitian government was \$21.6 billion (Stratfor, 2003). This was one of the first direct reparations demands coming from a head of state. But Aristide was very clear, that his demand for reparations did not include the crime of chattel slavery, only

the money paid to France since 1825. Therefore Aristide's case for reparations was really that of “*restitution*”. In 2004, the democratically elected Aristide was overthrown in a military coup by right-wing groups supported by France and the US, and Boniface Alexandre, who was loyal to France, was given power as provisional president. Aristide's claim for reparations was not the only reason for this coup, but arguably one side of it. Aristide was taken by the CIA and was exiled in the Central African Republic and later South Africa (NBC News, 2004), while Haiti entered a period of increased police brutality and other problems (Amnesty International, 2006). Seven months after the devastating earthquake that damaged Haiti in 2010, in a letter signed by a number of academics, authors and politicians from around the world, Aristide's call for reparations to Haiti was echoed. The voices supporting the call included “*MIT professor Noam Chomsky, author Naomi Klein, Princeton professor Cornel West, Uruguayan author Eduardo Galeano, French philosophers Alain Badiou, Etienne Balibar and Jacques Ranciere, and several members of parliament in Quebec, Europe, France and the Philippines*” (Macdonald, 2010). In an open letter directed to then French President Nicolas Sarkozy, this group urged the president:

“In 2003, when the Haitian government demanded repayment of money extorted from Haiti, the French government helped to overthrow it ... This is undoubtedly an inadequate response to a demand that is morally, economically and legally unassailable ... we urge you, Mr. President, to restore to Haiti, the first black republic in history, the historic debt of its independence” (Ali et. al., 2010, my translation)

This letter illustrated the internationalization of the movement for Black reparations, although the call was centered around Haiti. Now, to a higher extent than ever before, Blacks and Whites in different countries and in different positions supported Black reparations. Yet, the year after, Nicolas Sarkozy, then then president of France commented on reparatory justice in dismissive terms at the ceremony for the commemoration of the abolition of slavery in Paris. Neglecting facts about both Aristide and the Haitian public's demand for reparations Sarkozy declared,

“The descendants of the slaves have never asked for apologies. They've asked – they're still asking – for their wounds to be acknowledged. They haven't asked for redress. They've asked for understanding and respect of their uniqueness, their bruised identity ... They've only asked for

full and complete liberty, equality and fraternity. They've asked us to give those words their full meaning. The Republic gave them liberty in 1848. The Republic promised them equality in 1946" (Sarkozy, 2011)

In this manner Sarkozy portrayed descendants of people formerly enslaved by France as merely seeking symbolic justice, not even in the form of an apology, but in the form of acknowledgement. At the same time France was portrayed as a morally just society "giving" Haitians liberty and securing equality.

In the 2010's the Black reparations cause was to be manifested in a new sphere, that of international political diplomacy. The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) which politically represents approximately 16 million citizens in the English speaking Caribbean (CARICOM, n.d.), initiated a new course for the movement. In 2013, partially on the basis of Hilary Beckles' newly published book "*Britain's Black Debt: Reparations for Caribbean Slavery and Native Genocide*" (2013), CARICOM created the Caribbean Reparations Commission (CRC) with the intention to

"Establish the moral, ethical and legal case for the payment of Reparations by the Governments of all the former colonial powers and the relevant institutions of those countries, to the nations and people of the Caribbean Community for the Crimes against Humanity of Native Genocide, the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade and a racialized system of chattel Slavery (Caribbean Reparations Commission, n.d.)

The year after, the Commission issued a "*Ten Point Plan for Reparatory Justice*", sent to the former colonial and "slave owning" European States including the UK, France, Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Denmark. The ten points covered a number of socio-political and cultural subjects, substantiating the call in history, numbers and facts.

The first and opening point of the CRC's plan is that of a *full formal apology*. This is seen as a "*precondition [for the] healing process for victims and the descendants of the enslaved and enslavers*" and statements of regret was deemed insufficient (CARICOM, 2014). In other words, the symbolic act of officially apologizing for slavery and colonialism is seen as a premise for further reparatory measures. The CRC's second point is repatriation to Africa:

“Over 10 million Africans were stolen from their homes ... The descendants of these stolen people have a legal right to return to their homeland ... A Repatriation program must be established and all available channels of international law and diplomacy used to resettle those persons who wish to return. A resettlement program should address such matters as citizenship and deploy available best practices in respect of community re-integration.” (Ibid.)

This point was significant because the desire to repatriate is not a majority call, but a longstanding claim since the 18th century, maybe most famously in the case of Garvey in the 1920s. It is interesting that a Commission set in motion by the heads of states of the English speaking Caribbean nations demand the repatriation of its population to another continent, just as it is interesting that the Commission has prioritized the demand to be the second demand in the total of ten. This can be seen as a signal of acknowledgement for the “traditional” Black reparatationists throughout time, who has fought hard for this aim. The third point of the Commission is for the European States to establish an “*Indigenous Peoples Development Program*”, seeking redress for the genocide of millions of indigenous Caribbeans, and the appropriation of their lands. This includes Carib, Arawak, Taino and other groups, which are minorities in the region today. The Commission demand that “*A Development Plan is required to rehabilitate this community*” (Ibid.), thus CARICOM's call is not only on behalf of Blacks but also other groups affected by colonialism.

The forth point in the plan is that of cultural institutions. The Commission call for the establishment of educational centers to inform Caribbeans about slavery and colonialism: “*Descendants of these CAH [Crimes against Humanity] continue to suffer the disdain of having no relevant institutional systems through which their experience can be scientifically told*” (Ibid.). The fifth point is that of alleviation of the “*Health Disaster*” of the people in the Caribbean:

“The African descended population in the Caribbean has the highest incidence in the world of chronic diseases in the forms of hypertension and type two diabetes [being] the direct result of the nutritional experience, physical and emotional brutality, and overall stress profiles associated with slavery, genocide, and apartheid ... Europe has a responsibility to participate in the alleviation of this health disaster” (Ibid.).

While the connection between health problems such as hypertension and slavery might not be clear to all, this demand is written into the context of existing

literature determining lasting after effects of slavery, such as Joy D. Leary's concept of *"Post Traumatic Slave Syndrome"* (2005). Behind this argument is the change in diet and culture which slavery and colonialism has caused, as well as other factors. The sixth point is *"Illiteracy Eradication"*, on the grounds that *"Some 70 percent of blacks in British colonies were functionally illiterate in the 1960s when nation states began to appear"* (Ibid.). The Commission's seventh point is for the establishment of an *"African Knowledge Program"*. According to the CRC, Black people in the Caribbean has suffered from *"cultural and social alienation from identity and existential belonging"* because of slavery. Among the reasons for this is that they have been *"divorced by space from the source of historic self"* (Ibid.). This program could include *"school exchanges and culture tours, community artistic and performance programs, entrepreneurial and religious engagements, as well as political interaction ... in order to neutralize the void created by slave voyages"* (Ibid.). Psychological rehabilitation is the eighth point, in order to counter the *"massive psychological trauma upon African descendant populations"* because of slavery and colonialism. The ninth point is technology transfer, as the CRC argues:

"The Caribbean was denied participation in Europe's industrialization process, and was confined to the role of producer and exporter of raw materials ... the Caribbean entered its nation building phase as a technologically and scientifically ill-equipped- backward space within the postmodern world economy" (Ibid.)

The final point is that of *debt cancellation*. In order to *"[clean] up the colonial mess in order to prepare for development ... Support for the payment of domestic debt and cancellation of international debt are necessary reparatory actions"* (Ibid.). The ten points, or demands, were accompanied by the clear message that if the European States would not discuss these, the case would be taken to the International Criminal Court, by each single State individually (Torres-Bennett, 2014). In total, these ten points constitute a profound demand, and includes symbolic (1), material (2, 3, 5, 8, 9 and 10) and educational (4, 6 and 7) dimensions, which all have economic implications for the European States, maybe except the demand of a formal apology. What all ten points have in common is their foundation in the lived experience of being Black in former European colonies in the Caribbean, and the call was thereby an attempt to critique and destabilize the present world order of *coloniality*.

