Submission to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD)
Toward a General Recommendation on Reparatory Justice and Reparations for the Chattel Enslavement of Africans and the Continuing Harms to People of African Descent

Prepared by: Dr. Remi Alapo
Director, Institute for Peace and Leadership USA
Date: November 7, 2025

Executive Summary

The transatlantic trade in enslaved Africans and the global systems of colonial domination that followed formed a single, interlocking regime of racialized violence and economic extraction. Together, they generated enduring de facto material and social inequalities that continue to shape the lives of people of African descent worldwide. The Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (United Nations, 2002) recognized slavery and the slave trade as crimes against humanity, and contemporary international law particularly the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court of 1998 (ICC, 1998; 2021) and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (ICRC, 1948), establishes a continuing duty to remedy such harms.

Article 6 of the Rome Statute (ICC, 2021) defines genocide as acts committed "with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group," including killing, inflicting serious harm, or imposing conditions of life calculated to bring about a group's destruction. These provisions provide a legal and moral framework for recognizing that the Middle Passage and the broader Atlantic slave system meet the threshold of genocidal acts and thus warrant comprehensive reparations.

This submission to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) therefore urges the Committee to adopt a General Recommendation that clarifies State parties' obligations under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) to deliver both reparations, as specific forms of redress and reparatory justice, as a sustained, participatory process aimed at dismantling structural racism, redistributing resources, and restoring dignity. Reparatory justice extends beyond material compensation; it encompasses institutional reform, memory, healing, and guarantees of non-recurrence.

The paper distinguishes reparatory justice from retributive justice. While retributive justice seeks punishment of perpetrators, reparatory justice emphasizes transformation and restoration. It centers on the victims, descendants, and communities still living with the consequences of enslavement and colonialism, focusing on rebuilding moral, social, and economic balance rather than assigning blame. This distinction is crucial for framing reparations not as punitive demands but as the fulfillment of international legal and ethical obligations to correct continuing injustice.

In doing so, the paper addresses de facto inequality, the persistent material and social disparities between people of African descent and dominant populations. Despite formal legal equality, global racial wealth gaps, unequal access to education, health, and representation, and epistemic exclusion persist. CERD's General Recommendation must therefore move beyond symbolic recognition to establish minimum standards for

structural transformation, targeted redistributive policies, education reform, and inclusive development frameworks consistent with SDGs 4, 5, 10, 16, and 17 (all in line with Institute for Peace and Leadership USA's mission).

The intent and purpose of this paper are twofold:

1. To provide a scholarly and policy-based foundation for CERD's forthcoming General Recommendation on reparations and reparatory justice for people of African descent; and
2. To demonstrate how these principles are being operationalized through the applied work of the Institute for Peace and Leadership USA (IPL USA), a model of community-centered reparatory practice.

The Institute's initiatives in research, education, interfaith dialogue, and gender equity exemplify how reparatory justice can be enacted at the intersection of academia, civil society, and United Nations frameworks. By aligning its programs with CEDAW, UNSCR 1325, and the Durban Declaration, IPL USA's work illustrates the transformative potential of reparatory justice as lived policy and practice.

Ultimately, this submission calls upon CERD to frame reparatory justice as a forward-looking, global project, one that unites moral acknowledgment with structural change. The aim is not to reopen old wounds but to heal them through accountability, redistribution, and reconciliation, thereby advancing the UN's overarching goals of equality, peace, and shared humanity.

1. **Terminology: "Reparatory Justice" vs. "Reparations"**

Reparations are concrete measures that provide redress for identifiable harms (for example, compensation, rehabilitation, restitution, satisfaction, guarantees of non-recurrence). Reparatory justice is the broader, long-term process by which societies acknowledge, repair, and transform structures that produced those harms, typically combining legal remedies with institutional reform, memory work, and distributive measures (de Greiff, 2006; Laplante, 2015; Táíwò, 2022). This distinction is increasingly used by UN mechanisms and regional initiatives to emphasize transformation, not one-off payments (OHCHR experts; WGEPAD; CARICOM). CERD should embed this dual framing throughout the General Recommendation.

