Black Reparations in the United States, 2024: An Introduction

WILLIAM DARITY JR., THOMAS CRAEMER, DAINA RAMEY BERRY, AND DANIA V. FRANCIS

This introduction seeks to perform two tasks: it provides a roadmap for readers yet to be initiated into the reparations dialogue and provides fresh insights for those already well versed in it. Reparations are a program of acknowledgment, redress, and closure for a grievous injustice. This edition deals with reparations for black Americans whose ancestors were enslaved in the United States for government policies that allowed centuries of chattel slavery and legal race discrimination. The articles in this double issue represent the most up-to-date rigorous social science, policy, and historical research on the topic. This introduction discusses the world history of reparations efforts and the history of movements for black reparations in the United States; compares various plans for black American reparations, including various monetary estimation approaches; and discusses who should pay and what form payments ought to take. It closes by looking toward the future of the black American reparations movement.

Keywords: Black Reparations; chattel slavery; legal race discrimination; reparations for historical injustices; Holocaust reparations; reparations for Japanese American World War II internees; forty acres and a mule; H.R. 40

Slavery in the United States was a brutal, racialized system of forced labor under the constant threat of physical violence. It incentivized the rape of black women by white men seeking to increase their holdings of human property and led to centuries of absolute white exploitation of unpaid black labor.

Slavery created the startup capital for the U.S. economy's meteoric rise. It therefore indirectly benefits all Americans today, whether from immigrant or non-immigrant backgrounds, seeking economic opportunity in the United States.

Capital accumulated under slavery continues to grow exponentially because of compound interest. It accrues today to white heirs

William Darity Jr. is Samuel DuBois Cook Professor of Public Policy and African and African American Studies at Duke University. **Thomas Craemer** is associate professor in the School of Public Policy at the University of Connecticut. **Daina Ramey Berry** is professor of history and Michael Douglas Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts at the University of California, Santa Barbara. **Dania V. Francis** is associate professor of economics at the University of Massachusetts, Boston.

 Darity, William, Jr., Thomas Craemer, Daina Ramey Berry, and Dania V. Francis. 2024. "Black Reparations in the United States, 2024: An Introduction." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(2): 1–28. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.2.01. Direct correspondence to: William Darity Jr., at william.darity@duke.edu, Sanford School of Public Policy, 238 Sanford Building, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, United States.

of estates accumulated through slave labor. Yet the heirs of the black laborers who toiled for free have been excluded by law from their rightful inheritances. This is a present-day injustice that calls for a present-day remedy.

Tragically, slavery is not the only atrocity visited on black Americans. Racial violence, lynching, and so-called (white) race riots followed on the heels of the abolition of slavery (Craemer et al. 2023). Post-slavery de jure race discrimination produced segregation not only the Jim Crow South but also the New Deal North (Rothstein 2017). Most blacks were denied many benefits introduced during the New Deal era that lifted many whites into the middle class (Katznelson 2005).

This has had disastrous intergenerational consequences for black and white wealth: the majority of white Americans today, 73 percent, own their own homes and hand them down from generation to generation but only a minority of blacks, 44 percent, do the same (Cozzi 2023). Close to 20 percent of blacks bequeath poverty to the next generation relative to only about 10 percent of whites (Statista 2023). White Americans own 85.6 percent of all employer businesses in the United States, blacks only 2.5 percent (Cook, Shepard, and Martinez-White 2022). Twenty-four percent of white households own stocks, versus a mere 8 percent of black households (Bennett and Chien 2022)

Reparations increasingly has been positioned as a solution to these grave historical injustices. In fact, redress has been issued to many peoples around the world, including the U.S. government's compensatory payments to other Americans. Nonetheless, reparations has never been paid to black descendants of U.S. chattel slavery, and reparations for that community of Americans remains highly contested.

Debates over the suitability of reparations are not new. Yet black reparations appear to be especially contentious in the United States. Race-based slavery only ended in the United States with a cataclysmic and bloody civil war. The depreciation of black lives has continued relentlessly since 1865, and the heated exchanges over black reparations are a function of how black people are devalued in the United States. American racism that produced the conditions that warrant black reparations is a central obstacle to the enactment and execution of a comprehensive plan for black reparations.

For definitional purposes, we adopt the concept of reparations advanced in William Darity and Kirsten Mullen's (2020, 2) study *From Here to Equality: Reparations for Black Americans in the Twenty-First Century*, "Reparations are a program of acknowledgment, redress, and closure for a grievous injustice." Acknowledgment constitutes the admission by the culpable party or their successors of responsibility for the harms inflicted on victims or their heirs, coupled with a declared commitment to undertake redress. Redress is the act of restitution, the specific steps taken by the culpable party or their successors to provide compensation for damages to the victims or their heirs. Closure is the settling of accounts, a mutual agreement (without coercion) between the two parties that the debt has been met. Thereafter, the victimized community will make no further claims on the culpable party or their successors unless the atrocities are renewed or entirely new atrocities occur (Darity and Mullen 2020, 2–4).[1]

From the perspective of the specific case for reparations for black Americans whose ancestors were enslaved in the United States, the claim for redress is predicated on harms rooted in national policies from the formation of the republic to the present day. The most obvious of these is the regime of chattel slavery followed by nearly a century of legal race discrimination, or American apartheid.

After the official end of American apartheid with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the succeeding sixty years have witnessed mass

1. International law provides a definition of reparations based upon five principles: "restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition" (Medicins San Frontieres 2023). Restitution, compensation, and rehabilitation all fall under the category of redress in the Darity and Mullen definition. Satisfaction and guarantees of non-repetition mesh with their condition of closure. However, international law does not include the first category in Darity and Mullen's ARC (acknowledgment, redress, and closure) formulation—acknowledgment.

incarceration, ongoing police killings of unarmed blacks, continued discrimination in housing, employment, and credit markers, and a persistent markdown on the value of black lives (Darity and Mullen 2020, 5–6).

The articles in this issue of *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* bring together the most up-to-date, rigorous social sciences, policy, and historical research on the full range of developments and issues with respect to the case for reparations for black Americans.

In this introduction, the team of editors seeks to perform two tasks simultaneously, provide a roadmap to the issues at stake for those interested readers yet to be initiated into the reparations dialogue and provide useful fresh insights for those already well versed in the conversation. Our discussion moves from the past to the present and from the global to the local.

For context, the first section of this article explores the world history of reparations efforts. The second turns to the record of movements for black reparations in the United States. The third provides a comparative examination of various plans for black American reparations. The fourth examines various approaches toward determination of eligibility standards for black reparations, the monetary amounts for black reparations, who should pay, and what form payments ought to take. The fifth and final section looks toward the future of the black American reparations movement.

A BRIEF GLOBAL HISTORY OF REPARATIONS

Black people in the United States sought reparations during slavery and have been fighting for them, at least, since the Civil War. Today's activism around reparations is not a new cause. Enslaved people were the first advocates for redress. They knew from direct experience the injustices imposed on them, and they understood the toll on their physical, emotional, and familial lives. They grasped the devastating impact on their financial futures and the financial futures of their progeny. They fully recognized and understood the dichotomy between their personhood and being subjected to commodification: their humanity became a backdrop against the monetization of the bodies and theft of their labor for the enrichment of others.

Contemporary debates on reparations can be informed by international evidence of other groups who sought and received redress for collective victimization. Apart from many cases in which defeated nations or peoples were made to pay tribute to the victors, those most relevant to the black American claim involve payments made to victims of atrocities. Those payments have been made either by the perpetrators or their successors or by a third party choosing to take responsibility for the act of compensation. One of the most noteworthy instances of this type involved Germany making payments to the victims of the Holocaust and the state of Israel.

On September 10, 1952, Israel and Germany signed a treaty (informally known as the Luxembourg Agreements) acknowledging "unspeakable criminal acts . . . perpetrated against the Jewish people during the National-Socialist régime of terror." In Article 1 of this agreement, Germany agreed to pay 3 billion deutsche marks to Holocaust victims. They added another $1.4 billion to living survivors at the seventieth anniversary of this agreement in September 2022. This brought Germany's "total compensation to more than 80 billion euros," making it "the first time a defeated power paid compensation to civilians for wartime losses and suffering" (Grieshaber 2022).

Over the course of more than seventy years, not only have the direct victims who survived the Nazi's extermination plan received compensation but so have their heirs and descendants. Financial compensation to the victims also has been accompanied by resources devoted to an educational campaign to ensure that this history is recorded, taught, and never forgotten; some of the funds support Holocaust education at museums and cultural centers worldwide.

Holding Germany accountable via international treaties is just one form of restitution. Yet it appears that even countries who were not the perpetrators of genocidal acts participated in holding Germany accountable. The United States, in particular, has actively supported compensation for Holocaust survivors and also

led efforts, since World War II, to return and protect cultural relics and memorabilia.

In 2009, for example, the U.S. Department of State partnered with the prime minister of the Czech Republic and forty-four other European states and issued the Terezin Declaration on Holocaust Era Assets and Related Issues through the State Department's Office of the Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues. The purpose of this act is to support and protect "advanced age" survivors of the Holocaust, to "respect their personal dignity," to "rectify the consequences of wrongful property seizures," and to "develop measures to combat anti-Semitism" (U.S. Department of State 2009).

The declaration included special measures to preserve Jewish cultural property by making sure that "appropriate materials [are] available to scholars," such as archival documents and other ephemera. The expectation to maintain these records at repositories, museums, and cultural societies was an important part of this declaration, along with the encouragement that states create "annual ceremonies of remembrance and commemoration" (U.S. Department of State 2009). American participation in the World Jewish Restitution Organization conferences clearly outline decades of support for Holocaust survivors and their heirs (WJRO 2020).

In part to reward Native Americans for their contribution to the war effort after World War II, Congress set up the Indian Claims Commission in 1946 to hear "Indian claims for any lands stolen from them since the creation of the USA in 1776" (Boxer 2009). However, actual reparations payments have been exceedingly modest. For example, according to CNN (2012), "In 2012, the United States finalized a $3.4 billion settlement with American Indians for mismanagement of their land and resources," and according to Rebecca Hersher (2016), in 2016, "The U.S. government . . . agreed to pay a total of $492 million to 17 American Indian tribes for mismanaging natural resources and other tribal assets."

A resolution by the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI 2019) that urges Congress to authorize reparations for American Indians and Alaska Natives acknowledges that "various efforts have been made to settle American Indian and Alaska Native claims," but argues "those efforts have been woefully inadequate." Native American reparations claims are particularly relevant to black reparations in the United States; in both cases, the historical injustices to be addressed reach back from the present to the founding of the nation.

A more recent example of federal reparations in the United States is the Civil Liberties Act of 1988. The U.S. government made $20,000 payments to Japanese Americans who had been compelled to undergo mass incarceration during World War II (National Archives 2017). Through this act, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice established the Office of Redress Administration, which oversaw, acknowledged, apologized for, and offered restitution for, as specified in the Civil Liberties Act, the "injustices of the evacuation, relocation and internment of Japanese Americans during World War II."

A yet more recent example of federal reparations provided by the United States is compensation to Marshall Islanders for sixty-seven U.S. nuclear bomb tests there from 1946 to 1958 (Brunnstrom and Martina 2023). According to the U.S. Department of the Interior (2007), Marshall Islands Nuclear Testing Compensation consisted of "a total of $1.5 billion in assistance from 2004 through 2023."