In 2006, some time before CARICOM's claims were sent out, then British PM Tony Blair acted on international pressure to apologize publicly for the UK's role in the history of Atlantic slavery. In that context, he expressed "*deep sorrow [about] the crime against humanity*" (Smith, 2006), avoiding formally apologizing, which would have legal consequences, as well as he failed acknowledging the continual patterns of historical injustice between "racial" groups, or *coloniality*. Thereby Blair founded a new tradition of UK prime ministers, speaking about slavery without complying with reparationists. This display of sorrow without any acknowledgement of national intergenerational responsibility was repeated by British PM David Cameron, when he was answering to CARICOM's demands on his visit to Jamaica in 2015. He commented

"While there is much indeed to celebrate about our past ... Slavery was and is abhorrent in all its forms. It has no place whatsoever in any civilised society, and Britain is proud to have eventually led the way in its abolition ... I acknowledge that these wounds run very deep indeed. But I do hope that, as friends who have gone through so much together since those darkest of times, we can move on from this painful legacy and continue to build for the future."
(Cameron, 2015).

Thereby Cameron celebrated the colonial past, condemned slavery theoretically, gave his own country credit for its abolition and told reparationists to "*move on*", and stop their endeavors, all in one speech. The British position has not changed under the present PM Theresa May (Curaçao Chronicle, 2017).

As mentioned, CARICOM's ten demands were also directed at France. With both Aristide's government's demand of the 2003, the international group's advocacy in 2010, a persistent civil demand among some segments of Haitian society and now also the political body of CARICOM in 2014, the president François Hollande had to consider his words very wisely on his tour of the Caribbean in 2015. Seemingly, he was not fully aware of this, for when he held a speech in Guadeloupe before entering Haiti, he said "*When I go to Haiti, I will, for my part, handle the debt that we have*" (Quoted in Barbados Today, 2015). His subsequent visit to Haiti, the first official state visit of France to Haiti ever, was burning with the question of reparations or restitution in the form of payment of the independence debt. Hollande let down Haitian reparationists, specifying that

France's debt to Haiti was a “*moral debt*” and asserted that “*We cannot change the past, but we can change the future,*” (Quoted in Reuters, 2015) declaring that France would provide development aid of \$145 million, \$56 million of which would be targeted at education. There were a broad disdain for Hollande's easy dealing with the demand for restitution of the debt or even broader reparations for slavery. The present President of France, Emmanuel Macron are of a even more deprecatory opinion on the matter. In a recent interview recorded in Ghana, a Congolese woman asked the President as to his stance on reparations from France. The president found it “*totally ridiculous*” (Quoted in RFI, 2017), and thereby totally rejected reparatory claims per se. Thus, from Sarkozy, to Hollande, to Macron, France's official policy on reparations has been dismissive and not interested in engaging in discussion on historical responsibility.

What was generally interesting about the European political reception of CARICOM's demands, was that this was in most cases non-existent. Many European heads of states did not comment on the demands at all, for example Holland, Spain, Denmark, Norway and Portugal, in spite that the demands were sent by an international body of States, representing approximately 16 million people. Only Sweden's ambassador to the Caribbean, Claes Hammar, were willing to enter the dialogue, replying that Sweden was open to discuss the matter: “*Sweden did after all have a colony in the Caribbean so it's not wrong for us to be a part of the discussion*” (Quoted in Landes, 2013). This disconnect in linking colonialism and slavery to present living conditions for Blacks in the former colonies, for most European heads of States, could be labeled “*colonial aphasia*” (Stoler, 2010). With this concept US-based scholar Ann Laura Stoler, who is professor of anthropology and history, has theorized how European colonialism as well as ethnic/racial inequality and tension between former colonizers and former colonized are clearly defined phenomena, yet they are often not understood as interconnected in French (and I propose, generally European) contexts. In other words, there is not a language bridging the historical trauma of the past and present problems in relation to it. Stoler defines the concept in this manner:

”At issue is neither stubborn ignorance nor sudden knowledge. It is the confused and clogged spaces in between ... Aphasia is a dismembering, a difficulty speaking, a difficulty generating a vocabulary that associates appropriate words and concepts with appropriate things. Aphasia in its many forms describes a difficulty retrieving both conceptual and lexical vocabularies and, most important, a difficulty comprehending what is spoken” (2010:122, 125).

Simply put, *colonial aphasia* is the problem of understanding and speaking of the interconnection between European atrocities and oppression in the colonial era and its social and political repercussions today. Indeed, Stoler has not been alone in identifying the problem of *colonial aphasia*. The general tendencies which the concept refers to have been identified and discussed in several European contexts: for example in the UK (Edwards & Mead, 2013), in Holland (Bijl, 2015; Wekker, 2016), in Denmark (Andersen, 2017) and in more general European contexts (De Genova, 2016).

In the 2010s, US reparationists also gained momentum, both in public debate and in further organizing and unification of the US part of the movement. In public debate, Black journalist Ta-Nehisi Coates has been a central figure. In *”The Case for Reparations”* (2014), a popular article in *The Atlantic*, he documented the history of slavery and oppression in the US, in an account ultimately supporting Black reparations in the US. His argument was characterized by strong historical research, and elements of narrative, taking the reader through the different times and aspects of oppression of Blacks in the US. The piece was widely read and discussed in the US. His conclusion was that:

“An America that asks what it owes its most vulnerable citizens is improved and humane. An America that looks away is ignoring not just the sins of the past but the sins of the present and the certain sins of the future. More important than any single check cut to any African American, the payment of reparations would represent America’s maturation out of the childhood myth of its innocence into a wisdom worthy of its founders” (Ibid.)

But it is not just public figures such as Coates who has come to this conclusion. In 2016, a UN panel clearly urged the US to begin working on studying and implementing reparations. It was the U.N. Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent, an independent panel which were created after the Durban Conference of 2001 to find solutions to the problems of Black people in the

Diaspora appeal who were behind the proposal. Their grounds for recommending US Black reparations was that:

”the Working Group remains extremely concerned about the human rights situation of African Americans. In particular, the legacy of colonial history, enslavement, racial subordination and segregation, racial terrorism and racial inequality in the United States remains a serious challenge, as there has been no real commitment to reparations and to truth and reconciliation for people of African descent. Contemporary police killings and the trauma that they create are reminiscent of the past racial terror of lynching. Impunity for State violence has resulted in the current human rights crisis and must be addressed as a matter of urgency” (United Nations, 2016:16)

The panel's understanding of history, the present living conditions for Blacks in the US and the interconnection between these two, was thus in line with reparationist thought. The panel found reparations to be not only appropriate, but needed, *“as a matter of urgency”*. As a plan of action to find a solution to these problems, the panel encouraged Congress to pass Conyers' bill (H.R.40) and apply *“analogous elements contained in the Caribbean Community’s Ten-Point Action Plan on Reparations” (United Nations, 2016:20)*. The panel also recommended *“Monuments ... [and] acts of reconciliation” (Ibid. 19)*, as yet other ways of doing justice to the Black community in the US. Just like CARICOM's call, the U.N. Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent's recommendation to the US, signified a new current in global reparations discourse. Black reparations had moved from the Black churches, town halls and street protests, to the level of international diplomacy.

