



PROPOSAL FOR EXPLORATION — IBIS — AN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE TO FACILITATE THE DELIVERY OF REPARATORY JUSTICE

1 message

ic3csi Crime Scene Investigators <thereparationnation@gmail.com>

10 September 2026 at 11:23

To: Wilberforce Mailbox <wilberforce@hull.ac.uk>

Cc: s.t.green@hull.ac.uk, university-secretary@hull.ac.uk, reparation.research@uwimona.edu.jm, vcoffice@uwimona.edu.jm, commissioners.enquiry@churchofengland.org, legacies@theguardian.com, contactus@heirsofslavery.org, info@caribbeanreparations.org, Dr Hilary Brown <hilary.brown@caricom.org>, registry@caricom.org, "CecilGutzmore@yahoo.com" <CecilGutzmore@yahoo.com>, "secretarygacuk@aol.com" <secretarygacuk@aol.com>

SUBJECT: PROPOSAL FOR EXPLORATION — IBIS — AN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE TO FACILITATE THE DELIVERY OF REPARATORY JUSTICE

Dear Wilberforce Institute, University of Hull, Participating Institutions and Recipients,

Further to my circulation of the **Formal Advance Notice, Institutional Questionnaire and International Reference Document** concerning **Part 2: Reckoning and Repair**, I wish to place a separate constructive proposal before the Wilberforce Institute and University of Hull and, openly, before all of the other institutions copied into this correspondence.

I am **Derrick Lynch, also known as John Canoe**, writing for and on behalf of **Reparation Nation Limited**.

The extensive reference document already circulated examines the institutional architecture necessary to move from discussion of reparations towards the practical, evidential, accountable and measurable delivery of reparatory justice.

It deliberately asks questions such as:

Who decides?

Under what authority?

Who represents whom?

Who identifies beneficiaries?

Who controls resources?

What evidence establishes entitlement?

What safeguards exist against anti-Black racism?

What safeguards exist against institutional racism?

Who independently scrutinises the process?

How are financial and other resources traced?

How is actual repair measured?

What happens when a reparations process fails?

And who determines whether an identified reparative obligation has actually been discharged?

These questions lead me to place a further constructive proposition before you:

Should we begin exploring the establishment of a permanent international institution specifically designed to provide infrastructure for facilitating the delivery of reparatory justice?

For present working purposes, I refer to the proposed institution as:

IBIS

IBIS is presently a proposition for investigation.

Its precise legal form, governance, membership, functions, funding, international relationships, location and institutional architecture are **not predetermined**.

Those matters should be researched, questioned, tested and designed properly.

IBIS — FROM REPARATIONS DISCUSSION TO REPARATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE

Reparations are already being discussed and pursued through numerous:

governments;

regional organisations;

reparations commissions;

universities;

churches;

financial institutions;

media organisations;

descendant organisations;

community organisations;

research centres;

historical investigations;

funds;

conferences;

campaigns;

and institutional programmes.

The question I am raising is whether something is presently missing between these activities:

a durable international institutional infrastructure capable of facilitating cooperation between them and assisting the practical delivery of reparatory justice.

IBIS could potentially help provide that infrastructure.

Its purpose would not necessarily be to replace existing organisations.

It could instead provide mechanisms through which otherwise separate institutions, governments, communities and reparations structures can cooperate.

THE BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS — A USEFUL STRUCTURAL ANALOGY

One useful structural analogy is the **Bank for International Settlements (BIS)**.

This analogy should not be misunderstood.

I am **not** suggesting that reparatory justice is equivalent to central banking.

I am **not** suggesting that IBIS should simply reproduce the BIS.

I am pointing to an institutional principle.

The BIS demonstrates that otherwise separate national institutions can cooperate through durable international infrastructure without requiring the international institution simply to replace the national institutions participating within it.

The question is therefore:

Could reparatory justice benefit from its own international institutional infrastructure operating according to an appropriately designed model?

IBIS could facilitate cooperation without becoming a world reparations government.

BRITAIN MUST LEAD — THE PUBLISHED FOUNDATION FOR THE PROPOSAL

The proposition behind IBIS does **not** arise for the first time in this correspondence.

It develops work already placed into the public domain through my published book:

Derrick Lynch and John Canoe

BRITAIN MUST LEAD: RACE CODES, REPARATORY JUSTICE, AND THE GLOBAL DUTY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

ISBN: 9798264714726

Published: 10 September 2025

The book is available through multiple mainstream booksellers and bibliographic channels and can therefore be independently located by recipients using its title, authors or ISBN.

For example:

[Google Books — Britain Must Lead](#)

[Foyles — Britain Must Lead](#)

[Amazon UK — Britain Must Lead](#)

The published proposition is, in substance, that the United Kingdom possesses an unusually developed existing infrastructure concerning race and ethnicity and is therefore well placed to help initiate the next stage of international reparatory-justice infrastructure.

The proposition is **not** that the British system is perfect.

It is **not** that the British system represents a final international model.

It is **not** that British classifications should simply be imposed upon other countries.

