

Will Britain's Genocide Policy For Haiti Finally Be Defeated?

by Gretchen Small

April 3—It was both right, and of some political significance, that the representative of Her Majesty's British government was denied a spot to speak at the March 31 "International Donors Conference Towards a New Future for Haiti," held in New York City, under United Nations auspices, and led by Haitian President René Préval, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and former U.S. President Bill Clinton.

It was *right*, because Haiti today is teetering at the edge of national extinction, as a direct consequence of decades of British liberal economic policies of globalization, which left the desperately poor nation totally vulnerable to catastrophes such as the Jan. 12 earthquake that leveled the capital, Port-au-Prince; and because the British and their U.S. agents, such as the impeachable President Barack Obama, have adamantly refused to take the needed measures to immediately move 1 million homeless Haitians to higher ground, before the Spring rainy season produces another human holocaust.

That the British were left literally speechless at the Donors Conference was politically significant, because it was indicative of the fact that the most outrageous features of British policy—i.e., don't do anything of significance to try to stop further mass deaths in Haiti; and put the entire nation under receivership to globalization, through NGOs run by proponents of depopulation and drug-running, such as George Soros and Bill Gates—were in fact rejected by the international conference. This victory, albeit partial, was evidenced by the commitment made there by most of the world's nations, first, to help Haiti build a *better* future for its people than they faced before the earthquake; and second, that the Haitian government—not the NGOs—must be given the lead in that reconstruction, and provided the resources to do so.

The signal was sounded, most pointedly, by Bill

Clinton, that Haiti now has allies in its fight to regain its sovereignty from the squabbling "Republic of the NGOs," which currently rules much of the nation.

Time Is Running Out

While most world governments sent high-level officials to New York City to participate in the Haiti conference, the British government didn't bother even to appear interested. London sent its deputy ambassador to the UN to represent it, and refused to pledge any new funds for Haiti.

The rest of the international community (governments, NGOs, private sector, et al.) pledged at the conference to give Haiti \$5.3 billion over the next 18 months, more than the \$4 billion that the Haitian government had identified as the minimum required to reach "critical mass" for survival. Another \$4 billion or so was pledged for years after that.

Many such pledges are never made good. And the immediate critical fight remains undecided: whether the Haitian government will be assisted in carrying out the *physical-economic* measures required to secure Haiti's survival, starting with the immediate relocation of hundreds of thousands of Haitians into safe and sanitary housing on high ground.

The rains have begun, as they do every year at this time, and the number of suspected malaria cases is already reported to be on the rise amongst the upwards of a million malnourished people living largely at the mercy of the elements in the earthquake zone. The conditions are abominable: Most have nothing more than plastic sheeting or tents for protection; most have no access to latrines; even greater numbers are without mosquito nets; and they are now wading in raw sewage after each rain.


Such conditions will cause mass death, if not changed, and everyone knows it.



UN/Eskinder Debebe



UN/Paulo Filgueiras



UN/Paulo Filgueiras

UN Special Envoy for Haiti Bill Clinton (center), Secretary of State Hillary Clinton (left), and Haitian President René Préval (right), issued impassioned calls, at the UN Donors Conference, for saving Haiti, where over 1 million people's lives are now endangered. The Brits weren't invited.

In an impassioned presentation to NGOs and donors operating in Haiti on March 24, Bill Clinton warned that 20-40,000 people could die, if they are not moved to higher ground. “We gotta get those people out of there *now*,” he implored. “If they die, our concern about the services we were going to provide them two weeks from now, won’t sound very good. . . . I am *pleading* with you, if you can do anything about this now.”

Clinton, if anything, is understating the number of people in imminent danger.

Four days later, Haitian Ambassador Raymond Joseph sounded an even graver alarm: “There is a race against the clock to find tents and to house” at least 500,000 people in Port-au-Prince, “away from areas that will be flooded. That’s the big issue for us right now,” he told an audience at Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church in Nashville, Tenn.

A Plan on the Table

In mid-February, Lyndon LaRouche called upon the Obama Administration to offer the Haitian government the logistical capability of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to carry out precisely such an urgent relocation in the centralized fashion required to save the lives of those million-plus people. A few days later, LaRouche PAC learned that senior U.S. political

figures had presented just such a proposal to the White House on their own. The proposal was rejected out of hand.

Instead, despite the foreseeable second humanitarian catastrophe of mass death through disease, the U.S. military capabilities deployed to Haiti for the relief effort were ordered to begin their pullout.

LaRouche asked then: How many Haitians must die before we impeach President Obama?