Another organization aiming at implementing measures in the US similar to CARICOM's ten points is the National African American Reparations Commission (NAARC). Formed in 2015, the organization addresses its own ten point demand directed to the US government. This group was not constituted by politicians or officials, but professionals in a number of fields, including academics and lawyers. Both Christians, secularists and Nation of Islam were represented in the original group forming the Commission, making it a pluralistic, but still unified initiative. The mission for the Commission was to

“achieve repair for the centuries of enslavement, legal and de facto segregation, systematic exclusion and violent and repressive policies and practices which have damaged Black families and communities across generations” (NAARC, 2015:9)

Similar to the CRC, the NAARC authored a list of demands, still in its preliminary state, with ten points for US Black reparations. Many of these correlate with the CRC's demands, including an official apology, payed repatriation and integration, health care, as well as “*African knowledge*” and other educational programs (NAARC, 2015:3-5). But there are also demands unique to NAARC's proposal, which underlines the specific context of *coloniality* in the US. Some of these are

“The Right to Land ... Funds for Cooperative Enterprises and Socially Responsible Entrepreneurial Development ... Affordable Housing ... and Wealth Generation ... Strengthening Black America’s Information and Communications Infrastructure ... Preserving Black Sacred Sites and Monuments ... Repairing the Damages of the “Criminal Injustice System”” (NAARC, 2015:4 and 6-8).

NAARC's preliminary draft for their ten point-demand is thereby possibly the most comprehensive of all reparations claims, covering more aspects and in more detail than both CARICOMs and other initiatives. Interestingly, in one of NAARC's elaborations, they demand “*The exoneration of the Honorable Marcus Mosiah Garvey as the first victim of a “Cointelpro” type operation by J. Edgar Hoover’s FBI*” (NAARC, 2015:8) pointing to this organization's consciousness of continuity with the 20th century movement. The call for Garvey's exoneration, led by Julius Garvey, one of his living sons, was rejected by Obama's administration (Brown, 2017). Currently, NAARC's ten points are presented and discussed in meetings across the US, most recently in New Orleans in December 2017 with Beckles of the CRC as keynote speaker (IBW21, 2017), which underlines the fact that the Black reparations movement in the US and the Caribbean has reciprocally inspired and supported each other in their endeavors.

Yet in the US there has not been much encouragement from the “first Black US president” Barack Obama. He was a bringer of hope for many US Blacks, however after years in office, many were disappointed by the continued patterns of worse living conditions for Blacks compared to Whites in the US present

(Darity Jr., 2016). In an interview with the reparationist journalist Coates in 2016 shortly before his resignation as president, he discussed reparations. On the one hand, Obama supported the theoretical case, which according to him was obvious and appropriate, but on the other hand he did not find the cause politically possible (Coates, 2016). Thus, Obama did not seem to suffer from *colonial aphasia*, but his conclusion was the same as the European heads of states.

As mentioned earlier, John Conyers, as member of Congress, has presented a bill to study reparations (known as H.R. 40) since 1989. But in 2017 he changed the formulation of the bill from simply being about studying if there was any grounds for reparatory measures for Blacks in the US. In the new formulation of 2017, the basis of the appropriateness of these measures is taken for granted, as it is now a Bill to “Develop Reparation Proposals for African-Americans” (US Congress, 2017). This change may reflect the new momentum in the public discourse on US reparations to Blacks, with both Coates' popularization of the concept and the aforementioned UN panel's recommendations. Yet this year, as every year since 1989, the Bill has not passed Congress, maybe because of a fear that there may be grounds for reparations. In December 2017, 88-years old Conyers announced his retirement, and he will possibly be succeeded by Ian Conyers, one of his relatives (Jacobs, 2017). I am not aware of the present President Donald Trump's position on Black reparations, as he apparently has not addressed the issue. Judging from his general rhetoric which is akin to that of White nationalists, including his reaction to the pulling down of statues of Confederate “heroes” in 2017, where he was quoted saying “[*They're*] trying to take away our culture. *They're* trying to take away our history” (Buncombe, 2017), it is very unlikely that he would consider Black reparations as a viable solution to the problems of Blacks in the US. But this does in no way mean, that the movement is on a hold. Many groups advocating the cause of reparations throughout the second and third temporalities outlined in this thesis have kept working for the reparatory goal. UNIA is still functioning with chapters throughout the world, the Rastafari Movement is continually engaging in diplomacy on the matter and the Black Panther Party (in many different subgroups) are still working for the realization of the reparationist goal.

8.3.1 Sub-conclusion

The Durban Conference of 2001 created a new atmosphere of possibilities for Black reparationists, with “the slave trade” and chattel slavery being condemned as “*a crime against humanity*”. This factor, combined with a rise in focus on issues of minorities and a rising global commitment to different strands of Black reparations, has supported the reparationist agenda, whether in purely symbolic forms (apologies, monuments, museums) or multifaceted as the demands of the CARICOM in the Caribbean and NAARC in the US. International political diplomacy and public debate has characterized a great part of the Black Reparations Movement in the present, being made possible by a higher level of mass appeal, and less “revolutionary” rhetoric. What we have been witnessing these last 15-20 years in relation to Black reparations, is a move from these demands being (mostly) “*fringe*” Black politics, to being the mainstream, as it is now the official policy of Black states in the Caribbean, and supported by a growing number of civilians including academics in the Caribbean, the US and in Europe.

This third and last temporality, which also includes “the present”, has marked both a change in the way Black reparations are pursued, while it also clearly contains continuities with the other two temporalities of Black reparations developments, most obvious in the now widespread demand for repatriation, one of the earliest proposals for reparations. *Coloniality* is still felt very clearly empirically, and is argued for extensively by many different agents on different power-political levels, such as the CRC, the U.N. Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent and the NAARC and groups with roots in the other temporalities, which continues their work to this day. *Coloniality*, in all these organizations' perspectives is primarily felt through wealth, health and educational gaps between former enslaved/colonized and former enslaver/colonizer groups. At the same time, patterns of *coloniality* are very visible in the way European States react (or rather ignores) official Caribbean calls for reparations in the case of CARICOM. I believe it is plausible to expect the UK would enter into diplomatic dialogue with France, if France claimed billions of pounds in reparations for a past atrocity, but because the Caribbean are in many

cases on the receiving end in the context of aid and other initiatives, the CARICOM case is different.

Colonial aphasia is very clear in most of the European officials' statements, representing a problem in the discourse on the effects chattel slavery and colonialism have caused for Blacks in the Caribbean. It is manifest in a parallel condemnation of slavery (in theory and in distant “history”) and ignoring or dismissing the continuous legacy of inequality and racist structures in the present. All leaders were presenting initiatives of business cooperation or aid, removing such ventures from the actual historical relation between the peoples implicated. Business and aid, then, is used by European officials to bridge all the difficult problems of historical or intergenerational responsibility, and allows European states to appear responsible and humane in their treatment of their former “subjects”. The problem is that these ventures might create jobs or a level of wealth on the short term, but they are not addressing the underlying problems outlined in detail by the Black reparations movement through time. Business incentives does not erase the condition of *coloniality*. As is evident through the lived experience of Black reparationists, Black and White people in the Atlantic world are not born equal, in socio-economic terms.

Apparently, Obama did not suffer from *colonial aphasia*. Instead, he found reparations to be politically impossible to implement, ultimately coming to the same conclusion as European leaders, that reparations is not the way to justice. While disappointing to reparationists, he was actually conceding to the basic premise that Black reparations, at least on a “theoretical” level, would be in its place. At the present CARICOM's threat of (a number of national) lawsuits through the International Criminal Court has not been initiated. NAARC's 10 points are in hearing and the UN's call for US reparations has not been acted upon. But the call is still strong, also in historical groups such as the Rastafari, the UNIA and the Black Panthers. Likewise, N'COBRA in the US is still going strong.