It is **not** that Britain should control international reparatory justice.

The proposition is more practical:

Britain presently possesses a sufficiently developed legal, administrative, statistical and institutional race-and-ethnicity infrastructure to provide a serious starting point for international research, testing, adaptation and development.

In that sense:

BRITAIN MUST LEAD DOES NOT MEAN BRITAIN MUST CONTROL.

Leadership can mean initiating, providing infrastructure, convening expertise, making existing work available for scrutiny, and then participating with other countries and institutions in developing something genuinely international.

The present IBIS proposal is therefore an attempt to move an already published proposition towards:

INSTITUTIONAL EXAMINATION

↓

FEASIBILITY RESEARCH

↓

INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION



INSTITUTIONAL DESIGN



TESTING



AND, IF JUSTIFIED BY THE EVIDENCE, IMPLEMENTATION

AN OPERATIONAL SYSTEM ALREADY EXISTS

There is another important reason why I believe this proposition is now suitable for serious institutional examination.

The work has already progressed beyond theory.

An operational **Racial Security platform and Identity Engine** has been developed.

It can be explored directly:

[Racial Security — Live Operational Website and Identity Engine](#)

The Identity Engine develops an operational identity framework from the underlying British race-and-ethnicity infrastructure.

I am therefore not asking recipients simply to imagine what such technological infrastructure might look like.

There is already something available to inspect.

I AM NOT ASKING YOU TO ENDORSE THE EXISTING SYSTEM

This distinction is important.

I am **not** asking the Wilberforce Institute, University of Hull or any other recipient to endorse the existing Racial Security system or Identity Engine.

I am asking you to **examine it**.

Explore it.

Test it.

Question it.

Identify weaknesses.

Identify strengths.

Challenge its assumptions.

Examine its methodology.

Consider its governance implications.

Consider privacy and data protection.

Consider representation.

Consider identity and verification.

Consider international compatibility.

Consider what should be retained.

Consider what should be changed.

Consider what should be rejected.

And consider whether any elements of the existing work could contribute to the development of a substantially more sophisticated international infrastructure for facilitating reparatory justice.

A POSSIBLE ROLE FOR THE WILBERFORCE INSTITUTE AND UNIVERSITY OF HULL

I therefore place a specific question before the **Wilberforce Institute and University of Hull**:

Would the Wilberforce Institute and University of Hull consider helping to convene an exploratory project examining the feasibility, institutional architecture and possible establishment of IBIS?

I am not asking the Wilberforce Institute to assume ownership of IBIS.

I am not asking the University of Hull to endorse a predetermined model.

I am not asking either institution to accept the propositions contained within *Britain Must Lead* without examination.

I am asking whether the Wilberforce Institute's research expertise, institutional position and convening capacity could potentially assist in bringing together the people and institutions necessary to examine this proposition seriously.

The forthcoming **Part 2: Reckoning and Repair** event makes this particularly relevant.

My previously circulated document describes the event as a starting point rather than the limit of the wider inquiry.

It also moves deliberately beyond the general question of whether reparations are supported and asks about the actual architecture of implementation: governance, authority, representation, resources, safeguards, scrutiny and measurable repair.

IBIS is offered as one possible response for investigation.

OPEN INVITATION TO ALL RECIPIENTS

I deliberately make this proposal **in front of all institutions copied into this correspondence**.

If IBIS is worth developing, I do not believe that one individual or one institution should privately construct the entire international architecture and subsequently present everybody else with a completed model.

There should be an opportunity for relevant institutions to participate in examining the proposition from the beginning.

Accordingly, **every recipient of this email is expressly invited to indicate whether their institution might be interested in participating in an exploratory IBIS project.**

Participation at this stage would **not** constitute:

endorsement of IBIS;

endorsement of *Britain Must Lead*;

endorsement of the Racial Security system;

endorsement of the Identity Engine;

acceptance of any particular definition of reparations;

acceptance of any proposed governance structure;

or commitment to participate in any eventual institution.

It would mean only that the institution considers the proposition sufficiently important to examine.

POSSIBLE PARTICIPATION BY THE INSTITUTIONS PRESENTLY COPIED

I therefore respectfully ask:

The Wilberforce Institute / University of Hull — would you consider helping to convene or participate in an exploratory IBIS feasibility and institutional-design project?

The Centre for Reparation Research / University of the West Indies — would you consider contributing your reparations research and institutional expertise?

The CARICOM Reparations Commission and CARICOM Secretariat — would you consider examining the proposition from the perspective of existing Caribbean regional reparations architecture, Member States, representation and international cooperation?

The Church Commissioners for England / Project Spire — would you consider contributing experience arising from institutional historical investigation, governance and reparative programmes?

The Scott Trust / Guardian Legacies of Enslavement Programme — would you consider contributing experience concerning institutional historical investigation, public evidence, restorative/reparative work and accountability?

Heirs of Slavery — would you consider contributing experience concerning descendant responsibility, historical inheritance, engagement and reparative action?

I also invite every recipient to identify other organisations or individuals whom they believe should participate.