Proposed language:

States Parties should take all appropriate measures to provide reparations to victims and their descendants and to advance reparatory justice through inclusive, participatory processes aimed at dismantling structural legacies of enslavement and colonialism, promoting equitable redistribution, and achieving substantive racial equality (United Nations, 2005).

Justification for a proposed language:

This proposed language reflects established principles of international law affirming the right to remedy and reparation for gross human rights violations (United Nations, 2005). It aligns with ICERD Article 2(2), which requires States to take special measures to eliminate *de facto* racial discrimination, and with the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (2001/2009) recognizing slavery and colonialism as crimes against humanity. By explicitly linking reparations to reparatory justice a*s* a participatory, transformative process. This formulation ensures that remedies extend beyond financial compensation to include structural reform, equity, and the restoration of human dignity.

2. Reparatory Justice vs. Retributive Justice

The pursuit of reparatory justice must be distinguished from the logic of retributive justice. Whereas retributive justice focuses on punishment and proportionality for wrongdoing, seeking to impose penalties on perpetrators, reparatory justice aims at repairing relationships, restoring dignity, and transforming structures that have produced and sustained systemic harm.

In the context of slavery and colonialism, the retributive model is limited: centuries of violations cannot be undone through punishment alone, and many perpetrators and states implicated in these crimes no longer exist in their historical form. Reparatory justice, by contrast, recognizes the ongoing effects of these historical crimes and seeks to address them through transformative measures, including restitution, rehabilitation, institutional reform, and collective acknowledgment (de Greiff, 2006; Laplante, 2015).

As de Greiff (2006) notes, retributive mechanisms alone often "fail to rebuild civic trust or rectify the conditions that produced harm." Reparatory justice instead, centers on the victims and their descendants, aiming to restore their agency, participation, and sense of belonging within the moral community. It draws on restorative and distributive principles rooted in global human rights law.

Reparatory justice therefore does not seek vengeance, but balance a moral, social, and economic reordering of the world toward equity. It is future-oriented: not a backward gaze of blame, but a forward commitment to rebuilding justice through recognition, redistribution, and reconciliation. In this sense, it aligns with the United Nations' framework of transitional and transformative justice, extending these principles beyond post-conflict societies to the enduring aftermath of racial and colonial subjugation.

In contexts of historical injustice, including the transatlantic trade in enslaved Africans and colonial domination, retributive mechanisms alone are insufficient. The structural nature of these harms, and their continuing legacies in the form of racial inequality,

economic disenfranchisement, and epistemic exclusion, demand a transformative and participatory approach. It operationalizes the Convention's mandate to achieve substantive equality by dismantling structures of racial subordination and ensuring the full participation of people of African descent in public life. Reparatory justice therefore requires States to:

1. **Acknowledge** their historical role and responsibility in creating and perpetuating racial hierarchies;
2. **Engage** in dialogue and partnership with affected communities, descendants, and diaspora populations;
3. **Implement** comprehensive measures that address both symbolic and material dimensions of harm, including restitution, rehabilitation, and systemic reform; and
4. **Promote** reconciliation grounded not in punishment, but in moral accountability and shared commitment to a just future.

Accordingly, States Parties should be guided by reparatory justice principles when designing or implementing policies related to education, development, and reconciliation, ensuring that the objective is not retribution, but restoration of human dignity, social harmony, and equitable coexistence.

3. Enslavement and Colonialism are Inextricably Intertwined

Enslavement financed and underwrote colonial expansion; colonial legal orders normalized racial hierarchy and facilitated slave trading, expropriation, and forced labor. The DDPA records global consensus that slavery, the slave trade (including the transatlantic slave trade), and colonialism produced continuing harms that require remedies. Contemporary UN resolutions and the UN Permanent Forum on People of African Descent reiterate that racialized inequalities today are direct legacies of these systems (DDPA; HRC resolutions; PFPAD proceedings). CERD should therefore treat colonialism and enslavement as a single continuum of racially discriminatory practices within ICERD's scope, triggering obligations to remedy structural discrimination, not merely individual acts.