9. DISCUSSION

"For the love of money is the root of all evil" (1 Timothy 6:10)

I have now analyzed the Black Reparations Movement in the Caribbean and the US through the three temporalities, during slavery and its immediate aftermath, the 20th century and the time from the Durban Conference of 2001 until today. Free Blacks during slavery established a tradition, and textually consolidated a distinctive perspective on freedom, justice and racial relations which would develop and change in different spatial and temporal contexts. In this temporality, demands were most often, although not exclusively, based upon biblical faith and morality, in many cases in the form of Ethiopianism, which were turned against the Euro-American racist establishment. But there were also others, such as the many Maroon societies, which were at the same time exemplars of armed resistance, Black self-determination and sabotage, as well as pragmatic instances of collaboration with colonial authorities. On a mass scale shortly after abolition, people like Callie House mobilized former enslaved Blacks to petition the US government for redress in the form of "*Ex-Slave Pensions*". In the second temporality, elements of the first temporality were built upon, and extended with new political currents of Black nationalism, Socialism and new manifestations of Black spirituality such as the Rastafari. Throughout the 20th century, reparationists were increasingly seen as presenting a challenge for colonial and recently independent governments in the Caribbean and for the US government, as they were feared as radicals and threats to security and "peace". Strong and charismatic figures such as Marcus Garvey and Martin Luther King Jr. put words to the experiences and suffering of especially lower- and middle class Blacks in the Caribbean and the US, and demanded reparatory justice, whether in the form of detachment, as in Garvey's notion of African redemption and mass repatriation, or reparatory integration, such as King's Civil Rights efforts. Neither Garvey nor King were known primarily for their reparatory aims, but people like Audley Moore and James Forman in the US popularized the idea of Black reparations, which gave rise to debates about racism and historical responsibility. Tireless front-runners such as King Emmanuel and Moore

continued their efforts from the 1940s- and 50s into the 1990's, being living examples of the continuous demand for Black reparations under changing circumstances. In the third temporality, which also encompasses the present, links to the other two temporalities are still very clear. Both when it comes to the intellectual aspects, or the specific arguments for Black reparations, and when it comes to relations between Black reparationists and Euro-American governments. The Durban Conference symbolically fell out in favor of the longstanding reparatory struggles of not only Blacks in the Caribbean and the US, but all indigenous or oppressed peoples globally. However, the UN urge for reparations was not binding. The present temporality is also characterized by a partial move from grassroots or radical politics, to mainstream government policy in the Caribbean. Even president Obama agreed on the fairness of the “theoretical” case for reparations, but he did not believe it would ever be attainable politically in the White-dominated US. While biblical arguments dominated in the early years of the movement, now the movement is far more pluralistic, including secular and spiritual groups, from governmental levels to grassroots. At the present there is an increasing level of mobilization for Black reparations, and a widespread assessment of a higher probability of success, which showed in US Congress member Conyers' change of words in his H.R.40 bill in 2017. From proposing simply to study the viability of reparations, the new formulation of the aim of the bill is to develop specific reparation proposals.

In the time from 1600-2017, *coloniality* has evolved and changed, but according to my findings, it is still very much defining the lived experience of many Blacks in the Caribbean and the US today. In the early years of colonization and early chattel slavery, the racist system of chattel slavery was developed to support European economic growth. Reparationist reactions to *coloniality* in this time was that of moral condemnation, cultural critique and demands for redress. With abolition and the ending of physical chattel slavery, Euro-American racist sentiments were continued and new ways of exploitation were set in place. As Blacks were now, at least to some extent, considered human beings, they were allowed to speak their case, meeting great opposition from White majorities. This explains the high level of surveillance, sabotage and propaganda against Marcus

Garvey, who was a non-violent but powerful figure. Both House's and Garvey's Associations were in effect mass movement attempts to alter the conditions for Blacks in *coloniality*, and Forman called to destroy the US system of *coloniality* altogether. In the most recent temporality, where reparations has become a subject of discussion in the media and a standing demand from CARICOM and other non-governmental groups, *coloniality* is characterized by Black “independence” and the possibility of diplomacy, while there is no sincere will among Euro-American governments to even enter into discussions regarding Black perspectives on the case of reparations. Thus it can be questioned, if Blacks are free and equal in the “Western world”, if their disadvantages are not taken seriously and the many Black reparatory voices are not heard. Wealth, health and educational gaps between historically racialized groups are the order of the day, making the validity of the claim more obvious to Blacks than to Whites. Euro-American governments, which have benefited so magnificently economically from slavery and colonialism, apparently still has the upper hand in international race-relations. Euro-American involvement with the Black Reparations Movement throughout the three temporalities, has been characterized by violence, fear and ignorance. This violence against and fear of reparationists through time has manifested in a number of ways. Almost all Black reparationists since slavery, from former enslaved persons to presidents, have been either murdered, been unlawfully condemned to prison, censured, exiled or simply monitored by authorities as threats to national security. At the center of this fear, Euro-American governments was the fear of “losing” enormous amounts of money, which would arguably constitute a problem for these governments, as money is essentially what makes States work and which constitutes their power.

While reparationists have underlined the strong case for an intergenerational understanding of history, anti-reparationists, mainly illustrated here by European heads of states, argue for the case of ahistorical liberalism, which asserts that the present situation is defined by a break from the history of colonialism. As Thompson states, there is not a very strong history-philosophical case for this position, convenient as it may be for politicians. These different orientations towards history is ultimately linked to how these respective groups approaches

“coloniality”. While reparationists have apparently not used this term, being a term first coined in the 2000s, reparationists are directly relating their efforts to their understandings of *“coloniality”*, which in reparationist thought is pervasive, dominant and oppressive to this day. In the anti-reparationism, or ahistorical liberalism of the European heads of states, the premise of *coloniality* as an existing condition is not accepted, and at most negative repercussions of slavery and colonialism are relegated to other spheres than the political, or socio-economic. Thus, while slavery and colonialism are very present or recent in the memory of Black reparationists, to Euro-American powers in general it is considered “history”, a delimited part of the past, and thus much more distant. These differences in approaching history and politics are also evident in the way the different camps approach the question of Black reparations politically. Generally speaking, reparationist politics has been reformist or revolutionary in their scopes, while Euro-American politics on the matter have been characterized by mainly prioritizing Euro-American economical and political stability, or conservation of the present system.

When evaluating my study in relation to the historiography it becomes evident that this study has been quite comprehensive in its scope, focusing both on Caribbean and US developments in detail. Also, my study has centered around an analysis of original materials. My focus on the movement's development and intellectual history has meant that all three temporalities have had priority as constituting the historical landscape of “the present”, and not just as periods of “a long time ago”, “some time ago” and “our time”. I have thereby taken reparationists through time seriously, and have not, as is sometimes the case in other scholarly works, just treated these as legitimization of the present movement or as peculiar artifacts of the past. Another point where my study distinguishes itself from other studies in the field is that I have not put a great focus on legal viability and in-depth discussions about present politics in relation to reparations. One of the reasons for this has been the fact that as many have pointed out, in the traditional Euro-American legal systems, socio-economic historical claims such as those of the Black Reparations Movement (where the immediate victims, at least of chattel slavery, have passed generations ago), there is not much precedence or

established procedures to rely on. Some will argue that these legal systems, which again are defined by hierarchies of *coloniality*, have not been created to comply with demands of minorities. This broad area of legal studies has not been within my scope. Instead of asking what is legally possible in the present Euro-American establishment, I have asked what reparationists through time have found necessary, for Blacks to attain a level of justice, and to reach a level of reconciliation between Whites and Blacks in the Atlantic world. With all this in mind, I regard my contribution as having improved the empirical treatment of the movement by including more diverse sources and a focus on clear textual examples, adding more knowledge to the total body of text on the Black Reparations Movement. With my specific decolonial scope, connecting the history of the movement, with the evolving mechanisms of *coloniality*, I have also widened the conceptual frames wherein the Black Reparations Movement has previously been studied.