These might include:

African governments and regional institutions;

Caribbean governments;

other governments;

international organisations;

reparations commissions;

economists;

international lawyers;

constitutional specialists;

financial institutions;

technologists;

data-governance specialists;

historians;

researchers;

universities;

descendant organisations;

and, critically, representatives of the people and communities whom reparatory justice is intended to benefit.

QUESTIONS FOR AN INITIAL IBIS FEASIBILITY PROJECT

The first stage need not attempt to create IBIS.

It could simply determine whether IBIS **should be created at all**.

Among the questions for examination could be:

1. Is there a demonstrable need for permanent international institutional infrastructure specifically concerned with facilitating reparatory justice?

2. What problem would IBIS solve that existing organisations cannot adequately solve individually?

3. What functions should IBIS perform?

4. What functions should IBIS expressly not perform?

5. What existing international institutions provide useful structural lessons?

6. What can be learned from the Bank for International Settlements and other international institutional models without simply copying them?

7. Who should participate in designing IBIS?

8. What should membership eventually look like?
9. How should affected populations and descendant communities participate?
10. How should representative mandates be established and verified?
11. How should financial resources and reparative assets be governed, transferred, traced and audited?
12. What safeguards would be required against conflicts of interest, institutional capture, anti-Black racism and institutional racism?
13. What should independent scrutiny look like?
14. How should IBIS interact with governments, CARICOM, African institutions, universities, churches, financial institutions, descendant organisations, community organisations and existing reparations bodies?
15. What legal and governance architecture would be appropriate?
16. What technological infrastructure would be required?
17. Which aspects of Britain's existing race-and-ethnicity infrastructure are genuinely useful as an international starting point?
18. Which aspects are not transferable and should not be exported?
19. What can be learned from the operational Racial Security Identity Engine?
20. What changes would be necessary before any such technology could appropriately contribute to international reparatory-justice infrastructure?
21. How should privacy, security, identity, eligibility, verification and data governance be protected?
22. How would IBIS distinguish expenditure on administration from actual delivery of reparatory value?
23. How would IBIS measure whether reparatory interventions actually repaired identified harm?
24. How would communities themselves participate in evaluating whether repair had occurred?
25. What remedies and accountability mechanisms would exist if IBIS itself failed?

And fundamentally:

26. IS IBIS FEASIBLE AND SHOULD IT BE BUILT?

The answer must be allowed to be **no**.

A genuine feasibility process must remain capable of concluding that IBIS is unnecessary, that another model would be superior, or that substantial changes to the proposition are required.

FROM RECKONING AND REPAIR TO DELIVERY

The forthcoming discussion is entitled:

RECKONING AND REPAIR.

That raises what I consider to be the central institutional question:

WHAT INFRASTRUCTURE IS REQUIRED TO TURN RECKONING INTO ACTUAL REPAIR?

The international reparations discussion has already produced extensive historical research, scholarship, advocacy, institutional acknowledgement, commissions, conferences and proposals.

IBIS asks whether another layer is now required:

DELIVERY INFRASTRUCTURE.

That is the proposition I am placing before you.

IMPORTANT CLARIFICATION

For the avoidance of doubt, **Reparation Nation Limited** makes **no allegations, no accusations, no assertions, no assumptions and no conclusions** concerning any recipient of this correspondence.

Nor does this correspondence assert that IBIS is necessarily the correct solution.

The proposition should be tested.

Britain Must Lead should be examined and challenged.

The British starting framework should be tested.

The existing Identity Engine should be tested.

The technology should be tested.

The governance should be tested.

The economics should be tested.

The legal architecture should be tested.

The representation should be tested.

The safeguards should be tested.

And the evidence that any eventual system actually facilitates repair must itself be capable of independent examination.

Most importantly, the people whom reparatory justice is intended to benefit should not become spectators to the construction of an institution supposedly created to facilitate repair on their behalf.

REQUEST

I therefore place this proposal openly before all recipients:

COULD WE COLLECTIVELY EXAMINE WHETHER IBIS SHOULD BE BUILT?

At this stage, I request only:

- 1. acknowledgement of receipt;**
- 2. an indication of whether your organisation would be interested in participating in an initial exploratory or feasibility process; and**
- 3. identification of any other institutions or specialists whom you believe should be invited into that process.**

There is no requirement at this stage to endorse IBIS or agree upon its eventual form.

The first task is simply to determine whether the proposition merits serious collaborative investigation.

Yours faithfully,

Derrick Lynch, also known as John Canoe
For and on behalf of Reparation Nation Limited
Company No. 14761041

Email: thereparationnation@gmail.com

Telephone: 07874 338 512

Operational Racial Security / Identity Engine:
[Racial Security — Live Website and Identity Engine](#)

Published foundation:
Derrick Lynch and John Canoe
Britain Must Lead: Race Codes, Reparatory Justice, and the Global Duty of the United Kingdom
ISBN: 9798264714726
Published: 10 September 2025

[Google Books — Britain Must Lead](#)

[Foyles — Britain Must Lead](#)

[Amazon UK — Britain Must Lead](#)