Unlike the Japanese American or Marshall Islands examples, where the United States was blatantly culpable, there have been several instances where the national government paid reparations to victims when the U.S. government was not the perpetrator. These include the federal government's payments to families who lost loved ones during the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and $4.4 million payments to each American citizen held hostage in Iran from November 4, 1979, to January 20, 1981.

Precedents such as the U.S. reparations to Japanese American World War II internees, Marshall Islands nuclear testing compensation, and many other recent programs are of limited comparability to black reparations in the United States. In each of these cases, reparations went primarily, although not exclusively, to direct victims of an atrocity. In contrast, Native American reparations are particularly germane as a precedent for black

reparations in the United States. Both cases represent injustices over long periods from the colonial era to the present.

Outside the United States, reparations have also become commonplace. For example, the South African parliament paid reparations to those who participated in the amnesty hearings sponsored by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Republic of South Africa 1995).[2] In an act first issued in 1993, those who suffered during apartheid or their relatives testified at public amnesty hearings. Those whose testimonies were confirmed received a (very modest) payment of US$3,910.

Acts of mass violence committed by other government regimes including the British during the Mau Mau Rebellion (1952–1960), the Philippines under Fernando Marcos (1965–1986), and Chile under General Augusto Pinochet (1973–1990), resulted in redress measures years later. In 2013, the British government paid out £19.9 million to 5,228 Kenyan Mau Mau survivors. However, many were dissatisfied with this form of compensation and sued again in 2016, asking also for restitution for false imprisonment, forced labor, and interruption to their right to an education. In 2023, Mau Mau veterans continued lobbying for compensation and demanded substantial additional compensation. It is not clear whether these demands will be met, even in part (Miriri and Ross 2023).

However, redress in the Philippines led to somewhat different results. To "right the wrongs of the past in the Philippines," President Benigno Aquino signed a law in 2012 to provide $224 million in compensation to the thousands of people who suffered under the Marcos regime. This new human rights law was "the first of its kind in Asia." Additionally, the law rolled back the Marcos martial law that had allowed for the practice of abduction of people "by government security forces."

More than 1,600 people disappeared during Marcos's rule (Desapaericidos, n.d.). Another thousand have vanished—presumably through government-sanctioned abductions—since the end of Marcos's dictatorship, signifying the need for the 2012 law to put an end to the legacy of government engineered disappearances (BBC 2012, 2013).

The Chilean government modeled its plans for redress after South Africa and established a National Commission for Truth and Reconciliation. After hearings and testimonies from more than thirty-five thousand people, two government commissions (one under Raúl Rettig and a second under Bishop Sergio Valech), reports confirmed 3,428 "cases of disappearance, killing, torture, and kidnapping." Payments were about US$190 per month, and victims and their relatives received "free education, housing, and health benefits" (Associated Press 2004; USIP 1990).

A number of other countries undertook acts of restitution for human rights violations including Algeria's payments of €310 million to fifty thousand Harkis, Algerian Muslims who fought with France during the Algerian war for independence in 1962 (Al-Awsat 2022), Canada's payment of CA$2.8 billion to indigenous students forced to attend government funded residential schools (Canadian Press 2023), and Colombia's payment of US$29 billion to over 7.6 million persons who suffered via state and nonstate violence during its civil war (RRVTS, n.d.). In the case of Colombia, the reparations program will likely grow substantially after the government pledged in 2023 to pay reparations to victims of exterminative violence against Patriotic Unity party members in the 1980s and 1990s (Taylor 2023).

Reparations paid to survivors of the German Holocaust, South African apartheid, or human rights abuses in Kenya, the Philippines, or Chile went to survivors relatively soon after the historical injustice had occurred. This temporal proximity between harm and attempted redress may make a reparations process appear more feasible. It should be born in mind, however, that injustices that Native Americans and black Americans suffered stretch hundreds of years into the past. Thus reparations to Native

2. The period of legal segregation in South Africa lasted nearly fifty years, from 1948 to the early 1990s. In this instance, a regime change took place with a post-apartheid government established by a new constitution that took effect in 1997. Such a change does not absolve the new regime from accounting for the damages wreaked by its predecessor.

Americans may serve as a direct precedent for black reparations.

Is it, then, that reparations for slavery lack apparent feasibility, perhaps because the numbers of victims (the enslaved Africans and their black descendants) are simply too numerous? Historical precedent suggests that this is not the case. In at least forty-four countries or territories, including the United States, reparations for slavery have been paid as a matter of course, based on the number of the enslaved. Disconcertingly, however, in virtually all cases where slavery reparations have been paid, the compensation went to the former enslavers for the loss of their property, not to the formerly enslaved.[3] That reparations have been forthcoming to any group of recipients except most of the black descendants of the enslaved anywhere in the world (the United States, the Caribbean, Latin America) suggests that racial considerations rather than questions of feasibility may explain the reluctance.[4]

The global context indicates the black American quest for redress, in principle, is neither unique nor exceptional.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE BLACK REPARATIONS MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

The first claims made by blacks in the United States took the form of lawsuits and involved persons who sued for freedom, not necessarily suing for compensation (reparations) for slavery. Although some enslaved people sought freedom, others wanted both liberty and compensation. For example, Elizabeth Freeman (Mum Bet) filed a lawsuit for freedom in 1781 and won (Jones 2021). She did not seek monetary compensation.

However, eighteenth-century evidence attests to persons suing for both. Quock Walker (Spector 1968) filed a lawsuit in 1781 seeking both freedom and financial compensation for damages. Ten years later, in 1791, Nelly Mumpherd submitted a deposition in New York City to protect her freedom after a man named Henry Hurt tried to assault her. Hurt took money and Mumpherd's freedom papers, and she knew too well the value of those papers. In defense of herself, Mumpherd brought Hurt to court. She won the case, protected her freedom, and received compensation for damages (Jones 2021).

Another black woman, this time an enslaved woman named Belinda Sutton (Royall House and Slave Quarters, n.d.) took her former enslaver Isaac Royall to court in 1783. After Royall, a British loyalist, fled to England, Sutton was left free but penniless. Decades after being brought to the United States, Sutton sued the state of Massachusetts for pensions for herself and her two children—and won (Berry and Gross 2020).

Perhaps the most successful effort to acquire personal restitution is represented by the legal case brought forward in 1870 by Henrietta Wood. Wood was a free black woman living in Ohio in 1853 when she was kidnapped by Zebu-

3. One notable exception is land provided to formerly enslaved blacks by Native American tribes who were allied with the Confederacy during the Civil War: Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Muscogees (formerly called Creeks), and Seminoles. After the war, the U.S. federal government insisted that they provide land to their freedmen and freedwomen at the very same time that same federal government denied land to its own freedmen and freedwomen (Wikipedia 2022).

4. Reparations to enslavers, not to the enslaved, were paid by Haiti, Guadeloupe, Martinique, and French Guiana (Beauvois 2017, 5); Chile (Aurora de Chile, n.d.), Argentina (Coria 1997), Gran Colombia (Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Panama; Colombia Aprende 2007; Free Womb Project, n.d.b; Fundacion Polar 2007; Patiño 2007), Peru (Valdez and Villamonte 2006), Costa Rica (*Tico Times* 2004), Uruguay (Presidency of Uruguay 2006), Bolivia (Free Womb Project, n.d.a), Mexico (Weltman-Cisneros 2012), Paraguay (Francois 1999, 777), Cuba, and Puerto Rico; Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Belize, Bahamas, Barbados, Saint Lucia, Grenada, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, the Cayman Islands, Turks and Caicos, the British Virgin Islands, Anguilla, and Montserrat; Suriname, Curaçao, Aruba, Sint Marten, Caribbean Netherlands; Saint Barthélemy; the U.S. Virgin Islands; the United States, in many northern states and in Washington, D.C.; and Brazil (Beauvois 2017, 5). In none of these forty-four countries or territories have reparations ever been paid to the black enslaved or to their rightful heirs.

lon Ward, sold into slavery, and held captive by Mississippi slaveholder Gerard Brandon until after the end of the Civil War. She sued her kidnapper for damages. In 1878, eight years after she filed the suit, the case finally went to trial. An all-male, all-white jury returned a decision in Wood's favor with the largest settlement for enslavement to that date, $2,500. Still, Woods actually had sued Ward for $20,000 in damages, nearly ten times the amount she eventually was awarded (McDaniel 2019).

Giuliana Perrone (2024, this volume, issue 2) provides multiple examples of lawsuits involving enslaved persons who were freed through the wills of their deceased enslavers and often granted land or other assets. Nevertheless, they typically had to fight for their freedom and assets after relatives of the deceased contested the wills. Owner manumission seems to have been infrequent, and owner manumission coupled with some form of bequest even more rare. However, Perrone conceptualizes the bequests as voluntary reparations from enslavers and a deeper understanding of this form of atonement might lend support to contemporary calls for reparations.

All of these instances involve individual claims for restitution; they were not class action suits. More than two hundred years later, Deadria Farmer-Paellmann brought lawsuits against FleetBoston (now merged with Bank of America), Aetna, and New York Life for their history of complicity with slavery and slaveholding on behalf of a class of plaintiffs that included "millions of African-American slave descendants."[5]

Farmer-Paellman's lawsuits failed, as have all lawsuits on behalf of black American descendants of the enslaved. In rejecting these claims, judges have either invoked the principle of sovereign immunity or violation of statutes of limitations. Furthermore, when charges of complicity with slavery, including the buying and selling of human beings, are brought against private organizations or institutions, they are insulated to a degree by the fact their actions, at the time, were perfectly legal. This is without doubt immoral but legal under the laws of the land.

The first, and most significant, class action lawsuit directed at the federal government was brought by attorney Cornelius J. Jones in 1915 on behalf of the National Ex-Slave Mutual Relief, Bounty and Pension Association of the United States of America (MRB&PA). The MRB&PA was an organization pursuing restitution for the formerly enslaved founded by Isaiah Dickerson and Callie House, the latter the most important figure in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century black reparations movement.

The lawsuit sought damages in the amount of $68 million, the value of cotton taxes collected by the U.S. government between 1862 and 1868, an amount Jones argued was due to "the appellants because the cotton had been produced by them and their ancestors as a result of their 'involuntary servitude.'"[6] Faced with determined and vicious opposition from the national government directed with special ferocity at House, the lawsuit failed with the Supreme Court confirming the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia's decision to deny on grounds of sovereign immunity (Booker Perry 2010).

The judicial route never has been propitious for collective black reparations.

The first major collective claim for restitution was embodied in the unfulfilled promise of forty acres land grants allotted to the freedmen and freedwomen at the end of the Civil War. As early as 1775, Thomas Paine suggested land distribution to the formerly enslaved, perhaps over-optimistically presuming that slavery would come to an end with the formation of the new republic. History confirms that his vision for land distribution never came to fruition.

Four million enslaved black people obtained freedom in 1865 and were left to fend for themselves. Some described freedom as being turned out like cattle. Many did not know where to go or how to negotiate their labor contracts, and economic stability was essential to their success. "One of the country's earliest ef-

5. *Farmer-Paellmann v. Fleetboston Financial Corp.*, Civil Action # CV 02 1862, Class Action (E.D.N.Y. March 26, 2002).

