

LETTING SILENCES SPEAK:
DECONSTRUCTING THE DISCOURSE OF REBUILDING
IN POST-EARTHQUAKE HAITI

By
Catalin Hartwig

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of International Relations and European Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Michael Merlingen

Word Count:
17,213

Budapest, Hungary
2010

ABSTRACT

On January 12, 2010, a devastating earthquake hit Haiti, a small island in the Caribbean, causing the death of approximately 300,000 people. Although the international community responded with immediate emergency relief, international disaster assistance has been criticized for failing to meet the demand of the victims, as well as militarizing the situation, reflected in the deployment of US and UN military. In other words, post-earthquake relief in Haiti has been framed in terms of humanitarian benevolence and development needs however, practices on the ground associated with an extensive securitization of the situation as well as an ‘intervention’, due to long-term engagement envisioning radical reforms. Therefore, it has to be asked how these practices, suggesting the political and economic subjugation of Haiti, are legitimized. What is the underlying rationale that informs these instances? This thesis analyzes the construction of the dominant discourse in Haiti to reveal the production of power relations. Using the Foucauldian concept of governmentality as my theoretical framework, I will unravel the inclusionary/exclusionary mechanisms forming and structuring discourse in post-earthquake Haiti to understand the implementation of these programs. Paying particular attention to silences, I argue that rationalities of the so-called ‘international community’ go beyond humanitarian and development concerns but are informed by security and economic considerations. The adoption of a neoliberal rationale to the disaster in Haiti causes practices which support the notion of political control and economic exploitation, and reproduce global structures of inequality.

CONTENT

Letting Silences Speak:	i
Deconstructing the Discourse of Rebuilding in Post-earthquake Haiti	i
Introduction	1
Chapter 1:	6
Setting the Context- Approaches to Disaster Relief	6
Chapter 2:	10
Understanding the Production of Global Power Structures	10
2.1 The Concept of Governmentality	10
2.1 The Advantages of Governmentality Theory for Analyzing Haiti	14
Chapter 3:	15
Linking Power to Discourse – The Methodology.....	15
Chapter 4:	18
Deconstructing the Dominant Discourse in Haiti	18
4.1 Acting in the Name of Benevolence - Justifying Involvement?	19
4.2 Securitizing the Situation- Extending Dominance and Control?	28
4.3 Reforming the Economic System – Implementing Neoliberal Policies?	37
Chapter 5:	46
Transforming Rationalities into Practices	46
5.1 The International Donors’ Conference Towards a Future for Haiti.....	46
5.2 The Two Main Policy Documents Deciding on Haiti’s Future	49
Conclusion	54
Reference List	56

INTRODUCTION

On January 12, 2010, a devastating earthquake hit Haiti, a small island in the Caribbean, known for its poverty, authoritarian leaders, drug smuggling and underage prostitution. Within minutes the earthquake destroyed the capital Port-au-Prince as well as surrounding areas and caused the death of approximately 300,000 people, according to the Haitian national authorities. It has been estimated that 1.5 million people have been affected by this natural disaster, leaving them injured, homeless, hungry and in despair (Action Plan, 2010, p.7).

The international community responded with immediate emergency relief in form of medical support, food and shelter provision, as well as extensive financial assistance including the debt cancellation of the World Bank. In the aftermath of the earthquake humanitarian relief has been extended to longer term programs dealing with the recovery and reconstruction of the island (Schneider, February 4, 2010). As Haiti is known for its turbulent history and considered to be a 'failed' or 'fragile' state, the international community regards the catastrophe as creating opportunities to 'build back better' or 'build Haiti anew' (Rodham Clinton, March 31, 2010; Ban, January, 2010). Therefore, the situation is framed as a chance to trigger profound social change by introducing democratic and economic reforms.

Even though the international community reacted promptly to the catastrophe and is committed rebuilding the island, international disaster assistance has been criticized primarily on two grounds. First, medical care, the establishment of camps and shelter as well as the distribution of food failed to meet demand, and coordination difficulties left many victims without help (Oxfam, 2010a). Second, the deployment of US and UN military forces to restore peace and order was conceived as a foreign intervention by locals and organizations providing emergency relief (Schofield, January 19, 2010; Thompson & Cave, January 16, 2010). In this way, the 'international community', the US and UN being most visible, has

been accused of ‘securitizing’ or ‘militarizing’ their operations by primarily sending troops (Medicine Sans Frontière, January 19, 2010). The large presence of international actors, in contrast to the invisibility of the Haitian government in the rebuilding process (Chong, 2010), leaves the Haitian population doubting the adopted rhetoric of international solidarity and development reforms. This skepticism is intensified by past experiences of US involvements and UN interventions which were regarded as attempts to control and subjugate the population according to their needs.