4. The Middle Passage and the Genocide Question

Whether the Middle Passage constitutes genocide under international law hinges on the specific intent requirement in Article II of the Genocide Convention. Even when the narrow proof of *dolus specialis* is contested, many protected acts such as killing, causing serious bodily or mental harm, deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction, occurred on a massive scale during the slave trade, accompanied by policies that destroyed social and familial continuity (Card, 2003; Patterson, 1982). The Middle Passage can thus be analyzed as genocidal in effect and as a crime against humanity under Rome Statute Article 7 (enslavement; deportation;

persecution), informing the scope and gravity of reparations (Genocide Convention (ICRC); Rome Statute (ICC). CERD should explicitly permit States to frame harms under both regimes, while recognizing that failure to establish genocidal intent does not reduce obligations to provide full, adequate, and effective reparations for crimes against humanity and racially discriminatory policies.

5.Legal Bases for State Obligation

The right to reparation and the duty to remedy gross violations of human rights are firmly established principles of international law. These obligations arise not only from moral responsibility but from binding legal frameworks developed through the United Nations system, international criminal law, and customary international norms. In the case of chattel enslavement, the transatlantic slave trade, and colonial domination, the international community has long recognized that these acts constitute crimes against humanity and under certain conditions, genocidal practices that trigger continuing State obligations for redress. Reparatory justice therefore finds its foundation in multiple intersecting legal instruments:

The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD), which mandates States to eliminate racial discrimination "by all appropriate means"; the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (2001/2009), which expressly names slavery and the slave trade as crimes against humanity; and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998), which defines both enslavement and genocide as crimes giving rise to international responsibility. Together with evolving jurisprudence and emerging practice such as the CARICOM Ten-Point Plan for Reparatory Justice, and the findings of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (WGEPAD), these instruments establish that States have a continuing duty to repair the legacies of historical racial injustice.

These frameworks collectively affirm that reparations are not discretionary gestures of goodwill but legal and procedural obligations rooted in the principles of equality, accountability, and non-discrimination. These provisions are directly relevant to the transatlantic slave trade and colonial projects, which inflicted widespread death, physical and psychological harm, and cultural erasure upon peoples of African descent. The systemic conditions created by slavery and colonialism forced displacement, family separation, sexual violence, and cultural genocide, mirror the constituent acts outlined in Article 6 of the Rome Statute and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948). As such, the Committee should affirm that these historical crimes and their ongoing consequences establish continuing obligations under international law for reparations, rehabilitation, and guarantees of non-recurrence.

Emerging international practice: Human Rights Council resolutions, Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (WGEPAD) reports, CARICOM's Ten-Point Plan, and AU–CARICOM cooperation collectively articulate modalities for collective and structural reparations consistent with international law's transformative and generative purposes, beyond narrow state liability frameworks.

6. De Facto Material and Social Inequality

Despite formal legal prohibitions against racial discrimination, people of African descent across the diaspora continue to experience entrenched de facto inequalities in income, education, health, housing, and political representation. These disparities are not accidental but are the material legacy of chattel enslavement, colonial expropriation, and racial capitalism, perpetuated by structural and institutional barriers that reproduce disadvantage across generations.

According to the United Nations Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (WGEPAD, 2025), racialized economic exclusion has produced a *"global racial wealth gap"* wherein communities of African descent are systematically denied access to credit, property ownership, and intergenerational wealth accumulation. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) similarly confirm that even in countries with anti-discrimination statutes, Black populations hold less than one-tenth of the wealth of white populations, and face persistent disparities in infant mortality, life expectancy, education attainment, and employment outcomes (Darity & Mullen, 2022; OHCHR, 2025).

Social inequality also manifests through epistemic and cultural exclusion. The continued marginalization of African knowledge systems, languages, and histories in education and public institutions. The devaluation of African heritage perpetuates psychological and social dislocation, reinforcing what Frantz Fanon (1967) described as the "colonial wound." Addressing these inequities thus requires reparatory measures that move beyond formal equality toward substantive and redistributive justice.

CERD's General Recommendation should explicitly recognize that de facto racial inequality and inequity constitutes a continuing violation of ICERD. States Parties must therefore be urged to adopt proactive and measurable strategies, including:

a) Targeted wealth redistribution through land, credit, and education programs;
b) Restorative education reforms that incorporate African and diasporic histories;
c) Public health equity initiatives addressing disparities rooted in environmental racism and colonial infrastructure; and

d) Gender-responsive measures acknowledging that women of African descent face compounded inequality.