6. *Johnson v. McAdoo*, 45 App. D.C. 440 (1916).

forts to dramatically alter blacks' economic condition" Darity and Mullen (2020, 2) explain, "was the federal government's post–Civil War plan to give at least forty acres of abandoned and confiscated land as well as a mule to each formerly enslaved family of four (or ten acres per person)."

The first phase, outlined in General William T. Sherman's Special Field Orders No. 15, allocated 5.3 million acres of land, stretching from the sea islands of South Carolina to northern Florida bordered by the St. John's River, to the freedmen and freedwomen. But only forty thousand freed people managed to take residence on four hundred thousand acres, less than 10 percent of the land specified in Sherman's order, before being forced off the land under orders of Lincoln's successor, Andrew Johnson (Darity and Mullen 2020, 158–59).

In 1883, on behalf of the all-black, two-thousand-member Indemnity Party he had formed, John Wayne Niles petitioned Congress for land to be distributed to the freedpeople and their descendants in the western territories. He successfully generated support from an Ohio senator, John Sherman, brother of General Sherman, to present the petition for slave reparations to the Senate, but subsequently the petition was tabled into oblivion (Darity 2021a).

Prior to the cotton tax lawsuit, Callie House (Berry 2005) brought forward a petition on behalf of her chartered MRB&PA for pensions for those who had been subjected to slavery. Her organization, founded in 1898, had a membership of three hundred thousand by 1900. Support was so strong and growing that House, seen as a threat to established interests particularly when the MRB&PA sued the federal government for $68 million, was prosecuted on trumped-up charges of mail fraud, sending her to prison, and effectively removing her from the movement (Booker Perry 2010).

Nevertheless, the movement did not die. Many of her disciples moved into the various branches of Marcus Garvey's Universal Negro Improvement Association, founded in 1914, and continued the call for reparations for the formerly enslaved and their posterity. A charismatic and determined Garvey disciple, Queen Mother Audley Moore, brought a petition to the United Nations in 1957 seeking land and billions of dollars from the United States government as restitution to the freedpeople and their descendants (Mullen 2022b; see also Berry 2005, 237; Blain 2019).

At the time, the petition did not succeed—nor is it apparent that the United Nations had any leverage to make the United States pay reparations, in the first place—although nearly sixty years later, the United Nations Working Group of Experts on Peoples of African Descent explicitly called for reparations for black Americans.

Despite her pan-Africanist orientation, Moore's focus for reparations was directed at the U.S. government's obligation specifically to those black Americans whose ancestors were enslaved in the United States. Hence, in 1963, she formed the Committee for Reparations for Descendants of U.S. Slaves. This effort evolved into the founding in 1968 of the Republic of New Afrika, an organization calling for the formation of a separate nation out of five states of the old Confederacy, peopled and controlled by black Americans (Blain 2019).

In 1969, James Forman seized the podium at New York City's Riverside Church to issue the Black Manifesto, which called for white churches and synagogues to pay "$500 million . . . for the crimes religious institutions had visited upon black Americans in the United States" (Darity and Mullen 2020, 14; Riverside Church, n.d.; Berry 2005, 239). Ultimately, donations of $500,000 were forthcoming, only 0.1 percent of the total demanded. The funds were used to create several institutions, including Black Star Publications and the Black Economic Research Center, that have not survived.

The U.S. payments of restitution to Japanese Americans subjected to imprisonment during World War II was preceded by a report with recommendations from the congressionally mandated Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. After passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, Rep. John Conyers (D-Michigan), with persistent pressure from Detroit-based activist "Reparations Ray" Jenkins, introduced legislation, soon to be labeled H.R. 40 as a nod to the unfulfilled promise of forty acres land grants, to create a similar com-

mission to address the matter of black reparations.

Over the next thirty years, the bill's text was repeatedly modified by the leadership of two allied organizations, the National Coalition of Blacks for Reparations in America (N'COBRA) and the National African American Reparations Commission (NAARC).[7] Curiously, the bill does not provide for any reparations to descendants of people enslaved in the United States. It only calls for the formation of a commission to investigate reparations, despite the fact that reparations have been studied at length in the extant literature since the bill was first introduced (see, among others, America 1990; Darity 2008; Craemer 2015).

Both organizations, avowedly pan-African, departed from Queen Mother Audley Moore's particular emphasis on U.S. reparations going to black American descendants of U.S. slavery, instead seeking a more global, diasporic reach for compensation coming from the U.S. government.

In addition to lobbying for passage of H.R. 40 on the federal level, the reparations movement is presently devoting great attention to redress projects at the state and local levels. At the state level, California's Reparations Task Force (2023) completed the second segment of its two-part report in June 2023. The state of Illinois now has activated an African Descent-Citizens Reparations Commission, and New York's State Assembly has passed legislation establishing its own commission. These are three states out of fifty, none of them located in the southeastern part of the nation.

A spiraling wave of cities and towns is now taking steps toward reparations. However, the total number of municipalities and townships on this path still is less than 150, a mere 0.1 percent of approximately 20,000 incorporated cities, towns, and villages across the country. In this volume, Olivia Reneau (2024, issue 3) details the nineteen municipalities that have passed reparations resolutions as of March 2023. Using a mixed-method analysis, Reneau codes the text of each municipality's resolution to pull out themes around sources of injustice and evidence of disparity and then combines the coded data with quantitative data about the municipalities to uncover patterns in the types of reparations programs different municipalities support.

Also in this volume, Monique Newton and Matthew Nelsen (2024, issue 3) provide a case study of the Evanston, Illinois, reparations program. Implemented in 2021, Evanston began providing housing grants of $25,000 for black residents (up to a total of $10 million) as redress for past discriminatory housing policies. They explore in depth the tensions and conundrums that have arisen with this local initiative.

Prior to the recent surge in local reparations initiatives, there were three occasions of state level restitution for antiblack atrocities, the Rosewood, Florida, massacre of 1923, the closing of public schools in Prince Edward County, Virginia, from 1959 to 1964 to avoid desegregation, and police torture in Chicago in the 1970s and 1990s.

Indeed, in the case of the Florida legislature awarding payments to victims of the 1923 Rosewood massacre, the lawmakers consciously avoided using the term reparations. They agreed "to award direct cash payments to nine survivors of the event. Descendants of those survivors also received money, in the form of small cash sums and college scholarships" (Luckerson 2020). The Rosewood massacre apparently is the only one of upward of one hundred mass killings of blacks by white mobs between the Civil War and the 1950s for which any form of restitution has been made to the victims or their descendants.

After being ordered to desegregate on May

7. In an opinion piece for Bloomberg, Kirsten Mullen (2022a) details both the structural and substantive weaknesses in H.R. 40, arguing that it will not lead to a true reparations program for black American descendants of U.S. slavery. Going through multiple revisions over the years, largely under the influence of NAARC and N'COBRA, H.R. 40 originally specified seven commissioners but now specifies fifteen, six of whom "shall be selected from the major civil society and reparations organizations that have historically championed the cause of reparatory justice." Effectively, NAARC and N'COBRA seem to have written themselves into the bill to ensure their representation on the commission.

1, 1959, the school board in Prince Edward County, Virginia, chose to close public schools entirely; they were not reopened until 1964. White students were given a lifeline to private all-white academies via county tax credits and state vouchers. Large numbers of black students had to discontinue their education altogether (VMHC 2023). In 2005, the Virginia General Assembly finally established a reparations plan for the black students who were denied access to schooling:

> Combining private donations from billionaire John Kluge with state funds, scholarships were offered to the victims of the shuttered school system to enable them to pursue higher education at this much later date. No compensation was offered for past years of lost schooling. Nor was compensation offered to offset the impact of the lost schooling on the affected students' long-term prospects for employment and earnings. (Darity and Mullen 2020, 21)

Given that the beneficiaries of this plan were in their fifties, sixties, and even seventies, by 2005, very few were able to take advantage of the scholarships for study at state-supported institutions of higher education or vocational training.

For almost two decades between the 1970s and 1990s, Chicago officers under the leadership of Commander Jon Burge tortured 125 persons to extract confessions, many of whom were not guilty of any crime. In 2015, the city of Chicago committed to a "$5.5 million reparations package that included a formal apology from former Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, financial compensation to survivors and their families, waived tuition to City Colleges, a mandatory Chicago Public Schools curriculum to educate students about police torture under Burge, and the creation of a permanent, public memorial" (Jaffe 2020).

The only component of the reparations package that remains unmet is the erection of the memorial. Critics of the plan have argued that it is incomplete because it was not only police under Burge's authority who engaged in torture practices in Chicago. Elizabeth Davies, Jenn Jackson, and David Knight (2024, this volume, issue 3) take a deeper dive into the Chicago reparations initiative through interviews with local advocates as well as reparations recipients.

The notorious Tuskegee syphilis experiment provides an example of court-recognized reparations. The intentional failure to inform the black men infected with syphilis of their illness and the intentional failure to provide them with treatment, even after effective drugs became available, provided a rationale for reparations persuasive to the courts.

In 1974, the NAACP filed a class action suit on behalf of the subjects of the horrific experiment, who had not been given the opportunity to extend informed consent. The favorable decision resulted in a $10 million settlement from the federal government given that the U.S. Public Health Service had conducted the experiment (Edwards, Berdie, and Welburn 2024).

In this volume, Linda Bilmes and Cornell Brooks (2024, issue 2) highlight, through a taxonomy of atrocity and redress, the vast number of times the U.S. federal government has compensated individuals for harms across multiple realms, such as environmental damages and vaccine injuries. They argue that this pattern of compensation should normalize reparations, setting precedents that should ease the path for reparations for black Americans.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR BLACK REPARATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

In this section, we consider major plans put forward thus far to conduct black reparations in the United States. Among the many proposals for black reparations over the decades, we identify four that have been developed as relatively detailed and concrete. Any substantive plan must address at least four considerations: Who should be eligible to receive black reparations? How much is owed to the eligible recipients? How should compensation be made? Who is responsible for making compensation?

In the current volume, Kathryn Edwards, Lisa Berdie, and Jonathan Welburn (2024, issue 2) set the stage for this discussion by presenting case studies of past reparations policies that have succeeded yet fail to offer important insights into what features should be included in a reparations policy. A key takeaway from

their study is that reparations should have a redress and atonement component to shift the power dynamics between perpetrator and victim. A second takeaway is that the design of the program should be victim led. Finally, the policy should be a "living" policy, open to adjustment and reevaluation as time goes on. In light of these lessons, we review four major reparations plans.

The four major plans we review are tRoy Brooks's (2004) atonement model, the National African American Reparations Commission's Preliminary 10-Point Program (NAARC 2015), William Darity and Kirsten Mullen's (2020) federal program of black reparations, and the California Reparation Task Force's (2023) proposals. The discussion of the plans is organized under separate subheadings discussing their differing specific goals, conceptualizations of providers, eligibility standards, modalities, administration of funds, and estimated per-recipient amounts (see table 1).

Program Goals

According to Roy Brooks (2004), the primary goal of a reparations plan (see table 1, row 1), is "atonement from the perpetrator" (140), that is, a formal apology and some form of compensatory action "because they make apologies believable" (142). In his view, "Racial reconciliation should be the primary purpose of slave redress" (141), not necessarily a "preoccupation with compensation" for the victimized side (142).