Prevailing discourses have either explained disaster relief in terms of humanitarianism based on global moral ethics (Donini, 2008) or with regard to the need of development, arguing for democratic reforms and economic growth in order to reduce vulnerabilities (Escobar, 1995; Crush, 1995). However, recent studies of disaster assistance have increasingly argued for more complex objectives in post-disaster reconstruction. Duffield (2007), for instance, has pointed to an increasing securitization that goes hand in hand with development, based on the logic that security is the prerequisite for successful economic and democratic reforms. Based on the evaluation of the 2006 Tsunami disaster response as well as the publication of Klein’s “The Shock Doctrine” (2007), disaster capitalism argues that natural or man-made disasters have an instrumental use for implementing neoliberal policies. These are associated with privatization, foreign direct investment, market liberalization, and fiscal discipline as well as down-sizing of the government in terms of social spending (Klein, 2007; Gunewardena & Schuller, 2008). According to the evaluation of neoliberal policies, it is claimed that disaster assistance rather benefits the corporate sector than affected communities (Gunewardena, 2008, p. 4).

Reflecting dominant discourses to disaster assistance, post-earthquake relief in Haiti has also been framed in terms of humanitarian benevolence and development needs. However, practices on the ground are associated with an extensive securitization and

militarization of the situation as well as an ‘intervention’, due to long-term engagement that envisions radical reforms.

Therefore, it has to be asked how these practices, suggesting the political and economic subjugation of Haiti, are legitimized. What is the underlying rationale that informs these instances? As these practices differ from humanitarian and development narratives, I will analyze the construction of the dominant discourse in order to reveal the production of power relations in Haiti. In particular, I will unravel the inclusionary/exclusionary mechanisms forming and structuring the discourse in post-earthquake Haiti to understand the implementation of these programs. Deconstructing the discourse formation in Haiti and paying particular attention to silences, I argue that the rationalities of the so-called ‘international community’ go beyond humanitarian and development concerns but are informed by security and economic considerations.

Employing an approach to discourse analysis that draws attention to blind spots serves to highlight rationalities that allow me to explain the structural aspects of the discourse formation the reproduction of dominance. A hybrid approach that considers texts and agents contributes to gaining a more complex understanding of the production of power structures in post-earthquake Haiti.

Considering that power does not only manifest itself in the material world but is constructed in discourses (Schuller, 2008, p. 19), theoretical frameworks developed by the philosopher Michel Foucault are of value to my analysis. In particular, the concept of governmentality proves to be useful for analyzing the exercise of power through the construction of narratives that legitimize rationales. According to Foucault, modern liberal states have adopted a governmental rationality or governmentality which aims at regulating and controlling a population, in order to improve the population’s productivity (Gordon, 1991). He developed the concept of ‘biopower’ which relates to “the numerous and diverse

techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations” (Foucault, 1994, p. 262). This biopower is legitimized through the creation of ‘truth’ discourses on behalf of competent authorities, which relate to the ‘vital’ character of human beings (Rabinow & Rose, 2006, p. 197; Miller & Rose, 1992, p. 173). As discourses are formed by rules of inclusion/exclusion, determined by the rationalities of participants, they reproduce power structures (Foucault, 1972, p.40).

Foucault’s ideas have been further developed by many scholars in the context of international relations (Dean, 2009; Dillon & Reid, 2001; Hardt & Negri, 2000; Lemke, 2003, Merlingen, 2006) who argue that in our contemporary world, neoliberalism has become the underlying rationality shaping every discourse (Lemke, 2001, p. 201), expanding now from national to supranational levels (Rabinow & Rose, 2006, p. 204). As argued by Deleuze (1992) and others, the increasing deregulation of the economic system need to be complemented by mechanisms of social control, causing the creation of “societies of control” (p.4).

The concept of governmentality for studying the process of reconstruction in Haiti has several advantages. On the one hand, employing the concept of governmentality allows me to analyze the production of power by understanding power as a complex relation interlinked with knowledge and the control of the discourse. On the other hand, using the concept of governmentality contributes to interpret my findings with regard to the concept of global governmentality, which highlights an increasing global power is reflected in increasing instances of control as well as neoliberal policies. Moreover, it also serves as framework to study new modalities of power, namely network governance. In short, the concept of governmentality in the early Foucauldian sense can be used as an instrument to highlight rationalities and technologies (Rose & Miller, 1992), but also to evaluate theories of global

neoliberal governance (Dean, 2009; Dillon & Reid, 2001; Hardt & Negri, 2000; Lemke, 2003, Merlingen, 2006)

Studying the production of power relations after the earthquake is justified by supporting Foucault's argument that social research should focus on studying 'events' as they break the causal relations of sets of practices, hence analyzing "the connections, encounters supports, blockages, play of forces, strategies and so on which at a given moment establish what subsequently counts as being self-evident, universal and necessary" (Foucault, 1991, p. 76). Similarly, De Waal has argued that studying disasters highlights invisible power relations which are manifested in a society. Following the strategy of 'examining the exceptional to better understand the normal' (Stallings, 2002, p.283), I contribute to the understanding of the production of power relations in post-earthquake Haiti, which has not been sufficiently assessed yet due to its actuality.