It is now meaningful to ask what my *decolonial* approach has meant for my investigation. By focusing on the voices and perspectives advocating Black reparations through time, it has been possible for me to gain an insight into the continuities and developments of Black reparationist thought, and from where these perspectives originate spatially and culturally through time. Through my *decolonial* angle, which analytically has been present through the concept of *coloniality*, I have been able to treat reparationist texts through time as legitimate positions relating to a concrete problem, and not just as random, subjective statements. I have based my approach on “*responses to the “conquest and colonization” ... and the massive trade of enslaved Africans*” (Mignolo, 2011:45), as Mignolo has suggested, in order to interpret the world, not through the eyes of the violent oppressor, but through the voices of oppressed Blacks through time. In this manner, I have dissociated my study from Eurocentric investigations of the history of colonial history, which tends to construct European “modernity” as the epicenter of all historical developments, such as Hobsbawm and other writers. Many of the selected examples of reparationists have offered alternative ways of understanding racial relations from the 1700s onwards, all of them refuting any ideas that Blacks in the Atlantic world did not engage in resistance and that they

did not work for redress during and immediately after slavery. Likewise, it is hard not to notice the interconnection between White racist practices in the two first temporalities, and the Euro-American governments' failings to consider the call for discussion on reparations in the present temporality, even when this call is coming from recognized Nation States. While president Hollande for example is most probably not racist personally, his insensitivity in dealing with Haiti and in praising his own country's colonial past, continues a pattern of White or colonial paternalism, disengagement and master race mentality toward Haitians, a people where decolonial struggles lies at the heart of their nation's identity. As many of these European (lacks of) answers to the reparatory demands illustrates, there is a basic problem of *colonial aphasia*. For Euro-America to deal appropriately with the demands of Black reparationists, a bridge between the history of the atrocities of chattel slavery, the oppression of colonialism, racial segregation and disenfranchisement in relation present "racial" inequalities is to be built.

The title of this thesis refers to Black justice in the future, because the selected reparationists have not only responded to their pasts. This is clearly illustrated in the plea of Hall where he both commented on the past ("*We, or our ancestors have been taken from all our dear connections, and brought from Africa and put into a state of slavery*") and the current situation for Blacks ("*we find ourselves, in many respects, in a very disagreeable and disadvantageous circumstances*"). But he also addressed his vision for the future ("*[We] desire to return to Africa, our native country ... where we shall live among our equals and be more comfortable and happy*"). In this way, Black reparationists have used history and visions in a complex way, to define their identities, describe their problems, criticize White oppression through time, determine and demand reparatory claims and to propose a number of possible futures. These futures could be the peaceful and "*happy*" African vision of Hall, the self-governing Black State in the US imagined by Walker, the African Super Power of Garvey, the biblical exodus and homecoming of the Rastafari, the overthrow of the US government in Forman's vision or King's dream of peaceful co-existence and integration after reparatory measures have been implemented. Understanding the imagined futures inherent in the demands for Black reparations points to the significance of the categories of experience and expectation, being central for

human thought and historical endeavors. The Black Reparations Movement then is one example of the asymmetric relation in the present between, in the terms of Koselleck, “*the space of experience*” and the “*horizon of expectation*” (Jordheim, 2012:153). On the one hand, reparationists have been more or less rejected by Euro-America since the beginnings of colonialism. On the other hand, reparationists have continually envisioned a grand future, an expectation that tomorrow can become more just than yesterday. Possibly the increasingly more radical split between experience and expectation can be traced from the first demands which focused mainly on repatriation and education, to the present demands of CARICOM and the NAARC, which in great detail describes how they envision a multifaceted future initiative, including apologies, health services, regeneration of African culture, education, repatriation – and ultimately aiming at overcoming the lasting effects of colonialism and slavery. Maybe this change underlines how, while Black reparations as such has not become a unified mass movement, there is now a socio-political environment of globalism and international “morality” in the form of the UN, where more radical measures of redress might become possible. Of course, I do not know what the future might bring in relation to Black reparations. While there are no signs that Euro-America willingly will meet the present demands, there are also no signs of reparationists as a whole conforming to “ahistorical liberalism” and giving up the aim of reparations. Black reparations from Euro-America may not be likely at the moment, but the satisfaction of these reparatory demands may be more likely now than ever.

IO. CONCLUSION

It is now time to answer my problem statement, which reads as the following:

Through an investigation of the emergence of the Black Reparations Movement in the US and the Caribbean in three different temporalities, I will ask which historical patterns have occurred in addressing the cause of Black reparations since slavery, and which changes have occurred in these patterns? And how are the atrocities and the oppression of slavery and post-slavery world orders (coloniality) problematized by reparationists through time?

For more than 300 years and ever since enslavement, the Black Reparations Movement has been a contested, but generally steady social, spiritual and political force in dialogue and conflict with Euro-American governments. The claim of reparations has been consistent in its essence, but varying in its forms and its scopes. The essence of the claim for Black reparations has been based upon the deliberate, institutionalized dehumanization of millions of Black people in the Diaspora in slavery over centuries. Depending on the temporality and locality of demands, other elements of the Black experience have been included in the overall case for reparations, whether these were disenfranchisement, racial violence such as lynchings, a major independence debt in the case of Haiti, forced segregation, general racism, health issues or poverty. While the grounds for reparations have often been agreed upon by Black reparationists, their socio-economic status or ideological convictions have differed and still do. The demands have come from a number of positions, including former enslaved people, Christians, Muslims, Black Nationalists, Rastafari, Black Socialists and revolutionaries, academics (including historians), politicians, and non-Black academics and activists (sometimes in combinations).

By structuring my analysis through temporalities instead of periods, I believe I have come to a deeper understanding of the movement's development as an intergenerational entity. Understanding multiple temporalities as layers, in a sense all present at the same time at varying levels, I have avoided oversimplifying the complex history of the movement in linear narratives from “early modernity” to

“postmodernity”. There have been variations in the movement's conditions of *coloniality* and its demands throughout different times. But it is noteworthy that key arguments for reparationists such as Cugoano's in the 1700s are very similar to that of the present: condemning Euro-American dehumanization, slavery and colonialism as being “a crime” and non compliant with Christian and/or secular norms. While the movement have never been unified into a single body or organization, it is evident that arguments and perspectives are agreed upon, repeated and built upon across temporalities. Among these are the goal of repatriation. Before this study I was aware that repatriation to Africa was a dominant theme in the historical Black Reparations Movement, but I did not know how widespread this vision actually was. Thus, the call for repatriation to Africa was advocated by such diverse groups and individuals as Hall, Garvey and UNIA, the Rastafari, Forman, the Black Panthers, CARICOM and the NAARC. This claim which arguably is grounded in the history of forced migration and enslavement lives on into the 21th century.

While there is a longstanding tradition of more or less coherent elements in the Black reparations demands, there are also new developments. Especially since the 2010s, the Black Reparations cause has moved from representing a minority or radical position to becoming government policy in the Caribbean through the Caribbean Reparations Commission. International bodies of justice such as the UN and the ICC, which were created to protect States and citizens of the world from crimes against humanity, are increasingly becoming more central to the cause of reparations, and I believe that my thesis documents that Euro-American governments have not predicted and are not prepared for this development. But this does not necessarily mean that great changes will come soon. I find it fascinating how Euro-America have been able to justify its position of anti-reparationism, through time. The complex mechanism of *colonial aphasia*, being a state of confusion disconnecting the history of slavery, colonialism and oppression of Blacks from the present socio-political situation, makes mantras like “*moving on*” possible and legitimate. This points to how selective historical memory works, but also how it creates problems. The result is that those in political power practically get to define who engages (or disengages) history in an acceptable way politically.

The centuries-long dehumanization of Black people in the Diaspora, including post-slavery discriminatory laws, were all based upon the ultimate goal of wealth and privileges for Whites. Through the 20th and 21th centuries the call for reparations has been ignored or rejected, with the main reason being ... the fear of monetary loss. Money, which has meant so much for “modern” civilization and technology, seems to be in the center of all questions about “racial relations” between descendants of enslaved Africans and Euro-Americans. However, the focus of the Black Reparations Movement have mainly been the vision of reaching peace, equality and friendship between the historically racialized groups of Blacks and Whites, rather than plain cash payments.