True equality cannot be achieved through race-neutral policies alone. As the Durban Declaration (2001) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development affirm, justice requires both acknowledgment and material redress, not symbolic inclusion but structural transformation.

7. Minimum Standards and Modalities CERD Should Recommend

To give full effect to States' legal and moral obligations under ICERD and related international instruments, the Committee should articulate a set of minimum standards and implementation modalities for reparatory justice. These standards are necessary to ensure that reparations are not symbolic or discretionary, but comprehensive, inclusive, and measurable. They must address the material, structural, and psychosocial dimensions of harm caused by enslavement and colonialism, while aligning with the principles of equality, participation, accountability, and non-recurrence. The modalities proposed below outline the essential pillars of legal, institutional, economic, educational, and memorial through which States can operationalize reparatory justice in both national and transnational contexts:

a. Comprehensive national reparations programs with mixed measures: direct compensation; education and health equity funds; large-scale wealth-gap reduction programs; community land and housing restitution; memorialization and curricula reform; archives and truth-telling processes; gender-responsive and diaspora-inclusive design.

b. Regional and transnational mechanisms for harms that cross borders, including contributions by former colonial powers to reparations trusts and development compacts co-governed with affected communities.

c. Institutional guarantees of non-recurrence: legal reforms to end racial profiling and discriminatory policing; audit and redress of racially skewed AI systems; anti-discrimination enforcement with reparations triggers; and removal of colonial symbols as part of satisfaction measures.

d. Corporate and academic co-responsibility: due diligence and restitution frameworks for universities, banks, insurers, churches, and companies enriched by slavery and colonialism.

e. Monitoring and participation: binding timelines; transparent budgeting; community oversight; and disaggregated indicators aligned to SDGs to evidence material closing of outcome gaps.

8. Addressing Common Objections

Efforts to advance reparatory justice for the legacies of slavery and colonialism often encounter recurring objections rooted in misconceptions of law, history, and equity. These objections whether legal, political, or moral reflect ongoing resistance to acknowledging the enduring nature of racial harm. The Committee should therefore anticipate and respond to these concerns by reaffirming that reparations are grounded in established principles of international law, are forward-looking in purpose, and serve the universal goal of achieving substantive equality rather than revisiting blame.

The following section addresses some of the most frequently cited objections and offers reasoned responses to guide States in fulfilling their obligations under ICERD:

1. "No retroactivity / intertemporal law." Reparatory justice does not depend solely on retroactive criminal liability; international law's generative function and States' present-day equality duties justify negotiated and legislative solutions (Ratner, 2025; WGEPAD).
2. "Reparations are only monetary." International practice recognizes diverse measures (restitution, rehabilitation, satisfaction, guarantees of non-recurrence). Monetary components should target wealth gaps produced by state action and exclusion (de Greiff, 2006; Darity & Mullen, 2022).
3. "The Middle Passage wasn't genocide." Even where specific intent is litigated, the slave trade and plantation regimes entailed protected genocidal acts and clearly meet crimes-against-humanity thresholds; this heightens obligations to repair (Card, 2003).

9. Specific Recommendations for CERD's General Recommendation

Building upon the legal foundations, conceptual frameworks, and applied practices outlined above, the following recommendations translate the principles of reparatory justice into actionable guidance for States Parties. These proposed measures are designed to support CERD in formulating a comprehensive General Recommendation that is both normative and practical clarifying obligations, setting measurable standards, and encouraging coordinated international and regional implementation. Together, they provide a roadmap for integrating reparatory justice into national policies, development agendas, and multilateral cooperation mechanisms in alignment with ICERD and the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The following are specific recommendations for CERD's to consider:

1. Define reparatory justice (process) and reparations (measures), and require States to adopt both.

2. Affirm the indivisibility of colonialism and enslavement as mutually constitutive racial regimes, producing present obligations.
3. Acknowledge that the Middle Passage and plantation slavery implicated genocidal acts and undeniably constitute crimes against humanity.
4. Set baselines: national reparation programs with transnational funds; direct payments plus structural investments; truth/memory; institutional reforms; targeted gender- and youth-responsive measures; diaspora participation.
5. Mandate monitoring via time-bound targets, disaggregated data, and independent oversight with affected communities.
6. Encourage regional compacts (for example, AU–CARICOM) and partnership with universities, churches, firms, and financial institutions for restitution of unjust enrichment.