Brooks (2004, 143) says that once a formal apology and compensation have been rendered, the victimized side may have a civic obligation to forgive. Thus the Brooks model can be characterized as primarily perpetrator focused. In contrast, the other three models focus primarily on redress for, and the well-being of the victimized side and would likely be characterized as instantiations of what Brooks criticizes as the "tort model." Brooks is critical of the tort model because in his view it is "incapable of generating the one ingredient that I believe is or should be the sine qua non of slave redress—namely atonement, and ultimately, racial reconciliation" (98–99).

In contrast to the focus on the perpetrator side, the other plans center on the victimized side. For example, the primary goal of the NAARC's Preliminary 10-Point Plan (2015, 1) is to "repair and heal the damages done to Native people and Africans" in the United States. Darity and Mullen's (2020, 263) plan seeks to close the national average per capita black-white wealth gap because they view the racial wealth gap "as the most robust indicator of the cumulative economic effects of white supremacy in the United States."

The 2023 California Reparations Task Force (CRTF) plan attempts to achieve a similar victim-centered goal at the state level. However, although the wealth gap works well as an aggregate indicator of black losses on the federal level, a specific state's racial wealth gap may be influenced by other factors. Hence, the CRTF tasked an expert team—which included Kaycea Campbell, Thomas Craemer, William Darity Jr., Kirsten Mullen, and the late William Spriggs—to estimate some losses due to specific racial injustices for which the State of California was partially or directly responsible, which then can be added up, depending on an eligible recipient's length of residence in California.

Proposed Reparations Providers

All four plans agree that some level of government should be the reparations provider rather than exclusively private individuals or organizations (table 1, row 2). Three plans view the federal government as responsible because it allowed slavery to exist prior to the end of the Civil War. Only the CRTF's (2023) plan treats a state government as the responsible provider.[8]

8. Although NAARC's 10-Point Plan is predicated on the federal government as the payer, NAARC's leadership has been an aggressive supporter of the local reparations movement (NAARC 2021). In contrast, Darity and Mullen (2023) say that "this range of initiatives that are being undertaken in a number of municipalities and in a handful of states are intrinsically *incomplete, inconsistent, and inequitable*. By incomplete, we mean that these policies are practices being undertaken by cities and states that are labeled as reparations intrinsically cannot fulfill the amount that is due. The federal government does have the capacity to meet a bill of $14.3 trillion. We think that's fully evident as a consequence of what occurred in response to the Great Recession, as well as what

Table 1. Four Proposed Black Reparations Plans Compared

	Brooks (2004)	NAARC (2015)	Darity and Mullen (2020)	CRTF (2023)
Primary goal	Atonement of perpetrators and racial reconciliation; benefit all Americans, not just black Americans	Repair and heal the damages done to all descendants of Africans in the United States	Close black-white average per capita wealth gap in the United States	Compensate victims of slavery and discrimination in California for some specific losses due to state action
Proposed providers	U.S. federal government	U.S. federal government	U.S. federal government	California state government
Proposed recipients	Black American children newborn within approximately ten years	All people of African descent in the United States	Descendants of at least one person enslaved in the United States who have self-identified as black (or synonymous) at least twelve years before the enactment of a reparations plan or a study commission for reparations	Californians who are African American descendants of a chattel enslaved person, or descendants of a free black person living in the United States prior to the end of the nineteenth century
Proposed modalities	Formal apology, museum of slavery and twenty-five-year atonement, trust fund for every newborn black American child born within approximately ten years.	Formal apology, black Holocaust Institute, repatriation rights, land, cooperative enterprises, health resources, education funds, affordable housing, funding for black media, black memorials, criminal justice reform	Must include direct payment of cash or its equivalent to eligible recipients but could also include trust funds and annuities	Payment of cash or its equivalent to eligible recipients

Administration	Reputable trust administrators selected by prominent black Americans	National Reparations Trust Authority of "credible" representatives of community organizations	Eligible recipients (monetary payments) coupled with a supervisory board elected by eligible recipients (trust funds)	State Freedman's Affairs Agency to make direct payments and aid with proof of eligibility
Preliminary per-recipient estimates in 2020 dollars	$69,647	Not specified	$357,000	$13,619 per year of California residence for health discrimination; $2,352 per year of California residence between 1971 and 2020 for overpolicing during the war on drugs; $145,847 for housing discrimination; $77,000 for business devaluation, more as further evidence surfaces

Source: Authors' tabulation.

Although California entered the United States as a so-called free state, it did tolerate the practice of slavery in the state by Southern immigrant enslavers, and it was actively complicit in various forms of post-slavery de jure racial discrimination.

Eligibility Standards

The plans differ in terms of whom they deem eligible for black reparations (see table 1, row 3). Brooks (2004) conceptually equates the demographic category of black Americans with descendants of enslaved people. This leaves the door open for blacks descended from people enslaved elsewhere to demand reparations from the U.S. government. Furthermore, without providing an independent standard for determination of who is black, exclusive reliance on a standard linking a current claimant to an enslaved ancestor also leaves the door open for persons living as white today to make a claim.

The NAARC (2015) plan extends this definition to all people of African descent, including immigrants who voluntarily entered the United States after African immigration was legalized in 1965.[9] Again, presumably, persons living as white in the present who can document African ancestry also would be eligible, further distancing the eligibility standard from a specific community of eligibility consisting of black Americans whose ancestors were enslaved in the United States.

Because the Immigration Act of 1965 gave priority to professionals and other individuals with specialized skills, it selectively enabled Africans of elevated socioeconomic status to immigrate to the United States. Among these may be, at least theoretically, some descendants of the African slave traders who sold the ancestors of many black Americans into New World slavery.

Ruling out these possibilities, the Darity and Mullen (Darity and Frank 2003, 327; Darity and Mullen 2020, 258) plan sets two eligibility criteria, a lineage standard and an identity standard. The lineage standard has it an individual must establish they have at least one ancestor who was enslaved in the United States of America.

The identity standard states that an individual must establish that they self-identified on an official document as black, Negro, African American, or Afro American for twelve years before the enactment of a reparations plan or a commission to study reparations. In sum, on these criteria, eligible recipients for reparations will be black Americans whose ancestors were enslaved in the United States. The second condition rules out people abruptly adopting a black identity simply to gain reparations' benefits.[10]

---

occurred in response to the pandemic. The federal government amassed significant amounts of funds for expenditure purposes to deal with each of those crises without having any significant change in the level of taxes that people were incurring. So the federal government can do it, but states and localities cannot. Their total combined budgets at the present moment come to something less than $5 trillion. [One] bill that we've outlined is at least $14.3 trillion. So that's the incompleteness dimension. The inconsistency arises because these various state and local initiatives are uncoordinated, and they are not interwoven [n]or integrated with one another. . . . there's not a necessary degree of compatibility between them. And then finally, they're inequitable because they are not uniform. . . . eligible recipients in different communities are going to receive different types of restitution. If we indeed want to call it that. . . in fact, we would argue that these local and state initiatives are something that could have value from the standpoint of reducing the impact of the various harms that have taken place. But they do not have the capacity to essentially provide adequate compensation for the magnitude of the range of harms that have been inflicted on the victimized community" (emphasis added).

9. Even more extreme, philosopher Olúfẹ́mi Táíwò (2022) wants to absorb the black American claim for reparations into a global claim for diasporic justice for peoples of African descent for colonialism, linked to the unevenly distributed hazards of climate change.

10. On May 17, 2023, Rep. Cori Bush (D-Mo.) introduced a congressional resolution, the Reparations Now Resolution, shares similar problems (U.S. Congress 2023). Her resolution's eligibility criteria reads, "the Federal Government must compensate descendants of enslaved Black people and people of African descent." Presum-

Darity and Mullen (2020) urge a focus on black American descendants of U.S. slavery because, they argue, this is the community exposed to the long history of atrocities executed or sanctioned by the U.S. government that produced current disparities in health, wealth, employment, political participation, and treatment from the criminal justice system. They contend that this is the community whose ancestors were promised and denied forty acres land grants with intergenerational ramifications creating a debt still unpaid. This is the community that suffered the indignity and terror of legal segregation in the United States.

Furthermore, fewer than 1 percent of the U.S. black population voluntarily migrated here prior to the passage of the civil rights legislation of the 1960s (Berlin 2010). Substantial post-slavery black in-migration to the United States only took place after the 1970s. It is important that the more recent additions to the nation's black population came voluntarily to a nation with a long history of racism, unlike the ancestors of black Americans, who came in chains.

The CRTF's deliberations suggest the eligibility standard they established was intended to prioritize California descendants of American chattel slavery but also the descendants of a smaller group of free blacks prior to the abolition of slavery. The exact CRTF (2023, 1) definition is "African American Descendants of a Chattel Enslaved Person, or Descendants of a Free Black Person Living in the United States Prior to the End of the 19th Century."[11] Without a precise designation of who is African American, the CRTF criteria also open the eligibility window to persons currently living as white.[12]

Reparations Modalities

In terms of proposed reparations modalities (see table 1, row 4), Brooks's (2004, 157) plan calls for "a museum of slavery and an atonement trust fund." The atonement trust fund would benefit "every newborn black American child born within a certain period of time—five, ten, or more years" (Brooks 2004, 159). This means that not all blacks or descendants of a person enslaved in the United States would receive reparations but only some young members of that category. Presumably, this would keep costs relatively low for the federal government as reparations provider.

NAARC's (2015) plan also contains elements that are free or relatively low cost, such as "a formal apology," the establishment of a "MAAFA/African Holocaust Institute," for those who wish it "a right to return to the motherland to an African nation of their choice," an "African Knowledge Program" funds for black monuments, and criminal justice reform. Other elements of the plan potentially are costly, such as "substantial tracts of . . . public land," "resources to support major Cooperative Enterprises," "Black controlled Health and Wellness Centers, fully equipped with highly qualified personnel," education funds, funding for historically black colleges and universities and free tuition for students attending them, affordable housing, as well as funds for black public media.

The Darity and Mullen (2020) plan emphasizes the importance of a direct monetary component. They state, "While a personal check or its equivalent need not be the only form in which the program makes payments, both the symbolism and the autonomy it conveys will be

ably persons living as white today who could establish they have an enslaved ancestor or African ancestry would be eligible for reparations. In addition, this standard would include persons who have ancestors enslaved in any part of the world.

11. The presence of the word *or* following a comma produces amibiguity whether the phrase "Living in the United States Prior to the End of the 19th century" applies to "African American Descendants of a Chattel Enslaved Person." If it is not interpreted as applying, then the CRTF's criteria for eligibility can include a person whose ancestors were enslaved somewhere other than the United States.

12. Further complicating matters with respect to the use of *African American* without definition is that the term was not used in the laws establishing legal discrimination in the United States. For example, segregation ordinances referred to separation between "whites" and "negros" or "coloreds," with the latter two terms used interchangeably (see Benson 1915; PBS Learning Media for Teachers 2023).

a key dimension of a black reparations program" (265). The ancestors of many black Americans were deprived of their autonomy throughout the periods of both slavery and post-slavery discrimination.