Race does not exist scientifically speaking, just as the Euro-American colonialisms of yesterday is no more in effect. But racism and racialism, as well as *coloniality* in general exists, and these phenomena seem to be continuous forces in the world. The developments in the Black Reparations Movement in different temporalities leading up to the present, have been full of Black agency, resistance and diplomacy, aiming for Black empowerment, redress and real socio-political freedom and equality. Will Euro-America ever take heed to the call for Black reparations? No matter what the future might bring in regard to Black reparations, one thing seems sure after this investigation. Not all Black people will accept the socio-economic conditions of *coloniality*, although Euro-American chattel slavery and colonialism are, mostly, in the past. Repercussions of these are in the present, and the movement to counteract them is stronger than ever.

II. LITERATURE

Books

Andersen, Astrid Nonbo. 2017. *Ingen undskyldning: Erindringer om Dansk Vestindien og kravet om erstatninger for slaveriet*. Gyldendal.

Barnett, Michael. 2014. Rastafari in the New Millenium: Rastafari at the Dawn of the Fifth Epoch. In Barnett, Michael (ed.). *Rastafari in the New Millenium – A Rastafari Reader*. Syracuse University Press. pp. 1-12

Barrett, Leonard. 2010. *The Rastafarians: Twentieth Anniversary Edition* Beacon Press.

Bay, Mia. 2000. *The White Image in the Black Mind : African-American Ideas about White People, 1830-1925*. Oxford University Press.

Beauvois, Frédérique. 2016. *Between Blood and Gold: The Debates over Compensation for Slavery in the Americas*. Berghahn Books.

Beckles, Hilary McD. 2013. *Britain's Black Debt: Reparations for Caribbean Slavery and Native Genocide*. University of West Indies Press.

Berlin, Ira. 1998. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Harvard University Press.

Bijl, Paul. 2015. *Emerging Memory : Photographs of Colonial Atrocity in Dutch Cultural Remembrance*. Amsterdam University Press.

Blaut, James Morris. 2000. *Eight Eurocentric Historians*. The Guilford Press.

Brennan, Fernne. 2017. *Race Rights Reparations: Institutional Racism and The Law*. Taylor & Francis.

- Brooks, Roy L. 2004. *Atonement and Forgiveness: A New Model for Black Reparations*. University of California Press.
- Celermajer, Danielle. 2009. *The Sins of the Nation and the Ritual of Apologies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chevannes, Barry. 2014. Rastafari and the Coming of Age – The Routinization of the Rastafari Movement in Jamaica. In Barnett, Michael (ed.), *Rastafari in the New Millennium – A Rastafari Reader*. Syracuse University Press.
- Cugoano, Ottobah. 2014. *Thoughts and Sentiments on the Evil and Wicked Traffic of the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species Humbly Submitted to the Inhabitants of Great Britain*. Cambridge University Press.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2016. The ‘European’ Question: Migration, Race, and Post-Coloniality in ‘Europe’. In Amelina, A., Horvath, Kenneth, & Meeus, Bruno (2016). *An anthology of migration and social transformation, European perspectives (IMISCOE research)*. Cham: Springer. Pp. 343-356
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 2012 [1903]). *The Souls of Black Folk*. Dover Publications.
- Dunn, Richard S. 2012. *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Garvey, Marcus & Blaisdell, Bob (ed.). 2004. *Selected Writings and Speeches of Marcus Garvey*. Dover Publications. New York.
- Ghachem, Malick W. 2012. *The Old Regime and the Haitian Revolution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hager, Christopher. 2013. *Word by Word: Emancipation and the Act of Writing*. Harvard University Press.

Hawthorne, Walter. 2010. *From Africa to Brazil: Culture, Identity, and an Atlantic Slave Trade, 1600–1830*. Cambridge University Press.

Henry, Paget. 2014. Black Power in the Political Thought of Antigua and Bermuda. In *Black Power in the Caribbean*, edited by Kate Quinn, University Press of Florida. Pp. 181-196

Hicks, Jack and White, Graham. 2015. *Made in Nunavut: An Experiment in Decentralized Government* □ UBC Press.

Hoover, J. Edgar. 1983 [1919]. MEMORANDUM FOR MR. RIDGELY. In Robert A. Hill (1983), ed. *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers, Volume II, 27 August 1919 - 31 August 1920*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, pp. 72.

Horowitz, David. 2002. *Uncivil Wars: The Controversy Over Reparations for Slavery*. Encounter Books.

Howard-Hassmann, Rhoda E. 2008. *Reparations to Africa*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jones, Eric. 1981. *The European Miracle: Environments, Economies and Geopolitics in the History of Europe and Asia*. Cambridge University Press.

Kaplan, Sidney. 1973. *The Black presence in the era of the American Revolution, 1770-1800*. New York Graphic Society. Greenwich, Conn.

Keita, Maghan. 2000. *Race and the Writing of History: Riddling the Sphinx*. Oxford University Press.

King, Jr., Martin Luther. 1964. *Why We Can't Wait*. A Mentor Book/New American Library. New York.

- Lamming, George. 2006. On the Occasion for Speaking. In Ashcroft, Bill; Griffiths, Gareth & Tiffin, Helen. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. 2 edition, Routledge.
- Leary, Joy Degruy. 2005. Post Traumatic Slave Syndrome: America's Legacy of Enduring Injury and Healing. Uptone Press.
- Leslie M., Alexander. 2010. "The Black Republic:" The Influence of the Haitian Revolution on Northern Black Political Consciousness, 1816-1862. In Jackson, Maurice and Bacon, Jacqueline (Eds.). *African Americans and the Haitian revolution : selected essays and historical documents*. New York : Routledge.
- Levine, Lawrence W. 1982. Marcus Garvey. In Franklin, John Hope and Meier, August (Eds.). *Black Leaders of the Twentieth Century*. University of Illinois Press.
- Lovejoy, Paul E. 2011. Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa. Cambridge University Press. 3rd edition.
- Maeso, Silvia R. & Araújo, Marta. 2015. Eurocentrism, Political Struggles and the Entrenched Will-to-Ignorance: An Introduction. In *Eurocentrism, Racism and Knowledge : Debates on History and Power in Europe and the Americas*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, Tony. 1983. *Marcus Garvey, Hero: A First Biography*, The Majority Press, Dover, Massachusetts.
- Moore, Audley A. 1963. *Why Reparations? Reparations is the Battle Cry for the Economic and Social Freedom of More than 25 Million Descendants of American Slaves*. Los Angeles.
- Niaah, Jahlani. 2014. The Rastafari Presence in Ethiopia: A Contemporary Perspective. In Barnett, Michael (ed.), *Rastafari in the New Millenium – A Rastafari Reader*. Syracuse University Press. pp. 66-88

Parris, LaRose T. 2015. *Being Apart: Theoretical and Existential Resistance in Africana Literature*. University of Virginia Press.

Price, Charles. 2009. *Becoming Rasta: Origins of Rastafari Identity in Jamaica*. New York University Press.

□Prunier, Gérard and Ficquet, Éloi. 2015. *Understanding Contemporary Ethiopia: Monarchy, Revolution and the Legacy of Meles Zenawi*. Oxford University Press.

Remington Christa L.; Garcia-Zamor, Jean-Claude. 2016. *Haiti: Fragile State or Failed Nation?* In Rosen, Jonathan D.; Kassab, Hanna S. (Eds.). *Fragile States in the Americas*. Lexington Books.

Smith, Priest Douglas. 2012. *The Philosophy and Opinions of The High Priest*. Rootz Foundation Inc.