10. Applied Models of Reparatory Justice: The Work of the Institute for Peace and Leadership USA

The Institute for Peace and Leadership USA, (IPL USA) exemplifies the principles of reparatory justice through a holistic, multi-sectoral approach that addresses the continuing social, economic, and psychological harms resulting from slavery, colonialism, and racial discrimination. Operating across the United States, Caribbean (Haiti), and Africa, IPL USA integrates research, advocacy, education, and interfaith engagement to rebuild human dignity, strengthen institutions, and restore communities.

a. Research and Documentation

IPL USA's End Violence Against Women and Children Monitoring and Documentation Program promotes rights awareness and policy reform grounded in CEDAW and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, generating data that supports survivors' rights to justice, health, and education. This research directly supports reparatory justice as collective repair, addressing gendered and generational trauma inherited from histories of racial violence.

b. Transformational Leadership and Skills Development

The Institute's Career and Leadership Skills Development programs operationalize UNSCR 1325 by empowering women and youth through vocational training, entrepreneurship, and civic engagement. These initiatives advance economic and epistemic restitution, essential components of reparations by restoring opportunities denied under slavery and colonialism.

c. Support for Legislative Development

IPL USA collaborates with ministries and legal aid institutions to reform national penal codes, build survivor-centered legal frameworks, and promote compliance with

international human rights standards. This legislative advocacy models how States can institutionalize reparatory measures through structural transformation and guarantees of non-recurrence.

d. Community Outreach and Interfaith Dialogue

Through IPL USA's community outreach programs by King David Ministries and World Interfaith Alliance, the institute fosters moral and spiritual reconciliation across communities divided by race, faith, and history. These platforms exemplify reparatory justice as moral rehumanization by bridging divides that slavery and colonialism deepened. By engaging clergy, educators, and youth leaders, IPL USA demonstrates the power of intercultural and interfaith dialogue to heal historic harms and advance SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions).

e. Communication and Public Advocacy

IPL USA employs a multi-platform communication strategy such as social media, public service announcements, press releases, and collaborative networks to amplify community voices and raise public awareness about human rights, violence prevention, and racial equity. This work embodies the participatory spirit of reparatory justice by placing communities of African descent at the center of narrative and policy transformation.

Conclusion: Advancing Reparatory Justice Through Global Solidarity

The moral and legal imperative for reparatory justice is clear: the crimes of chattel enslavement, colonialism, and their afterlives in systemic racism continue to shape global inequities in wealth, health, education, and human dignity. These are not historical residues but living structures that require deliberate dismantling. The transatlantic slave trade and the colonial regimes that followed were not merely systems of labor exploitation; they constituted moral, social, and epistemic dismemberment of African peoples and their descendants. Reparatory justice therefore calls for more than compensation, it demands transformation.

This submission urges the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) to adopt a General Recommendation that articulates reparatory justice as both a process and a principle: a sustained global commitment to healing, restitution, and structural reform. By framing enslavement and colonialism as interconnected racial regimes, CERD can reaffirm that true equality requires dismantling inherited hierarchies in law, policy, and culture.

Institute for Peace and Leadership USA (IPL USA) demonstrates how this vision can be operationalized through applied research, education, advocacy, and interfaith dialogue. Its programs, ranging from ending violence against women and children to youth

empowerment, leadership training, legislative reform, and interreligious reconciliation represent living examples of reparatory work at the community level. These models prove that reparatory justice is achievable when governments, civil society, and faith actors collaborate to rebuild trust and restore dignity.

Ultimately, reparatory justice must be grounded in solidarity, memory, and accountability. It is not about reopening old wounds but about healing them through acknowledgment and repair. By embedding reparatory principles into international human rights law, CERD can help ensure that the descendants of the enslaved and colonized are not perpetual witnesses to injustice but co-authors of a new moral order; one rooted in peace, equality, and shared humanity.