Direct monetary payments would restore that autonomy to their descendants, albeit not necessarily in the form of a cash transfer. Darity and Mullen's (2020) plan also considers less liquid forms of money transfer than cash—transfers having more of an asset character than a sheer income supplement, such as trust funds, annuities, or other types of endowments for all eligible recipients. The key for them is the eligible recipients must have full discretion over the use of the funds.

In contrast, the CRTF (2023, 4) plan states simply, "Ultimately, the Task Force recommends that any reparations program include the payment of cash or its equivalent."

Reparations Administration

In terms of administration (see table 1, row 4), Brooks's (2004) proposed trust funds, would be managed by "reputable trust administrators selected by prominent black Americans" (159), and "help fund recipients make the right choices in schools and business opportunities" (161). This restriction smacks of paternalism and may be motivated by an internalized acceptance of ancient antiblack stereotypes.

In his expert testimony to the California Reparations Task Force (California Department of Justice 2021, 8:39–9:14 min), Brooks stated on September 23, 2021, "I am not in favor of compensatory reparations because . . . the individual can take that and go to Las Vegas to gamble it away. And that gives evidence to Chris Rock's famous quip that the only one who is going to benefit from reparations is Kentucky Fried Chicken."

Apart from denying the right of the individual recipient to do with the funds as they see fit—in other cases of reparations for members of victimized communities no restrictions have been placed on their use of the funds—no evidence supports the view that black Americans are any more frivolous with their monetary resources than any other group. In fact, the best evidence available reveals, if anything black Americans are less profligate with their money than white Americas, saving as much, if not more, than their white counterparts (Darity et al. 2018).

Although not explicitly repeated by NAARC (2015), similar stereotype-based considerations may motivate that plan's insertion of multiple levels of administrative bureaucracy between the federal government as provider and eligible recipients of African descent in the United States. First would be the establishment of a "National Reparations Trust Authority . . . comprised of a cross-section of credible representatives of reparations, civil rights, human rights, labor, faith, educational, civic and fraternal organizations and institutions" (NAARC 2015, 2). Further, an unelected "Boards of Trustees" would manage Cooperative Enterprises (5); there would be an "African American Housing and Finance Authority" (6); media funds would be "administered by the National Newspaper Publishers Association (NNPA) and National Association of Black Owned Broadcasters (NABOB)" (7); the National Parks Service would receive funds for monuments (7), and a newly founded "Black controlled Agency for Returning Citizens" would organize the process by which released prisoners would be reintegrated into society as part of criminal justice reform.

No election by eligible recipients to administrative roles is envisioned in NAARC's (2015) plan. In contrast, the Darity and Mullen (2020, 267) plan holds that "A twelve-member reparations supervisory board will be established, *elected by all those with established eligibility for the reparations program*" (emphasis in the original). The CRTF (2023, 2) envisions that the legislature charge a "recommended California American Freedman Affairs Agency . . . with processing . . . claims and rendering payment in an efficient and timely manner."

A related theme that emerges from the research of Newton and Nelsen (2024) and Davies, Jackson, and Knight (2024) is the importance of involving the victimized party early in the design and conceptualization of a redress program. In Chicago, early incorporation of victims' voices helped shape the reparations policy to have direct benefits for the victimized parties, whereas the process in Evanston may have been coopted by elites in a way that left the ultimate reparations policy narrowly ap-

plied to housing and fiscally unattainable for Evanston's most economically vulnerable black families.

How Much Is Owed?

Variance is also quite considerable in proposed amounts or in whether any estimates are provided at all (see table 1, row 6). Brooks (2004, 163) writes, "Under the capitalization approach, it would take $50,000 of investment capital [in 2004 dollars] per eligible worker" to close the black-white earnings gap. This would represent roughly $69,647 per eligible recipient in 2020 dollars (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.). The NAARC (2015) proposal names no estimates; the Darity and Mullen (Darity, Mullen, and Slaughter 2022) plan estimates that $350,000 per eligible black descendant of a person enslaved in the United States will eliminate the black-white wealth gap.[13]

The CRTF's (2023) amount is more difficult to assess given that it may differ from one eligible recipient to the next based on length of residence in California. For example, $13,619 would be due per year of residence in California for health discrimination and $2,352 per year of residence in California between 1971 and 2020 for overpolicing during the so-called war on drugs. A lump sum of $145,847 would be due for housing discrimination and another of $77,000 for business devaluation. Thus, for an eligible recipient forty-nine years of age in 2020, this would be $667,331 for health discrimination plus $115,248 for overpolicing plus $145,847 for housing discrimination plus $77,000 for business devaluation, roughly equivalent to $1 million. None of the four plans has yet been considered by an actual elected body, but the CRTF (2023) plan is approaching this test with the California State Assembly perhaps as early as 2024.

Based on the comparison of the four plans, a joint plan may be envisioned as follows: with victim-centered rather than perpetrator-focused goals—only Brooks's (2004) plan centering on the perpetrating side; with the federal government as the main reparations provider—only the CRTF (2023) plan being state level; with eligibility criteria derived from a combination of Darity and Mullen's (2020) plan and the CRTF's plan, specifically, black descendants of persons enslaved in the United States or black descendants of free black persons living under permanent threat of enslavement in the United States prior to the abolition of slavery in 1865.

The modalities also could combine Darity and Mullen's (2020) and the CRTF's (2023) recommendations: a meaningful monetary component over which the recipients would have exclusive decision-making power. In terms of fund administration, the CRTF's recommended Freedmen's and Freedwomen's Bureau could be reestablished with the leadership elected by all eligible adult reparations recipients, as Darity and Mullen's plan holds. Finally, in terms of the amounts, closing the current black-white wealth gap might be a minimum demand and represent a meaningful downpayment. As the CRTF's calculations demonstrate, adding losses from individual atrocities can exceed that amount because not every black loss was mirrored by white gain. For example, pain and suffering from generations of enslavement, race discrimination, and intergenerational poverty had no corresponding white gain and therefore are not fully captured by the wealth gap. Further, in the presence of racial discrimination, black Americans are likely to have worked harder to achieve the same level of success as comparable white Americans. Any additional, compensatory black effort would have reduced the observed wealth gap below its full discriminatory level.

LOSSES TO BLACK AMERICANS FROM U.S. SLAVERY AND THE RACIAL WEALTH GAP

To complicate matters, some estimates of black losses due to slavery in the United States alone (1776–1865) exceed the racial wealth gap. The most recent Survey of Consumer Finances for 2022 (Aladangady et al. 2023) indicates the average black-white family wealth gap is $1.15 million. Given an average black family size of 3.4 persons and an average white household size

13. The $350,000 estimate is based on data from the 2019 Survey of Consumer Finances (SCF) (Darity 2021b). As we demonstrate, the estimate based on the 2022 SCF is more than $40,000 higher.

of three persons, the average per capita wealth gap by race amounts to $393,519.

Three main estimation methods have been proposed to estimate losses due to U.S. slavery alone, the price-based method (Ransom and Sutch 1990; Neal 1990; Marketti 1990), the wage-based method (Craemer 2015; Craemer et al. 2023), and the land-based method (Darity 2008; Darity and Mullen 2020). They are cautious measures because they ignore colonial slavery from 1517, when the Spanish Crown authorized the importation of enslaved Africans to what is today Puerto Rico (Asiegbu 2020), to 1775, the year before the United States declared independence from Great Britain.

The price-based method was developed in the 1990s and documented in the groundbreaking volume edited by Richard America, *The Wealth of Races* (Ransom and Sutch 1990; Neal 1990; Marketti 1990). This approach treats the price of an enslaved person as the market signal of how much an enslaver expected to gain from owning that person. However, because the market price was established through negotiations between the seller and the buyer of human property and did not reflect the views of the enslaved, this price is likely to reflect the value of slavery only to the enslaver, not to the enslaved (Berry 2017).

Price-based estimates range from $17.4 billion (Ransom and Sutch 1990) to $1.4 trillion (Neal 1990), up to $4.7 trillion (Marketti 1990), all in 1983 dollars. Further compounded at 6 percent interest, this would represent $141.8 billion, $11.4 trillion, and $38.3 trillion in 2019 dollars respectively. Divided by forty-one million black descendants of the enslaved in the United States (Tamir 2022), this would amount to $3,458 (Ransom and Sutch 1990), $278,199 (Neal 1990), and $933,953 (Marketti 1990) per eligible recipient in 2019 dollars.

The wage-based estimation method (Craemer 2015; Craemer et al. 2023) uses U.S. Census (1975) records about the enslaved population measured every ten years from 1790 to 1860, and historical free-labor-market hourly wages from 1790 ($0.02) to 1860 ($0.08) provided by Lawrence Officer and Samuel Williamson (2019). It uses this information to estimate the enslaved population in each year from 1776 to 1860 and computes the number of hours per year that were available to enslavers by multiplying the annual slave population by twenty-four hours a day and 365 days a year.

This amount is then multiplied by the tiny hourly wage rate in each year and compounded by either 3 percent interest (not making up for inflation) or 6 percent interest (the interest rate specified in the sales contract of Georgetown University when it sold 272 enslaved in 1838 to save the university from financial ruin). The resulting totals are at 3 percent interest $19.1 trillion in 2019 dollars, and at 6 percent interest $6.6 quadrillion. The corresponding per recipient payments would be $465,854 or $161 million in 2019 dollars respectively. This computational example illustrates the central role the interest rate plays in estimating losses over such long periods.

Alternatively, loss of freedom due to slavery in the United States can be calculated based on the reparations Japanese American World War II internees received in 1988. The Civil Liberties Act of 1988 provided each surviving ex-internee $20,000 per person and an apology letter from the U.S. president (National Archives 2017). Internment lasted for three years, from 1942 to 1945, and did not involve slave labor. Hence reparations compensated for lost freedom implicitly was a rate of about $0.76 per hour in 1988 dollars.

The purchasing-power equivalent of that amount can be derived using Morgan Friedman's (2019) inflation calculator, and the total hours available to enslavers can be multiplied by the hourly compensation for lost freedom. At only 3 percent interest, this would yield $35.8 trillion in 2019 dollars, and at 6 percent a staggering $17.4 quadrillion. This would work out at 3 percent interest to $874,139 per person and at 6 percent to $424 million per person for black Americans. What would still be missing is compensation for lost opportunities to accumulate capital, as well as pain and suffering (Swinton 1990).

The land-based estimation method calculates the current value of the forty acres (and a mule) promised to the freedmen and freedwomen. Land as restitution was the basis for Sojourner Truth's demand for land redistribution (Araujo 2019). Businessman Dempsey Travis developed the proposal for a new Home-

stead Act in 1970 as a form of reparations based on the current land value of forty forty-acre plots (Allen 1998).

Darity (2008, 662) writes, "The unfulfilled promise of 40 acres per family . . . provides a means to gauge the magnitude of reparations owed to the descendants of those enslaved." He estimates the price of land in 1865 at about $10 per acre (Mittal and Powell 2000) and notes that "an allocation of 40 acres to a family of four would imply 10 acres per person, hence a value of $100 per ex-slave in 1865."

