

cine war has not abated, and it is clear that there will be no change in the U.S. policy of genocide against Haiti under Bush. In fact, no one but U.S. Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche (see box) is talking about the urgent need to resolve the desperate economic situation in the country, considered one of the four or five poorest in the world, as the most direct means of resolving Haiti's political crisis.

Haiti is a country in which 90% of the population is illiterate; the majority have no electricity or potable water, and a vast number are infected with AIDS. And while the United Nations called for establishing an emergency fund of \$35 million, to provide food and other necessities for six months, it turns out that this amount, divided among Haiti's 8 million, amounts to a ludicrous \$4.37 per Haitian, or less than 73¢ a month per person! Haitians are being told that they cannot escape the concentration camp into which their country has been turned by centuries of isolation and an unending series

of brutal dictatorships imposed or supported by the United States, including the infamous "Papa Doc" Duvalier and Aristide himself. On Feb. 25, President Bush reiterated that the United States would repatriate any Haitian who attempted to seek refuge on U.S. shores.

In fact, U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld gave the show away just days earlier, when he declared at a March 1 Defense Department briefing that Haiti "demonstrates the need for greater international capacity to conduct global peace operations." This is precisely the argument he used in November 2002 at the Defense Ministerial of the Americas, where he said that since terrorists and drug runners were threatening to take over "unoccupied areas of countries" such as Colombia, Haiti, and Brazil, it was necessary to deploy multilateral military forces to "re-establish sovereignty." The question is, *whose* sovereignty does Rumsfeld seek to re-establish on the Ibero-American continent?

LaRouche on Haiti

Excerpts from an interview with U.S. Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, by WRPI radio in Troy, New York on March 10, 2004.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, what's your take on the situation in Haiti? The recent coup d'état and President Aristide?

LaRouche: . . . The United States has a relationship with Haiti, going back to our struggle for independence. Haiti has been essentially destroyed many times over. I mean, the country is destroyed, even compared to the adjoining region of the island. We have done the worst with that area: It's not a problem with Aristide, or this guy, or that guy. The problem is, the United States has never accepted, in recent times, its moral responsibility to help the Haitians put their country back together again. That is our responsibility. We keep blaming them.

The way we treat the Haitians who are fleeing from that territory into Florida—it's horrible! It's wrong! We have to take a positive moral attitude on this thing, and we have to work with the nations of the region, to say—and tell the Haitians—"We are determined that you should have your independence, and you shall have development, and you shall have medical care, and the ability to live." That's our job.

We do it not only for the Haitians, we do it for ourselves. We do it, because we want to be the kind of country that does that kind of thing: Where a great injustice exists, we are the kind of country that will offer to help.

Q: Do you believe that, as President Aristide claims, the United States, directly or indirectly, assisted in kidnapping him from Haiti?

LaRouche: Well, I think that, certainly, U.S. policy created a situation in which that happened. As to what actual agencies were involved, I don't know. But, I am certain, from reading and following these events, that the United States is the principal perpetrator of the most recent mess! It started, probably, under the Clinton Administration, the mishandling of this Haitian problem under Clinton, and it's being mishandled in a much more extreme and worse way, under George Bush. . . .

Remember, Haiti established itself as a Republic, which at one point was modeling itself on the idea of the United States. So, this got it special hatred. . . . Of course, the problems that are occurring in other parts of the Caribbean are not much better; but they're not quite as bad, either. And the Haitian thing, is the thing that really sticks in my craw: This is the *worst* example of a *rotten policy* from the United States. There are other policies that are bad, but this is the absolute worst.

In my view, you always go to the worst case, to set a policy. In your own country, you look at the poorest layer of our population, and say, "Will this policy work for their children and grandchildren?" And if it works for the poorest ones, justly, then it'll probably work for everyone—as Franklin Roosevelt defined that: Always go to the "forgotten man." Take the person who's the greatest victim, of injustice or neglect, and start there; and prove that you are really for the general welfare of people, by showing that you're willing to face that problem. Look it in the eye, and talk about curing it.