Stein, Judith. 1986. *The World of Marcus Garvey: Race and Class in Modern Society*. Louisiana State University Press.

Walker, David. 2011 [1830]. *Walker's Appeal, in Four Articles : Together with a Preamble, to the Coloured Citizens of the World, but in Particular, and Very Expressly, to Those of the United States of America*. University of North Carolina Press.

Wekker, Gloria. 2016. *White Innocence: Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race*. Duke University Press.

Wheelock, Stefan M. 2016. *Barbaric Culture and Black Critique: Black Antislavery Writers, Religion, and the Slaveholding Atlantic*. University of Virginia Press.

□Winbush, Raymond A. 2009. *Belinda's Petition: A Concise History of Reparations For The TransAtlantic Slave Trade* □ Xlibris Corporation.

Wittmann, Nora. 2013. *Slavery Reparations Time is Now: Exposing Lies, Claiming Justice for Global Survival*. Power of The Trinity Publishers.

Government publications⁵

Leslie, L.C., Douglas, M. B., Gordon, C. G., Blackwood, W. M., Reid, V. and Scarlett, Z. M. 1961. Majority Report of Mission to Africa. Retrieved at <http://lojsociety.org/Majority-Minority-Summary-Report-of-Mission-to-Africa-1961-PrintReady.pdf>

Sarkozy, Nicolas. 2011. Day to commemorate the abolition of human trafficking and slavery – Speech by Nicolas Sarkozy, President of the Republic (excerpts). Retrieved on <https://uk.ambafrance.org/President-Sarkozy-commemorates-the>

Senate Select Committee. 1976. Final report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, United States Senate : together with additional, supplemental, and separate views. Retrieved on https://archive.org/stream/finalreportofsel03unit/finalreportofsel03unit_djvu.txt

United Nations. 2001. World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance: Declaration. Retrieved at <http://www.un.org/WCAR/durban.pdf>

United Nations. 2003. Address by Mr. Jean-Bertrand Aristide, President of the Republic of Haiti. In General Assembly, Fifty-eighth session, 13th plenary meeting Friday, 26 September 2003, 10 a.m. New York. pp. 6-8. Retrieved on http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/58/PV.13

US Congress. 2017. H.R.40 - Commission to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African-Americans Act: 115th Congress (2017-2018). Retrieved on <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/40>

5 All links have been accessed December 30th 2017.

Introductory quotes

Chapter 1:

Garvey, Marcus & Blaisdell, Bob (ed.). (2004). "Selected Writings and Speeches of Marcus Garvey". Dover Publications, New York, pp. 183

Chapter 6:

Brooks, Jerome. 1994. Chinua Achebe, The Art of Fiction No. 139. *The Paris Review*. Retrieved at

<https://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/1720/chinua-achebe-the-art-of-fiction-no-139-chinua-achebe>

Journals

Adu-Boahen, Kwabena (2012). The Impact Of European Presence On Slavery In The Sixteenth To Eighteenth-Century Gold Coast. *Transactions Of The Historical Society Of Ghana*, New Series, No. 14, Pp. 165- 199

Aiyetoro, Adjoa and Davis, Adrienne D. 2010. Historic and Modern Social Movements for Reparations: The National Coalition for Reparations in America (N'COBRA) and its Antecedents. *Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies Research*. Paper 10. n.p.

Anderson, Robert Nelson. "The 'Quilombo' of Palmares: A New Overview of a Maroon State in 17th Century Brazil." *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 28, no. 3 (1996): 545—566.

Beckles, Hilary McD. 2007. "Slavery was a long, long time ago": Remembrance, Reconciliation and the Reparations Discourse in the Caribbean. *ARIEL*, 38.1, pp. 9-25

Berry, Mary F. (1972). Reparations for Freedmen, 1890-1916: Fraudulent Practices or Justice Deferred?. *The Journal of Negro History*. Vol. 57, No. 3 (Jul.), pp. 219-230

Bilby, Kenneth. 2012. Image and Imagination: Re-Visioning the Maroons in the Morant Bay Rebellion. *History and Memory*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Fall/Winter), pp. 41-72

Biondi, Martha. 2003. The Rise of the Reparations Movement. *Radical History Review*. Issue 87 (fall): 5–18

Burton, Richard D.E. 1999. NAMES AND NAMING IN AFRO-CARIBBEAN CULTURES. *NWIG: New West Indian Guide / Nieuwe West-Indische Gids*, Vol. 73, No. 1/2, pp. 35-58

Chevannes, Barry. 2011. Ships that will never sail: the paradox of Rastafari Pan-Africanism. *Critical Arts: South-North Cultural and Media Studies*. Volume 25, 2011 - Issue 4. Pp. 565-575

Crockett, Hasan. 2001. The Incendiary Pamphlet: David Walker's Appeal in Georgia. *The Journal of Negro History*, Vol. 86, No. 3 (Summer), pp. 305-318

Dirlik, Arif (1999). Is There History after Eurocentrism?: Globalism, Postcolonialism, and the Disavowal of History. *Cultural Critique*, No. 42. (Spring, 1999), pp. 1-34.

Duncan, Graham A. (2015). ETHIOPIANISM IN PAN-AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE, 1880-1920. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, Volume 41, Number 2. pp. 198–218

Edwards, Elizabeth and Mead, Matt. 2013. Absent Histories and Absent Images: Photographs, Museums and the Colonial Past. *Museum & Society*, 11(1), pp. 19-38

Foster, John Bellamy. 2017. Neofascism in the White House. *Monthly Review*; New York Vol. 68, Iss. 11, (Apr 2017): 1-30.

Frye, Jerry K. 1974. The "Black Manifesto" and the Tactic of Objectification. *Journal of Black Studies*. Vol. 5, No. 1 (Sep.), pp. 65-76

Gross, Izhak. 1980. The Abolition of Negro Slavery and British Parliamentary Politics 1832-3. *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Mar.), pp. 63-85

Hill, Walter B. (1996). The Ex-Slave Pension Movement: Some Historical and Genealogical Notes. *Negro History Bulletin*; Washington Vol. 59, Iss. 4, (Oct 1): 7-11

Kent, R. K. "Palmares: An African State in Brazil." *The Journal of African History*, 6, no. 2 (1965): 161—75.

Lockett, James D. 1999. The Deportation of the Maroons of Trelawny Town to Nova Scotia, then Back to Africa. *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Sep.), pp. 5-14

McDuffie, Erik S. 2010. 'I wanted a Communist philosophy, but I wanted us to have a chance to organize our people': the diasporic radicalism of Queen Mother Audley Moore and the origins of black power. *African and Black Diaspora: An International Journal*, 3:2, 181-195

Mignolo, Walter (2011). Epistemic Disobedience and the Decolonial Option: A Manifesto. *TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(2)

Mignolo, Walter D. (2007). DELINKING: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies*, 21:2, 449 - 514

Oppenheimer, Martin. 2012. Mobs, Vigilantes, Cops, and Feds: The Repression of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. *New Politics*; New York Vol. 14, Iss. 1, (Summer): 64-74.

Postelnicescu, Claudia (2016). Europe's New Identity: The Refugee Crisis and the Rise of Nationalism. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*. Vol. 12 Issue 2, p203-209. 7p.

Price, Charles Reavis. 2003. "CLEAVE TO THE BLACK": EXPRESSIONS OF ETHIOPIANISM IN JAMAICA. *NWIG: New West Indian Guide / Nieuwe West-Indische Gids*, Vol. 77, No. 1/2 , pp. 31-64

Quijano, Anibal (2000). Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South* 1.3

Schuller, Mark (2007). HAITI'S 200-YEAR MÉNAGE-À-TROIS: GLOBALIZATION, THE STATE, AND CIVIL SOCIETY. *Caribbean Studies*. Jan-June, Vol. 35 Issue 1, p141-179

Spooner, Matthew (2014). 'I Know This Scheme is from God:' Toward a Reconsideration of the Origins of the American Colonization Society. *Slavery & Abolition*. Dec., Vol. 35 Issue 4, p559-575. 17p.