If we also take the total number of formerly enslaved persons who were emancipated at the close of the Civil War at four million persons, forty million acres of land valued at $400 million should have been distributed to them in 1865. Compounding this sum from 1865 at 6 percent interest to 2019 results in $3.156 trillion in 2019 dollars. However, white settler families were promised and given four times the amount, 160 acres, by the Homestead Act of 1862.[14] Thus the raw estimate must be increased by a factor of four to $12.6 trillion with outlays of $307,921 for each of the estimated forty-one million eligible recipients (Tamir 2022).

However, missing from the ledger would be a host of post-slavery atrocities that could be put on the register as well: the costs in lives and property of the one hundred white terrorist massacres, black excess mortality due to disparities in the healthfulness of living conditions, discrimination in homeownership access and home equity, differential access to quality medical care, employment discrimination, unequal education, and the sheer indignity of segregation.

Laws and policies, ostensibly in place for the general social benefit, have been mobilized for one-sided gains for white Americans. Eminent domain and predatory tax laws have been used widely to expropriate black property and transfer it to white ownership and profit, particularly high-value coastal properties (Kahrl 2016, 2024).

Contract selling schemes produced by the denial of adequate credit to potential black homeowners under redlining conditions served as a mechanism for extraction of black income by white real estate brokers. More often than not, the brokers ultimately retained ownership of the properties and could resell them for another round of exploitation (Satter 2010; Coates 2014). In the aftermath of official redlining, the federal government's program of guaranteed mortgage support in urban areas under the auspices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development was manipulated to produce sweeping numbers of foreclosures in black communities (Taylor 2019).

Related to recent federally funded and sanctioned discrimination against black Americans, Ann Pfau and her colleagues (2024, this volume, issue 2) embark on an ambitious archives-based analysis of the financial harms suffered by tenants and property owners displaced by local government agencies in the process of implementing urban renewal programs. These harms include inadequate reimbursement payments, lost business and rental income, and higher post-relocation housing costs. In the case of homeowners who became tenants, the authors estimate the present-day market values of individual properties and compare those estimates with the compensation received by displaced occupants. Their project is a roadmap for other communities looking to document and remedy the damages caused by urban renewal.

One difficulty with the enumeration and adding up strategy is the lack of sufficient data to provide a comprehensive calculation for each category (Darity, Mullen, and Slaughter 2022), particularly for loss of life and property during the course of mass killings and violent destruction of black communities. A second difficulty is the question of whether living descendants merit compensation for atrocities they did not experience directly, particularly the atrocity of slavery.

14. Keri Merritt (2016) reports that 1.6 million white families received 160 acres land patents under the Homestead Act of 1862, approximately 10 to 12 percent of the U.S. white population by the first two decades of the twentieth century. In contrast, little more than ten thousand black people received land patents under the short-lived Southern Homestead Act 1866 and the original Homestead Act, less than 1 percent of the four million persons emancipated at the end of the Civil War.

It is justifiable for living descendants to receive compensation for the intergenerational impact on their lives of the brutality imposed on their ancestors. Still, the current value of land not received by the freedmen and freedwomen does not encompass the full range of factors generating the contemporary racial wealth gap. Instead, one can go directly to the current disparity itself to compute the size of a reparations bill.

Distributed to every living black American descendant of an enslaved person in the United States, this amount should suffice to eliminate the intergenerational wealth effects of past atrocities, including the long-term effects of U.S. slavery. If roughly 85 percent of the nation's black population of approximately forty-seven million persons consists of individuals who have at least one ancestor who was enslaved in the United States (Tamir 2022), an estimated forty-one million black Americans would be due about $16.1 trillion.

Elizabeth Wrigley-Field (2024, this volume, issue 2) argues that the legacy of slavery and Jim Crow was not just lost income and wealth, but also lost time in the form of decreased life expectancies for black Americans. She empirically estimates the relationship between lifespan and measures of slavery and Jim Crow intensity for black Americans and argues that any reparations program should account for differences in lifespan between black and white Americans.

Wrigley-Field's (2024) focus on the racial longevity gap provides an intriguing alternative to the racial wealth gap as a summary measure for computation of the size of the reparations bill. A rough and ready approach to estimation of the amount due for reparations using her concept follows: conservatively, use as a benchmark $10 million as the value of a statistical life.[15]

If the average black lifespan is seventy-one years, then the average value of a black year of life will be $140,845. If white longevity runs seventy-six years, the comparative loss in black longevity is five years. Five years multiplied by $140,845 yields a payout per eligible black recipient of $704,255. With an estimated forty-one million black American descendants of persons enslaved in the United States, the total bill will come to about $29 trillion.

Using closing the black-white wealth gap as the goal post, Asher Dvir-Djerassi (2024, this volume, issue 3) uses counterfactual historic simulations to evaluate the ability of race-neutral baby bonds—wealth endowments bestowed at birth and financed through a progressive wealth tax—to close the wealth gap over time. Although race-neutral policies are by definition not reparations, they may be more politically feasible to enact and, therefore, important to study.

Dvir-Djerassi's simulations demonstrate that race-neutral baby bonds cannot close the mean racial wealth gap over a reasonable time scale. They can, however, virtually close the median racial wealth gap if the wealth endowment is at least $50,000 for the lowest-wealth children and graduated downward at lower endowment amounts for higher wealth families.

However, Darity and Mullen (2021) argue that elimination of the mean racial wealth gap should be the target for any reparations program to properly embody the intergenerational legacy of past atrocities against black Americans. As Dvir-Dejrassi (2024) demonstrates, baby bonds would have to be redesigned to target equalization of wealth at the national mean to close the wealth gap under race-neutral arrangements.

HOW TO PAY THE DEBT

Who should be responsible for paying the debt? Darity and Mullen (2022) argue that only the federal government has the capacity to meet the task.

A suitable plan for reparations should have a payment scheme that is sufficient, at least, to eliminate the black-white disparity in wealth, minimize the inflation effect, and minimize any new immediate or deferred tax burden. That combination of objectives can only be achieved by the federal government, particularly because as sovereign currency issuer only the federal government can spend huge sums of money without being constrained by tax rev-

15. This figure is actually very conservative (see Consumer Product Safety Commission 2023).

enue—unlike states and localities. The barrier to additional federal spending is the inflation risk, which can be mitigated by spreading the payments out across several years—no more than a decade—and by giving recipients, at least in part, payments in the form of less liquid assets like trust accounts or annuities (Darity and Mullen 2020, 266–67).

In this volume, Trina Shanks and colleagues (2024, issue 3) argue that evidence from the structure of child development accounts shows that reparations payments can be delivered to eligible recipients of all ages (not just children) through structured savings plans with automatic enrollment that promote asset growth and considerable autonomy for the recipients. The contribution of their article is to demonstrate a practical delivery system for cash reparations payments.

The form of reparations that is most appropriate is direct payments to eligible recipients, though not necessarily solely cash transfers. Ultimately, individual recipients should have full authority over the use of the funds. This has been the case for payments to other communities subjected to collective victimization internationally. Conditions should be no different for black American reparations when the bill finally is paid. Any other route would be unwarranted paternalism and an insult to the recipient community.

THE FUTURE

What is the future of black reparations in the United States? Ultimately, it will have to be decided by legislative bodies, which, in turn, are heavily influenced by public opinion. Two articles in this volume, by Jesse Rhodes and colleagues (2024, issue 3) and by Kamri Hudgins and colleagues (2024, issue 3), investigate public opinion toward reparations. Rhodes and colleagues examine the historic trajectory of public opinion on reparations and present evidence on contemporary public opinion using four nationally representative surveys administered between 2021 and 2023. They find that in recent polls between 14 percent and 28 percent of white Americans support cash reparations, up from a tiny 4 percent in 2000 (Dawson and Popoff 2004). There appears to be momentum with regard to the least popular form of reparations—cash payments (but see Craemer 2009a, 2009b). The political feasibility of reparations programs will depend on how fast the momentum in favor of reparations can build. This is notoriously difficult to predict, but examples such as the relatively sudden public opinion swing from majority opposition to majority support for gay marriage suggest that public opinion can change on a dime.

Once white non-Hispanics cease in a few decades to represent the majority in the U.S. electorate, a federal black reparations program may become more electorally feasible. This depends on whether the black reparations movement manages to build meaningful coalitions with other historically excluded nonwhite groups for whom black reparations could serve as a political precedent.

On the other hand, controlling a majority of the electorate does not guarantee political power, as white reparations opponents, who are still likely to control a disproportionate share of U.S. resources continue to lobby for disenfranchising policies (restricting access to the franchise, gerrymandering, and so on). Thus a federal program may not become feasible even after white non-Hispanics have become a minority.

Will local and state examples like those in Detroit, Evanston, and California set the course for other regions to follow? Rhodes and colleagues (2024) contend that "reparations policies may have considerable prospects in states and communities where Democrats—backed by progressive and racially liberal public opinion—are politically dominant." Will these local and state initiatives ultimately lead to federal legislation by example, or will they be treated as sufficient, removing the need, in many eyes, for federal action? If federal action is the next step, then how will public pressure effectively activate congressional action? We do not have the answers to these questions, but we can speculate on a few likely outcomes based on recent events.

State and local commissions and task forces on reparations are being formed and empaneled; this tendency is not dissipating. In addition to the local studies addressed in this volume, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors recently recommended $5 million payments to

every eligible black American (Hersher 2016). This came on the heels of the California Reparations Task Force submitting its report to the State Assembly.

Additionally, the city of St. Paul, Minnesota, recently appointed a committee called the St. Paul Recovery Act Reparations Commission to examine racial injustices in the city. Once payouts begin, local and state initiatives will find that they are incapable, singly or collectively, to meet bills of $29 trillion, or even a "mere" $16.1 trillion. The amounts proposed in San Francisco and in the California Task Force's report appear to be far beyond the ken of either their respective municipal or state resources.

States and localities may, finally, turn to the federal government, where they are likely to encounter substantial opposition; however, opposition may be susceptible to accurate information, as Hudgins and colleagues (2024) suggest in this volume. The authors use a representative survey of Detroiters in 2022 and a nonrepresentative national survey administered between 2020 and 2022 to examine attitudes toward reparations. They find a link between an awareness of racial inequality and support for reparations policies, suggesting that public education on racial disparities may increase the feasibility of a reparations program. Thus, education on existing racial disparities in intergenerational wealth, income, health, homeownership, and education may prove crucial to effecting a federal black reparations program.

A study undertaken by Michael Kraus and Chiyei Vinluan (2023) indicates that Asian American support for black reparations increases when Japanese American exposure to mass incarceration during World War II and their subsequent receipt of redress is invoked. This suggests that education about the record of restitution directed at one's group may stimulate greater approval for "reparative economic justice" for others. Reparations have appeared prominently in political campaigns over the last few years, confirming the relevance of this issue on contemporary national policy platforms. Recent developments provide clues to future debates and possible outcomes. It is likely that the fight for reparations will continue to escalate.

Morally and economically equitable solutions may gather momentum even if they seem politically and fiscally less than feasible at a given moment. This was true for the abolition of slavery at the height of its profitability, and for the ban of de jure Jim Crow discrimination as a result of the civil rights movement of the 1960s. Whether black reparations will join these historical examples remains to be seen.

REFERENCES

Aladangady, Aditya, Andrew C. Chang, and Jacob Krimmel. 2023. "Greater Wealth, Greater Uncertainty: Changes in Racial Inequality in the Survey of Consumer Finances." *FEDS Notes,* October 18. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/notes/feds-notes/greater-wealth-greater-uncertainty-changes-in-racial-inequality-in-the-survey-of-consumer-finances-20231018.html.

