

Will a U.S. invasion of Haiti resurrect slavery?

by Valerie Rush

The United Nations Security Council vote on July 31 authorizing “the use of all necessary means” to topple Haiti’s embattled military leadership and restore mad priest Jean-Bertrand Aristide to that country’s presidency, has given the Clinton administration a green light for invasion. The U.N. vote represents the first time that a foreign invasion of any country in the Americas has been internationally sanctioned.

Thus, in one stroke, the concept of a supranational authority has taken the place of the once-inviolable precept of national sovereignty. In that same stroke, the original 1823 Monroe Doctrine—which premised U.S. relations with the rest of the hemisphere upon a “community of interests” centered explicitly around respect for national sovereignty and rejection of imperialist adventures—was buried, perhaps forever.

The Clinton administration’s suicidal drift toward invading the tiny starving island-nation is not a policy of its own making. Rather, it is being shaped and driven by political forces and individuals from the George Bush crowd, who are as much interested in enmiring President Clinton in the quicksand of a no-win Haiti invasion, as they are in using the Haiti crisis to usher in Bush’s imperial “new world order.” And, as we shall see, the underpinnings of that “new world order” is *chattel slavery*.

‘Reconciling’ slavery

In March 1994, the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College published a study outlining a course of action on Haiti, which the Clinton administration subsequently began to adopt as policy, under pressure from Hollywood and the Congressional Black Caucus, beginning in late April. That study, entitled “Reconciling the Irreconcilable: The Troubled Outlook for U.S. Policy Toward Haiti” and

concocted by Bush-linked specialists, explicitly claims that Haitians were better off as a slave colony of France than at any other time in their history, and suggests that the restoration of Jean-Bertrand Aristide by the U.S. military be the start of a decades-long “wholesale cultural revolution” under foreign occupation.

The authors of the Haiti study write: “Under French rule, Saint-Domingue [Haiti’s colonial name] had been perhaps the most profitable colony in the western world, setting international production records for both sugar and coffee.” But, since 90% of the Haitian population were slaves under the French, the authors complain that “the revolution which brought independence also destroyed the country’s profitable agricultural base”—because independence brought an end to slavery in Haiti!

Advising the Army War College study was the U.S. State Department’s Luigi Einaudi, known as “Kissinger’s Kissinger” for Ibero-America since the days of the Gerald Ford administration. Einaudi was not only an architect of Bush’s Haitian policy as U.S. ambassador to the Organization of American States, but is also one of the key forces behind the plan to dismantle the armed forces of Ibero-America, a plan known throughout the hemisphere as “the Bush Manual.” Another leading collaborator in the Bush Manual project, “democracy advocate” Gabriel Marcella, is one of the co-authors of the War College’s Haiti study.

Before concluding that the study’s advocacy of slavery is actually only a poorly phrased argument—a quirk perhaps—let the reader take note that the promotion of colonialism and slavery is now making a comeback in one-worldist circles. Consider, for example, the fact that in 1993, the Nobel Committee gave its economics prize to U.S. “shock therapy” economist Robert Fogel of Milton Friedman’s Chicago

School of Economics. Along with Stanley L. Engermann of the University of Rochester, Fogel co-authored *Time on the Cross* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985), a study which explicitly argues that slavery is the most efficient form of agriculture. According to one reviewer, Fogel and Engermann insist that *every* aspect of slave farming was “favorable and superior” to free farming (see *EIR*, Jan. 3, 1994 for a full treatment of Fogel and Engermann’s thesis).

On July 14, the British news agency Reuters claimed that Haiti has been “the miserable, repressive, impoverished land of despots it has been since . . . slaves overthrew their French masters and established the world’s first black-ruled nation.” And on Aug. 1, Anglophile Argentine journalist Jorge Castro argued in *El Cronista* for an immediate invasion of Haiti, claiming that the U.N. could then get on with the “reconstruction of the Haitian state.” What kind of “reconstruction”? Castro explains: “The task of constructing states is no historical novelty. In the 19th century, it was assiduously practiced under the name of colonialism.” He adds, “there is no more successful model for constructing a nation” than Britain’s colonial rule over India.