Stoler, Ann Laura (2011). Colonial Aphasia: Race and Disabled Histories in France. *Public Culture* 23:1

Torpey, John. 2004. Paying for the past?: the movement for reparations for African-Americans. *Journal of Human Rights*, vol. 3, no. 2 (june), 171-187

Valencia, Henry Arenas. 2015. From Guinea-Bissau to Colombia. Benkos Biohó, resistance and (is)

Palenque. A case of the African Diaspora. *Revista CS*, 01 August, Issue 16, pp.233-242

Van Dijk, Frank Jan. 1995. SOCIOLOGICAL MEANS: COLONIAL REACTIONS TO THE RADICALIZATION OF RASTAFARI IN JAMAICA, 1956-1959. *New West Indian Guide/ Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 69, no: 1/2, Leiden, 67-101

Vasquez, Irene A. 2010. THE LONGUE DURÉE OF AFRICANS IN MEXICO: THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF RACIALIZATION, ACCULTURATION, AND AFRO-MEXICAN SUBJECTIVITY. *The Journal of African American History*, 01 April, Vol.95(2), pp.183-201

Wimmer, Andreas & Schiller, Nina Glick (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks* 2, 4 (2002) 301–334.

Wittmann, Nora (2016). Reparations — Legally Justified and Sine qua non for Global Justice, Peace and Security. *GLOBAL JUSTICE : THEORY PRACTICE RHETORIC* (9/2) 2016

Yudell, Michael; Roberts, Dorothy; DeSalle, Rob; Tishkoff, Sarah (2016). Taking race out of human genetics. *Science*, Vol. 351, Issue 6273, pp. 564-565

Newspaper Articles⁶

Brown, DeNeen L. 2017. Obama leaves White House without pardoning black nationalist Marcus Garvey. *The Washington Post*. 21 January. Retrieved on https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/obama-leaves-white-house-without-pardoning-black-nationalist-marcus-garvey/2017/01/20/d8b6f044-d906-11e6-9a36-1d296534b31e_story.html?utm_term=.1eddba8012c0

Buncombe, Andrew. 2017. Robert E Lee's descendant tells Trump to stop defending Confederate statues: 'How dare you'. *Independent*. 24 August. Retrieved on <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump->

6 All links have been accessed December 30th 2017.

[confederate-statues-robert-e-lee-descendant-stop-defending-comments-a7911116.html](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/12/how-barack-obama-failed-black-americans/511358/)

Darity Jr., William A. 2016. How Barack Obama Failed Black Americans. *The Atlantic*. 22 december. Retrieved on <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/12/how-barack-obama-failed-black-americans/511358/>

Franklin, Andrew K. (2013). King in 1967: My dream has 'turned into a nightmare'. *NBC News*. 27 august. Retrieved on <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/other/king-1967-my-dream-has-turned-nightmare-f8C11013179>

Gates Jr., Henry Louis (2010). Ending the Slavery Blame Game. *The New York Times*. 22 april. Retrieved at <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/23/opinion/23gates.html>

Jacobs, Ben. 2017. John Conyers resigns from Congress after sexual harassment allegations. *The Guardian*. 5 december. Retrieved on <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/dec/05/john-conyers-will-not-see-re-election-amid-sexual-harassment-allegations>

Landes, David. 2013. Sweden 'open' to slave trade reparations. *The Local*. 13 december. Retrieved on <https://www.thelocal.se/20131213/sweden-open-to-caribbean-slave-trade-reparations>

NBC News (2004). South Africa welcomes Aristide: Ousted Haitian president calls it 'temporary home'. *NBC News*. 31 may. Retrieved on http://www.nbcnews.com/id/5106141/ns/world_news/t/south-africa-welcomes-aristide/

RFI 2017. Macron rules out reparations for colonialism. *RFI*. 4 december.
Retrieved on <http://en.rfi.fr/africa/20171204-macron-rules-out-reparations-colonialism>

Riley-Smith, Ben (2015). David Cameron calls on Jamaica to "move on" from "painful legacy" of slavery. *The Telegraph*, 30th september. Retrieved at:
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/11902265/David-Cameron-calls-on-Jamaica-to-move-on-from-painful-legacy-of-slavery.html>

Smith, David. 2006. Blair: Britain's 'sorrow' for shame of slave trade. *The Guardian*. 26 november. Retrieved on
<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2006/nov/26/race.immigrationpolicy>

Torres-Bennett, Aileen. 2014. Caribbean nations agree to seek slavery reparations from Europe. *Reuters*. 11 march. Retrieved on
<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-caribbean-slavery-idUSBREA2A1ZR20140311>

TV-documentary transcripts

Gates, Jr., Louis Gates and Cross, June (1998). FRONTLINE: THE TWO NATIONS OF BLACK AMERICA. Air date: February 10, 1998. Produced by June Cross. Retrieved on
<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/race/etc/script.html>

Video

Garvey, Marcus ([1925] 2014). "Marcus Garvey Live Freedom Speech" (Address in New York). Video recording, youtube. Quote at 15:08. Retrieved at
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3ykhPHWIk48>

Web Pages⁷

⁷ All links have been accessed December 30th 2017.

Alvaranga, Filmore; Mack, Douglas. [1961] 2013. *Letter to Queen Elizabeth II*. Retrieved on <https://robbieshilliam.wordpress.com/2013/11/03/rastafari-letters-from-the-mission-to-africa/>

Amnesty International. 2006. Amnesty International Report 2006 – Haiti. Retrieved on <https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/186/34472.html>

Caribbean Reparations Commission. n.d.. What is the Caribbean Reparations Commission. Retrieved on <http://caricomreparations.org>

CARICOM (n.d.) *Who we are*. Retrieved at <http://caricom.org/about-caricom/who-we-are>

IBW21. 2017. *National African American Reparations Commission Meets in New Orleans, November 30-December 2*. Retrieved at <https://ibw21.org/events/national-african-american-reparations-commission-meets-in-new-orleans-november-30-december-2/>

Northwestern University (n.d.). *Martha Biondi: PROFESSOR OF AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDIES AND HISTORY*. Retrieved on <http://www.afam.northwestern.edu/people/faculty/martha-biondi.html>

Soomer, June. 2016. THE REPARATIONS MOVEMENT: “A RAGTAG COLLECTION OF RACIAL MALCONTENTS MARCHING TO THE BEAT OF THEIR OWN DRUM?”. Retrieved on <http://caricomreparations.org/reparations-movement-ragtag-collection-racial-malcontents-marching-beat-drum/>

Stratfor. 2003. *Haiti: Aristide Bills The French*. Retrieved on <https://worldview.stratfor.com/situation-report/haiti-aristide-bills-french>

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database (n.d.). *Table*. Retrieved at <http://slavevoyages.org/assessment/estimates>

UA Little Rock (n.d.). *Adjoa A. Aiyetoro*. Retrieved on <http://ualr.edu/law/faculty/adjoa-a-aiyetoro/>

US Census Bureau. 2006. *Statistics of Slaves*. Retrieved on <https://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/00165897ch14.pdf>

Weintrob, Celia. 2015. *Holocaust survivor heirs now eligible for pensions*. Retrieved on <http://beitahavavetorah.com/news-media/pensions-now-paid-to-heirs-of-holocaust-survivors/>

Photos used for front page art

<https://historyandthenews.files.wordpress.com/2015/11/slavemain1.jpg>

<https://ak6.picdn.net/shutterstock/videos/14023526/thumb/1.jpg>

https://www.istockphoto.com/ae/vector/freedom-and-escape-from-handcuffs-and-chains-gm469935223-34918056?st=p_handcuffs%20breaking%20slavery%20broken