References

Card, C. (2003). Genocide and social death. Hypatia, 18(1), 63–79 (Article). Indiana University Press. https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/hyp/summary/v018/18.1card02.html

Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Reparations Commission. (2020). CARICOM Ten-Point Plan for Reparatory Justice. https://caricom.org/caricom-ten-point-plan-for-reparatory-justice/

Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD). (May 9, 2025). United Nations Treaty Bodies. Meeting Summaries. https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies/cerd

Darity, W. A., Jr., & Mullen, A. K. (2022). From here to equality: Reparations for Black Americans in the twenty-first century (2nd ed.). University of North Carolina Press.

de Greiff, P. (2006). Justice and reparations. In P. de Greiff (Ed.), The handbook of reparations (pp. 451–477). Oxford University Press.

Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA). (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda

Fannon, F. (1967). Black Skin, White Masks. Grove Press.

International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD). (Dec 21, 1965). UNGA Res 2106 (XX). Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-convention-elimination-all-forms-racial

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). (Dec 9, 1948). Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. IHL Databases. Available at: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/genocide-conv-1948

International Criminal Court (ICC). (2021). Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. The Hague. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/rome-statute-international-criminal-court

International Criminal Court. (1998). Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. United Nations, Treaty Series , 2187, p. 3; depository notifications C.N.577.1998.TREATIES-8 of 10 November 1998.

International Criminal Court (ICC). (2021). Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. The Hague. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/rome-statute-international-criminal-court

Institute for Peace and Leadership, USA. (2025). Program and focal areas: Knowledge, empowerment, advocacy, dialogue, action.

https://www.peaceandleadership.org/what-we-do/

Laplante, Lisa J. (2015) "Just Repair," *Cornell International Law Journal*: 48: 3, Article 2. Available at: https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cilj/vol48/iss3/2

Mettraux, G. (2019). Special Genocidal Intent/Dolus Specialis. *International Crimes: Law and Practice: I. Genocide* (online edn, Oxford Law Pro). Accessed 7 Nov. 2025. https://doi.org/10.1093/law/9780198843115.003.0008

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (2021). The Durban Declaration and Program of Action at 20. United Nations.

Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (Oct. 1, 2025). UN experts call for reparatory justice for enslavement, the slave trade, and colonialism (Press release). United Nations. Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/10/un- experts-call-reparatory-justice-enslavement-trade-enslaved-africans-and

Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR). International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD). (Dec 21, 1965). UNGA Res 2106 (XX). Core Universal Instrument. United Nations. Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-convention-elimination-all-forms-racial

Patterson, O. (1982). Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study First Edition. Harvard University Press.

Ratner, S. (2025). Reparations for Colonialism Beyond Legal Responsibility. American Journal of International Law. 119(3): 507-529. doi:10.1017/ajil.2025.10077

Táíwò, O.O. (2022). Reconsidering Reparations. New York: Oxford University Press.

United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (Sep 6, 2024). Report delivered to Human Rights Council 57th Session. Promotion and protection of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of Africans and of people of African descent against excessive use of force and other human rights violations by law enforcement officers through transformative change for racial justice and equality. A/HRC/60/70. Available at: https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/60/70

Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (WGEPAD). (2025). Key positions on reparatory justice. Special Procedures: UN Human Rights Council. https://www.ohchr.org/en/special-procedures/wg-african-descent

United Nations. (2005). Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation (A/RES/60/147, 2005).

United Nations Department of Public Information. (2002). World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance. Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. United Nations.

Institute for Peace and Leadership USA, (IPL USA) operates across the United States, Africa, and the Caribbean, advancing peacebuilding, leadership training, and community development. Its programs are centered on education, research, and intercultural dialogue. IPL USA translates principles of reparatory justice into practice through transformative, community-based initiatives that empower marginalized populations and promote sustainable peace.

Dr. Remi Alapo is the Director of the Institute for Peace and Leadership (IPL USA), Inc., an international non-governmental organization promoting education, advocacy, and interfaith dialogue in alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.