Al-Awsat, Asharq. 2022. "France Approves Reparation Bill for Algeria's Harkis." Accessed December 13, 2023. http://english.aawsat.com/home/article/3478276/france-approves-reparation-bill-algeria's-harkis.

Allen, Robert L. 1998. "Past Due: The African American Quest for Reparations." *Black Scholar* 28(2): 2–17.

America, Richard F. 1990. *The Wealth of Races*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Araujo, Ana Lucia. 2019. "The History of Black Women Championing Demands for Reparations." *Truthout,* June 1. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://truthout.org/articles/the-history-of-black-women-championing-demands-for-reparations.

Asiegbu, Grace. 2020. "Blackness in Puerto Rico." Medill Reports, April 3. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://news.medill.northwestern.edu/chicago/blackness-in-puerto-rico.

Associated Press. 2004. "Tortured Chileans Gain Compensation." NBC News, November 29. Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna6612949.

Aurora de Chile. n.d. "Manuel de Salas." Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.auroradechile.cl/newtenberg/681/article-3031.html.

BBC News. 2012. "Philippines Signs Humans Rights Law on Forced Disappearances." December 22. Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-20823526.

———. 2013. "Philippines Law Gives Compensation to Marcos Victims." February 25. Accessed De-

cember 13, 2023. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-21571051.

Beauvois, Frédérique. 2017. *Between Blood & Gold. The Debates over Compensation for Slavery in the Americas*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Bennett, Julie, and YiLi Chien. 2022. "The Large Gap in Stock Market Participation Between Black and White Households." Economic Synopses no. 7. St. Louis: Federal Reserve Bank. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://research.stlouisfed.org/publications/economic-synopses/2022/03/28/the-large-gap-in-stock-market-participation-between-black-and-white-households.

Benson, T. B. 1915. "Segregation Ordinances." *Virginia Law Review New Series* 1(5): 330–56. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1104063.

Berlin, Ira. 2010. "The Changing Definition of African-American." *Smithsonian Magazine,* February. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/the-changing-definition-of-african-american-4905887/.

Berry, Daina Ramey. 2017. *The Price for Their Pound of Flesh: The Value of the Enslaved, from Womb to Grave, in the Building of a Nation.* Boston, Mass.: Beacon Books.

Berry, Daina Ramey, and Kali Nicole Gross. 2020. *A Black Women's History of the United States.* Boston, Mass.: Beacon Books.

Berry, Mary Frances. 2005. *My Face Is Black Is True: Calle House and the Struggle for Ex-Slave Reparations.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Bilmes, Linda, and Cornell William Brooks. 2024. "Normalizing Reparations: U.S. Precedent, Norms, and Models for Compensating Harms and Implications for Reparations to Black Americans." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(2): 30–68. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.2.02.

Blain, Keisha. 2019. "Audley Moore, Black Women's Activism, and Nationalist Politics." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.aaihs.org/audley-moore-black-womens-activism-and-nationalist-politics.

Booker Perry, Miranda. 2010. "No Pensions for Ex-Slaves: How Federal Agencies Suppressed Movement to Aid Freedpeople" *Prologue Magazine* 42(2)(Summer). Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2010/summer/slave-pension.html.

Boxer, Andrew. 2009. "Native Americans and the Federal Government." *History Today* 64 (September). Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.historytoday.com/archive/native-americans-and-federal-government.

Brooks, Roy. 2004. *Atonement and Forgiveness. A New Model for Black Reparations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brunnstrom, David, and Michael Martina. 2023. "Activists Urge U.S. Apology, Fair Compensation, for U.S. Pacific Nuclear Testing." Reuters, January 10. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.reuters.com/world/activists-urge-us-apology-fair-compensation-us-pacific-nuclear-testing-2023-01-10.

California Department of Justice. 2021. "Reparations Task Force, Witness Testimony, Roy Brooks, J.D." [YouTube video]. September 23. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sw9i1kBR57U.

California Reparations Task Force (CRTF). 2023. "Final Recommendations of Task Force Regarding Calculations of Losses to African American Descendants of a Chattel Enslaved Person, or Descendants of a Free Black Person Living in the United States Prior to the End of the 19th Century, and Forms of Compensation and Restitution." Part 4, Chapter 17 of draft report. May 6. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ab3121-agenda10-ch17-draft-05062023.pdf.

Canadian Press. 2023. "'Historic' $2.9B Class-Action Indigenous Court Settlement Approved." CBC News, March 9. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.cbc.ca/amp/1.6774186.

CNN. 2012. "U.S. Finalizes $3.4 Billion Settlement with American Indians." November 27. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.cnn.com/2012/11/26/politics/american-indian-settlment/index.html.

Coates, Ta-Nehisi. 2014. "The Case for Reparations." *The Atlantic,* June. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/06/the-case-for-reparations/361631.

Colombia Aprende. 2007. "Ley de Libertad de Vientres de 1821." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20070927023207/http://www.colombiaaprende.edu.co/html/etnias/1604/article-82844.html.

Consumer Product Safety Commission. 2023. "Notice of Availability: Proposed Draft Guidance for Estimating Value Per Statistical Life." *Federal Register* 88: 17826–28. Accessed December 13,

2023. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/03/24/2023-06081/notice-of-availability-proposed-draft-guidance-for-estimating-value-per-statistical-life.

Cook, Alex, Dan Shepard, and Xiomara Martinez-White. 2022. "Business Owner Demographics: Gender, Race, and More." Lending Tree, November 22. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.lendingtree.com/business/business-owner-demographics.

Coria, Juan Carlos. 1997. "Pasado y presente de los Negros en Buenos Aires." Educar - Argentina, October. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20061127105341/http://www.educar-argentina.com.ar/CORIA/coria9.htm.

Cozzi, Lauren. 2023. "More Americans Own Their Homes, but Black-White Homeownership Rate Gap Is Biggest in a Decade, NAR Report Finds." Chicago: National Association of Realtors, March 2. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.nar.realtor/newsroom/more-americans-own-their-homes-but-black-white-homeownership-rate-gap-is-biggest-in-a-decade-nar.

Craemer, Thomas. 2009a. "Framing Reparations." *Policy Studies Journal* 37(2): 275–98.

———. 2009b. "Psychological 'Self–Other Overlap' and Support for Slavery Reparations." *Social Science Research* 38(3): 668–80.

———. 2015. "Estimating Slavery Reparations: Present Value Comparisons of Historical Multigenerational Reparations Policies" *Social Science Quarterly* 96(2)(June): 639–55.

Craemer, Thomas, Trevor Smith, Brianna Harrison, Trevon D. Logan, Wesley Bellamy, and William A. Darity Jr. 2023. "Wealth Implications of Slavery and Racial Discrimination for African American Descendants of the Enslaved." In *The Black Reparations Project: A Handbook for Racial Justice*, edited by William Darity Jr., A. Kirsten Mullen, and Lucas Hubbard, 21–62. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Darity, William A., Jr. 2008. "Forty Acres and a Mule in the 21st Century." *Social Science Quarterly* 89(3): 656–64.

———. 2021a. "John Wayne Niles." In *Four Hundred Souls: A Community History of African America, 1619–2019*, edited by Ibram X. Kendi and Keisha N. Blain, 244–48. New York: One World Press.

———. 2021b. "The True Cost of Closing the Racial Wealth Gap." *New York Times*, May 2.

Darity, William A., Jr., and Dania Frank. 2003. "The Economics of Reparations." *American Economic Association Papers and Proceedings* 93(2): 326–29.

Darity, William A., Jr., Darrick Hamilton, Mark Paul, Alan Aja, Anne Price, Antonio Moore, and Caterina Chiopris. 2018. "What We Get Wrong About Closing the Racial Wealth Gap." Durham, NC: Insight Center for Community Economic Development and the Samuel DuBois Cook Center on Social Equity at Duke University. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://socialequity.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/what-we-get-wrong.pdf.

Darity, William A., Jr., and A. Kirsten Mullen. 2020. *From Here to Equality: Reparations for Black Americans in the Twenty-First Century.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

———. 2021. "Local 'Reparations' Plans Make Promises They Can't Keep." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, October 25, 2021. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355574566_Local_'reparations'_plans_make_promises_they_can't_keep_Opinion.

———. 2023. "William Darity Jr. and Kirsten Mullen on Why It's Time to Pay Reparations to Black Americans." Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.irp.wisc.edu/resource/william-darity-jr-and-kirsten-mullen-on-why-its-time-to-pay-reparations-to-black-americans.

Darity, William A., Jr., A. Kirsten Mullen, and Marvin Slaughter. 2022. "The Cumulative Costs of Racism and the Bill for Black Reparations." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 36(2)(Spring): 99–122.

Davies, Elizabeth Jordie, Jenn M. Jackson, and David J. Knight. 2024. "Limited Scopes of Repair: Black Reparations Strategies and the Constraints of Local Redress Policy." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(3): 162–83. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.3.08.

Dawson, Michael C., and Rovana Popoff. 2004. "Reparations: Justice and Greed in Black and White." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 1(1): 47–91.

Desapaericidos. n.d. "For Memory, Truth, and Justice: The Philippines." Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.desaparecidos.org/phil/eng.html.

Dvir-Djerassi, Asher. 2024. "Closing the Racial

Wealth Gap: A Counterfactual Historical Simulation of Universal Inheritance." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(3): 70–91. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.3.04.

Edwards, Kathryn Anne, Lisa Berdie, and Jonathan W. Welburn. 2024. "What Makes a Reparations Successful? A Discussion to Inform Design of Reparations to Black Americans." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(2): 69–85. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.2.03.

Francois, Chevalier. 1999. *América Latina. De la Independencia a nuestros días*. Misione: Primera Edición, México. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20070128015653/http://www.asa.edu.py/tch_work/estudios sociales/cronologiaamericalatina.htm.

Free Womb Project. n.d.a "Bolivia, 1831." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://thefreewombproject.com/bolivia.

Free Womb Project. n.d.b. "Gran Colombia (Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Panamá), 1821." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://thefreewombproject.com/colombia/.

Friedman, Morgan S. 2019. "The Inflation Calculator." West Egg. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://westegg.com/inflation.

Fundacion Polar. 2007. Historia de Venezuela Para Nosotros. Ley de Abolición de la Esclavitud. February 23. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20070223073325/http://www.fpolar.org.ve/nosotros/educacional/economia/abolescl.html.

Grieshaber, Kristen. 2022. "Germany Marks 70 Years of Compensating Holocaust Survivors." AP News, September 15. Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.apnews.com.

Hersher, Rebecca. 2016. "U.S. Government to Pay $492 Million to 17 American Indian Tribes." National Public Radio, September 27. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2016/09/27/495627997/u-s-government-to-pay-492-million-to-17-american-indian-tribes.

Hudgins, Kamri, Erykah Benson, Sydney Carr, Jasmine Simington, Zoe Walker, Jessica Cruz, Vincent Hutchings, Earl Lewis, Mara Cecilia Ostfeld, and Alford Young Jr. 2024. "Crafting Democratic Futures: Understanding Political Conditions and Racialized Attitudes Toward Black Reparations." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(3): 49–67. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.3.03.