These blatant arguments for recolonizing especially darker-skinned peoples, are revealed as lies by anyone willing to study a little history. In the case of Haiti, that country distinguished itself by carrying out the world’s first successful slave rebellion, which led in 1804 to the establishment of the second republic in the Western Hemisphere (after the United States), with the enthusiastic support and assistance of U.S. founding father Alexander Hamilton. In 1804, Napoleon demanded—and got—a worldwide economic embargo imposed against the black nation-state in retaliation for getting kicked out of his own colony. President Thomas Jefferson fully backed France’s (unsuccessful) drive for the recolonization and reenslavement of Haiti. It was decades upon decades of brutal economic warfare that reduced Haiti to what it is today.

Laundering Aristide

The Army War College study not only argues for the reenslavement of Haiti, but elaborates a step-by-step guide on how to accomplish this. First, it insists that Aristide must be reinstated as the means for launching a long-term, foreign-run “cultural revolution” in Haiti. The study acknowledges that Jean-Bertrand Aristide is “high-strung and susceptible to debilitating nervous crises,” but justifies Aristide’s calls (as President) for mob violence and “necklacing”—burning people to death with a flaming, gasoline-filled tire around their necks—as “rhetorical excesses” resulting from “traumatic and highly provocative conditions.” The study’s authors especially praise Aristide for his “moderation and flexibility” in dealing with the Bush regime and with “international lending agencies.”

The study argues that only a refugee crisis would make Haiti a priority for the Clinton administration, and that only an end to forced repatriation could guarantee such a refugee

crisis. One month after the study was released, Randall Robinson’s Trans-Africa organization began its publicity and hunger-strike campaign to pressure Clinton into ending forced repatriation of refugees—an admittedly despicable policy—while simultaneously beginning the drumbeat for invasion. Seamy Hollywood circles around producer John Demme (“Silence of the Lambs”), who finances Trans-Africa, as well as certain Black Caucus members in the U.S. Congress, joined in the act.

Defending sovereignty

Even as the countdown toward invasion begins, the U.N. Security Council resolution appears to have stiffened the backbones of not a few Ibero-American countries which have proven all too susceptible in the past to the myth about “restoring democracy in Haiti.” In the days prior to the U.N. vote, a number of steps were taken to organize some kind of resistance to this unprecedented offensive against national sovereignty. The newly formed 32-nation Latin American and Caribbean Group met in the Caribbean and strongly denounced any invasion plans, arguing instead for use of diplomacy. The Latin American Parliament, an organization of congressional representatives from all the nations of Ibero-America, proposed that both Aristide and Haitian military leader Gen. Raoul Cédras step down to facilitate an easing of tensions and a negotiated solution to the crisis.

Brazil, one of the Security Council’s 14 members, chose to abstain on the resolution vote; a spokeswoman explained afterwards that “everybody [from Ibero-America] was against it. Above and beyond our own reasons for abstaining, this was one of the facets of our vote.” She added that Brazil’s opposition was based on the charters of the Organization of American States *and* of the United Nations itself, which call for non-intervention in the affairs of other states. Brazilian President Itamar Franco added on Aug. 3 that “the methods approved in the Security Council resolution would [neither] contribute to the restoration of democracy nor relieve the prolonged suffering of the Haitian people. . . . The defense of democracy will not be helped by using coercive measures with unforeseeable consequences.”

Mexico’s Foreign Ministry “deplored” the U.N. Security Council vote, its ambassador to the United Nations Victor Flores Olea calling it “an extremely dangerous precedent in the field of international relations—in other words, a kind of *carte blanche* for a multinational force to act indefinitely when it deems it to be appropriate.” Peru charged that “the use of force would heighten the suffering of the Haitian people” and would be “incompatible with the juridical traditions of the hemisphere of respect for non-intervention in the internal affairs of its states.”

Venezuelan Foreign Minister Miguel Angel Burelli has called upon Colombia, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and Mexico to join his country in sending a delegation to Haiti to mediate a negotiated solution to the crisis. At last report, General Cédras has agreed to meet with them.