In our March 12 issue, *EIR* released a plan for how “to move people out of danger, in mass numbers, into secure, healthful temporary accommodations in transition camps, conducted in tandem with initiating CCC-type [FDR’s Civilian Conservation Corps] programs desperately needed in the nation—flood control, reforestation, upgraded farming, infrastructure-building of all kinds—that, at the same time, are geared for a new landscape of modern towns, cities, and economic activity. This way, saving the lives of masses among the 1.3 million internally displaced people in the quake zone, and the 600,000 who have fled to various other departments, is the same job as rebuilding the nation.”

That issue of *EIR* included Marcia Merry Baker’s article, “Move to Safe Ground; Build the Nation of Haiti,” the centerpiece of the broader feature entitled

“How Many Haitians Must Die Before We Impeach Obama?” It circulated widely within U.S. institutions and the U.S. and Haitian governments, quickly becoming famous within the Haitian-American diaspora. As several Haitians noted, it makes clear that *saving and rebuilding Haiti is eminently feasible*; it is matter of mobilizing the political will to do so.

Now the rainy season is here, and as former President Clinton warned in his speech at New York University’s Rosenthal Pavillion, mass death could strike at any time. “Nobody knows what the weather is going to do. Maybe we’ll catch a huge break. But every day we leave people in a low camp at risk of flooding, when we don’t have to, is a day we put their lives at risk.”

After the rains, come hurricanes. Clinton noted that the chief U.S. Army engineer in Haiti has said that encampments that typically get high winds, but won’t flood out, are still at risk from hurricanes. “A 40-mile-an-hour wind could blow down a lot of those places there,” said the former President. He said he is trying to get at least one big hurricane-resistant building to be erected in each of the camps.

As of this writing, however, the policy of the UN, international aid agencies, and the Obama Administration, continues to be that relocation to new facilities is only to be carried out for the least number of people possible, and only as a last resort.

That is a policy for people to die.

The Fight Before Us

The UN Donors Conference opens the possibility of breaking the British grip over U.S. and international policy. The Clintons, who have adopted Haiti as a personal concern, played a prominent role in the conference, with Hillary Clinton opening and closing the conference, and UN Special Envoy Bill Clinton, chairing one of the panels.

Haitian President Préval and Prime Minister Jean-Max Bellerive presented the outlines of the government’s two-phase reconstruction plan, which focuses on building up new regional development centers, where “large economic infrastructure, that include industrial parks, and large collective facilities such as national referral hospitals and state universities, will need to be set up or consolidated.” Haiti was once self-sufficient in food, and it can be so again; watershed management, electricity generation, education, health—and job creation, are outlined. The State “must create hope

and affirm its legitimacy as leader of the process of rebuilding of the country. The response must be massive and immediate,” the plan declares.

As Ambassador Joseph had pointedly noted in his above-mentioned Tennessee interview, NGOs “can’t build the roads, cannot provide the energy, cannot build the major water purification system, cannot build the airports, either.”

To force the issue of giving aid *to the government*, which most of the speakers at the conference agreed to, at least verbally, the day before the conference, the government announced that an “Interim Haitian Reconstruction Commission” will be established to oversee the next 18 months of rebuilding, which will be co-chaired by Bill Clinton and Bellerive.

President Clinton insisted, again, at the March 31 Donors Conference, that the Haitian government must take the lead. The Commission’s 20-plus members, however, are to include representatives of international donors, NGOs, etc., as well as the government, while the aid pledged to Haiti is to be channeled through a new Trust Fund, with the Malthusian-dominated World Bank, as its “fiscal agent.”

Secretary of State Clinton noted, in her opening speech, that whether Haiti achieves a better future than it had before the earthquake, is a test of the international community, as much as of the Haitian people.

“Why is Haiti’s fate of such consequence to the region and the world that it deserves sustained help?” she asked. “As fellow human beings,” she continued, “we respond from a position of conscience and morality to help those who, but for the grace of God, we could be.”

President Préval spoke of how Haitians “have paid in blood for the price of the fight for human dignity,” losing 300,000 people, and 120% of its GDP. He called rebuilding Haiti a project of humanity, before accumulation of wealth, and urged investment be made in infrastructure, especially education, since 38% of Haitians over 15 are illiterate.

True to form, the London *Economist* sneered at the calls dominating the donors conference for using the crisis as the opportunity to found “a new Haiti,” writing in its April 1 report on the donors meeting, that “history suggests expectations may need to be tempered.”

Haiti, like the rest of the world, will have a viable future only when such bestial British policy is silenced, permanently.