Jaffe, Logan. 2020. "The Nation's First Reparations Package to Survivors of Police Torture Included a Public Memorial. Survivors Are Still Waiting." *ProPublica*, July 3. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.propublica.org/article/the-nations-first-reparations-package-to-survivors-of-police-torture-included-a-public-memorial-survivors-are-still-waiting.

Jones, Thai. 2021. "Archival Documents Bring Light to Historical African American Legal Triumphs." *Columbia News*, September 16. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://news.columbia.edu/news/rare-book-and-manuscript-library-document-brings-light-to-historical-african-american-legal-victories.

Kahrl, Andrew. 2016. *This Land Was Ours: How Black Beaches Became White Wealth in the Coastal South.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

———. 2024. *The Black Tax: 150 Years of Theft, Exploitation, and Dispossession in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Katznelson, Ira. 2005. *When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Kraus, Michael W., and A. Chiyei Vinluan. 2023. "Reminders of Japanese American Redress Increase Asian American Support for Reparations." *Communications Psychology* 1(1). Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375481272_Reminders_of_Japanese_redress_increase_Asian_American_support_for_Black_reparations/references.

Luckerson, Victor. 2020. "What a Florida Reparations Case Can Teach Us About Justice in America." *Time,* September 10. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://time.com/5887247/reparations-america-rosewood-massacre.

Marketti, James. 1990. "Estimated Present Value of Income Diverted During Slavery." In *Wealth of Races*, edited by Richard F. America, 107–23. New York: Greenwood Press.

McDaniel, W. Caleb. 2019. *Sweet Taste of Liberty: A True Story of Slavery and Restitution in America.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Medicins San Frontieres. 2023. "Reparation (Compensation)." The Practical Guide to Humanitarian

Law. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://guide-humanitarian-law.org/content/article/3/reparation-compensation.

Merritt, Keri Leigh. 2016. "Land and the Roots of African-American Poverty." *Aeon*, March 11. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://aeon.co/ideas/land-and-the-roots-of-african-american-poverty.

Miriri, Duncan, and Aaron Ross. 2023. "King Charles' Regrets for Colonial Abuses in Kenya not Enough for Some Victims," Reuters, November 1. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.reuters.com/world/africa/king-charles-regrets-colonial-abuses-kenya-not-enough-some-victims-2023-11-01.

Mittal, Anuradha, and Joan Powell. 2000. "The Last Plantation." *Food First* 6(1): 1–8.

Mullen, A. Kirsten. 2022a. "America Needs a Better Reparations Plan." Bloomberg, May 20. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-05-20/america-needs-a-better-reparations-plan-a-kirsten-mullen#xj4y7vzkg.

———. 2022b. "The Queen Mother." *Vanity Fair*, November. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://archive.vanityfair.com/article/2022/11/the-queen-mother.

National African American Reparations Commission (NAARC). 2015. "Preliminary Reparations Program." NAARC, September 18. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://ibw21.org/docs/naarc/NAARC_Preliminary_Reparations_Program.pdf.

———. 2021. "National Town Hall Meeting: Building a Local Reparations Movement." YouTube video, 20:29:12. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lS-O5yiGhjA.

National Archives. 2017. "Japanese Claims Act of July 2, 1948 Case Files (Record Group 60)." Civil Liberties Act of 1988. Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.archives.gov/research/japanese-americans/redress.

National Congress of American Indians (NCAI). 2019. "Calling on Congress to Introduce and Support Reparation Legislation for the Treatment of American Indians and Alaska Natives." Resolutions Committee Recommendation Resolution no. REN-19–020. Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.ncai.org/attachments/Resolution_ueMXHKsnEbfLzaUzceyrsHJgTmxbkgQplyvkWHQBVciBejXlGMP_REN-19-020.pdf.

Neal, Larry. 1990. "A Calculation and Comparison of the Current Benefits of Slavery and an Analysis of Who Benefits." In *Wealth of Races*, edited by Richard F. America, 91–106. New York: Greenwood Press.

Newton, Monique, and Matthew D. Nelsen. 2024. "The Politics of Expedience: Evanston, Illinois, and the Fight for Reparations." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(3): 114–39. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.3.06.

Officer, Lawrence H., and Samuel H. Williamson. 2019. "Annual Wages in the United States Unskilled Labor and Manufacturing Workers, 1774–Present." *MeasuringWorth*. Accessed December 13, 2023. www.measuringworth.com/uswage.

Paine, Thomas. 1775. "African Slavery in America." *History Is a Weapon*. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/paineafricanslaveryinamerica.html.

Patiño, Victor Manuel. 2007. "Economic Reforms de Mediated del Siglo XIX." In *History of Material Culture in the Equinox Americas*, chap. 26. Bogotá: Biblioteca Luis Ángel Arango del Banco de la República. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20070626124522/http://www.lablaa.org/blaavirtual/historia/equinoccial_6_comercio/capitu26.htm.

PBS Learning Media for Teachers. 2023. "Segregation Ordinances: Birmingham, AL." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://pbsnc.pbslearningmedia.org/resource/iml04.soc.ush.civil.bhamseg/segregation-ordinances-birmingham-al/.

Perrone, Giuliana. 2024. "Rehearsals for Reparations." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(2): 132–50. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.2.06.

Pfau, Ann, Kathleen Lawlor, David Hochfelder, and Stacy Kinlock Sewell. 2024. "Using Urban Renewal Records to Advance Reparative Justice." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(2): 113–31. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.2.05.

Presidency of Uruguay. 2006. "Instrumentos Nacionales de Derechos Humanos." September 23. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20060923110540/http://www.presidencia.gub.uy/_Web/ddhh/ddhhuru.htm.

Republic of South Africa. 1995. Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34 of 1995. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.gov

.za/documents/promotion-national-unity-and-reconciliation-act.

Ransom, Roger L., and Richard Sutch. 1990. "Who Pays for Slavery?" In *Wealth of Races*, edited by Richard F. America, 31–54. New York: Greenwood Press.

Reneau, Olivia J. 2024. "Justice Delayed: An Analysis of Local Proposals for Black Reparations." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(3): 140–61. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.3.07.

Reparations, Responsibility & Victimhood in Transitional Societies (RRVTS). n.d. "Colombia." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://reparations.qub.ac.uk/countries/colombia/.

Rhodes, Jesse H., Tatishe M. Nteta, Lilliauna Hopkins, and Gregory Wall. 2024. "Why Reparations? Race and Public Opinion Toward Reparations." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(3): 30–48. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.3.02.

The Riverside Church. n.d. "The Black Manifesto at The Riverside Church." New York City. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.trcnyc.org/blackmanifesto.

Rothstein, Richard. 2017. *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. New York: Liveright Publishing.

Royall House and Slave Quarters. n.d. "Belinda Sutton and Her Petitions." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://royallhouse.org/slavery/belinda-sutton-and-her-petitions.

Satter, Beryl. 2010. *Family Properties: How the Struggle over Race and Real Estate Transformed Chicago and Urban America*. London: Picador.

Shanks, Trina R., Jin Huang, William Elliott III, Haotian Zheng, Margaret M. Clancy, and Michael Sherraden. 2024. "A Policy Platform to Deliver Black Reparations: Building on Evidence from Child Development Accounts." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 10(3): 92–111. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.3.05.

Spector, Robert Melvin. 1968. "The Quock Walker Cases (1781–1783): Slavery, Its Abolition, and Black Citizenship in Early Massachusetts." *Journal of Negro History* 53(1): 12–32. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://archive.org/details/sim_journal-of-african-american-history_1968_53_index.

Statista. 2023. "Poverty Rate in the United States in 2022, by Race and Ethnicity." Statista Research Department. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.statista.com/statistics/200476/us-poverty-rate-by-ethnic-group.

Swinton, David H. 1990. "Racial Inequality and Reparations." In *Wealth of Races*, edited by Richard F. America, 153–62. New York: Greenwood Press.

Tāíwò, Olúfémi. 2022. *Reconsidering Reparations* New York: Oxford University Press.

Tamir, Christine. 2022. "Key Findings About Black Immigrants in the U.S." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2022/01/27/key-findings-about-black-immigrants-in-the-u-s.

Taylor, Keenga-Yamhatta. 2019. *Race for Profit: How Banks and the Real Estate Industry Undermined Black Homeownership*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Taylor, Luke. 2023. "Colombia to Pay Reparations for Role in Extermination of Leftwing Party." *Guardian*, February 1. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://amp.theguardian.com/world/2023/feb/01/colombia-reparations-systemic-violence-leftwing-patriotic-union.

Tico Times. 2004. "Country Celebrates Abolition." August 20. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://ticotimes.net/2004/08/20/country-celebrates-abolition.

United States Institute of Peace (USIP). 1990. *Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace. Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.usip.org/publications/1990/05/truth-commission-chile-90.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. n.d. "CPI Inflation Calculator." [Inflation measured from $50,000 on January 2004, to $69,647 on January 2020]. https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

U.S. Census. 1975. *Bicentennial Edition: Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*. September 1975. https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/1975/compendia/hist_stats_colonial-1970/hist_stats_colonial-1970p1-start.pdf.

U.S. Congress. House of Representatives. 2023. *H. Res. 414: Recognizing that the United States has a moral and legal obligation to provide reparations for the enslavement of Africans and its lasting*

harm on the lives of millions of Black people in the United States. House Resolution, 118th Cong., 1st sess., May 17. https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-resolution/414/texthttps://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-resolution/414/text

U.S. Department of the Interior. 2007. "Marshall Islands Nuclear Testing Compensation: Statement of Thomas Bussanich, September 25." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.doi.gov/ocl/hearings/110/S1756_092507.

U.S. Department of State. 2009. "Terezin Declaration on Holocaust Era Assets and Related Issues." Office of the Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues. Accessed December 13, 2023. http://www.state.gov/prague-holocaust-era-assets-conference-terezin-declaration.

Valdez, Jorge Luis, and Gonzalo Villamonte. 2006. "El fenómeno caudillista." September 6. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20060906085337/http://www.educared.edu.pe/estudiantes/historia6/fenomeno2.htm.

Virginia Museum of History and Culture (VMHC). 2023. "The Closing of Prince Edward County's Schools." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://virginiahistory.org/learn/historical-book/chapter/closing-prince-edward-countys-schools.

Weltman-Cisneros, Talia. 2012. "Shared Pathways in History: Mexico's President Vicente Guerrero Abolishes Slavery in 1829." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57b74931b3db2be1cef4e3c8/t/588b99923a041194fc79dff2/1485543828075/shared+pathways+pres+vicente.pdf.

Wikipedia. 2022. "Five Civilized Tribes." Accessed December 13, 2023. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Five_Civilized_Tribes.

World Jewish Restitution Organization (WJRO). 2020. "The Role of the United States in Pursuing Compensation for Holocaust Victims and Heirs and the Historical Bases for U.S. Leadership." September 23. Accessed December 13, 2023. https://www.claimscon.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/2020.9.23-The-U.S.-Role-in-Holocaust-Compensation-.pdf.

Wrigley-Field, Elizabeth. 2024. "Stolen Lives: Redress for Slavery's and Jim Crow's Ongoing Theft of Lifespan." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Science*s 10(2): 88–112. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2024.10.2.04.