

Haiti invasion means disaster for Clinton

by Cynthia R. Rush

At the June 6-12 meeting of the Organization of American States (OAS) which took place in Belém, Brazil, member nations approved a joint resolution recommending a “total embargo” against the starving island-nation of Haiti, including the added ban on all commercial flights to Haiti to begin on June 25, and suspension of any bank money transfers to Haiti, announced by President Clinton. These newest sanctions, in particular the ban on money transfers, mean an end to the \$200-300 million a year which Haitians living abroad have sent to family members at home, keeping many Haitians alive—barely.

With these measures, the majority of Ibero-America’s “democracies,” many of them with their own problems of political instability, have thus capitulated in large measure to the pressure campaign coming from the United Nations and from elements in and around the Clinton administration who are demanding a “surgical” invasion of Haiti in the immediate period ahead. Pro-invasion factions in Washington, as well as several Ibero-American governments, have chosen to ignore the implications of the actions they are so casually contemplating.

The consequences for President Clinton, were he to endorse such a genocidal action, would be strategic disaster. Not only would he be discredited, but the U.S. presidency would be enslaved to the U.N.’s one-worldist colonial apparatus. Any “peacekeeping” force sent to Haiti would have to be deployed on a long-term basis, thereby destroying the principle of national sovereignty in Ibero-America.

National dignity is the issue

The history of Haiti gives some indication of how their government is liable to respond. Haitian historian Georges Michel has written, “In modern times, a sense of Haitian nationhood began as patriotic resistance during the 1915-1934 occupation.” Historian Roger Gaillard explained in a recent interview that “the fight against the occupation was a fight for Haitian dignity, a fight against injustice. Still, in many ways you can say that Haiti is still occupied. The U.S. Marines aren’t here, but they are still controlling us, keeping us hostage.”

According to several reports, in anticipation of an invasion, the Haitian military is said to be planning a “strategy of evaporation”—that is, disappearing into civilian clothing and carrying out guerrilla attacks rather than directly confronting

a U.S.-led invasion force. There is a precedent for such action in the guerrilla resistance to an American occupying force during 1918-20. The U.S. Marines finally wiped out the guerrilla movement, at the cost of thousands of civilian casualties, and stayed in the country until 1934.

On June 12, Haitian President Emile Jonassaint, citing the threat of foreign invasion, declared a state of emergency, and his government is now considering expelling the joint U.N. and OAS human rights observer mission. Sen. Osner Eugene charged that the mission “was destabilizing Haiti.” There are also reports that the government may impose a curfew, restrict movements in the provinces, expel foreigners who are believed working against Haitian interests, and possibly close down foreign embassies.

Voices of opposition

Although most Ibero-American nations are still resistant to participating in the first wave of a military invasion, many governments have agreed to commit troops to a multinational peacekeeping force in Haiti, under the mandate of the United States. That U.N. mission would serve as a police force as well as protect elected officials, embassies, and humanitarian supply personnel.

However, some recognize what such action means. In El Salvador, which experienced U.N. “democracy” when its government was forced to drastically “downsize” its defense forces and share power with the Marxist Farabundo Martí guerrillas, the editors of the newspaper *El Diario de Hoy* wrote: “A military attack on Haiti, like the embargo currently ongoing, seems designed to send a message to all of Ibero-America more than anything else. The support for [ousted dictator Jean-Bertrand] Aristide is a kind of unwritten support for the extremist movements of the continent to not fear taking power: Washington will back them, come what may, even if it leads to the ruin of the people who have the misfortune of suffering them.”

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Santo Domingo, Cardinal Jesús López Rodríguez, who is also president of the Latin American Bishops Conference, has repeatedly attacked the U.S./United Nations embargo against Haiti. On June 13, he characterized it as “cruel and unjust” and said that it was subjecting an innocent population to “cruel, inhuman, dishonest and immoral” treatment. He demanded the immediate departure of U.S. military personnel who have been sent in to “help” the Dominican Republic, with which Haiti shares the island of Hispaniola, “monitor the border” and enforce the embargo against Haitians. The Balaguer government’s agreement to send its own troops, and accept these foreign “advisers” was the result of blackmail by the U.S. State Department which threatened to embargo that country’s exports to the U.S. if the government didn’t acquiesce to its demands.

Tragically, Dominican troops deployed to the border with Haiti have already shot to death a Haitian attempting to smuggle a few gallons of gasoline into his country.