However, this thesis is concerned with the construction of the dominant narrative in rebuilding Haiti at present, while neglecting challenging discourses. Even though alternative discourses are important sources to highlight mechanisms of inclusion/exclusion (Milliken, 1998, p. 14), my analysis is concerned with the structure of the dominant discourse. Pointing to issues rendered invisible allows for a deconstruction and thus, critical analysis of the production of global power structures.

My thesis is organized according to the following structure. The first chapter presents the contemporary approaches to disaster assistance. To explain the theoretical underpinnings of my analysis, the second chapter introduces the concept of governmentality. The third chapter outlines my method of inquiry which is then applied to analyze the discourse in Haiti, in the forth chapter. The last chapter presents the practical implications of the discourse formation. In the concluding part, I summarize my findings.

CHAPTER 1:

SETTING THE CONTEXT- APPROACHES TO DISASTER RELIEF

In our contemporary world, characterized by intensification of global capital exchanges and interactions, disasters cannot be understood as secluded events happening at remote places anymore (Gunewardena, 2008, p.3). Due to processes of global integration, catastrophes and human suffering have received increasing global media coverage and thus, attention by the public.

Drawing on ideas of ‘one mankind’ and universal morality, disaster relief or assistance has primarily been explained in terms of humanitarian and moral obligations, derived from historical traditions which emphasized universal compassion and benevolence. With regard to disaster relief, it has been argued that vulnerable people have to be protected and assisted in situations of threat or harm. In situations of disasters, activities focus on life-saving, search- and- rescue operations, the distribution and provision of basic needs, and the protection of human dignity. Providers of disaster relief have repeatedly emphasized their altruistic principles in reducing human suffering.

Besides humanitarianism, the ‘development’ discourse has received increasing public attention since the beginning of decolonialization (Escobar, 1995). Within this framework, disaster assistance is explained as a means to reduce vulnerabilities and mitigate the impact on affected communities. The development paradigm is based on the idea of human progress and argues that only economic development and democracy can generate the ultimate goal of human liberty. Policies in this perspective are mainly associated with poverty reduction, democracy promotion and economic development (Doty, 1996, p. 129). According to this view, most countries in the global South are considered to be ‘underdeveloped’, a condition that can only be improved by the assistance of developed countries. As Pelling & Dill (2006)

suggest, disasters can be conceptualized as being the result of failed development but at the same time failed development is exacerbating the impact of natural catastrophes.

Even though humanitarianism and developmentalism are the dominant discourses in which disaster responses are framed (Donini, 2008, p. 34), recent theories explaining disaster assistance have challenged these approaches. On the one hand, studies such as Donini (2008), have highlighted notions of neo-imperialism and neo-colonialism as both discourses primarily spread Western ideas of morality and development which might not have universal value.

On the other hand, critics have argued that these discourses are not simply based on benevolence and goodwill (DeWaal, 2008, p. xiv) but are informed by additional rationales. Duffield (2007), for instance, has argued that the logic of development is increasingly connected to security concerns, causing the adopting of technologies of control and regulation. According to him, the development discourse has recently served to promote security interests. This is based on the rationale that in our increasingly interconnected world national problems also affect the international arena (Doty, 1996, p. 128). Regarding security as the prerequisite for global and human development, this approach posits that economic growth and democratic development can only flourish in stable circumstances. In this context, the concept of ‘failed’ or ‘fragile’ states applies to states that do not show the characteristics of a liberal capitalist economy and democratic process (Duffield, 2007, p. 2). As a consequence, to implement policies linked to development, all possible threats or challenges to these principles need to be eliminated. This logic leads to the conclusion that security and stability are the most important factors for improving human development, leading to practices of increased control (Duffield, 2007).

At the same time, Klein (2007) and Gunewardena and Schuller (2008) have argued that dominant discourses serve as a cover to implement neoliberal economic technologies.

Klein (2007) claims that disasters have been used, or rather abused, by the US and its allied UN institutions, the IMF and World Bank, to introduce neoliberal policies. As natural and man-made disasters cause a state of shock among societies, policies of neoliberal capitalism can be easily introduced without resistance. Neoliberalism, as understood by Klein, is an ideology founded on the idea that unregulated economic liberalism is the best mechanism for social progress. Policies adopted by the so-called Washington Consensus envision the privatization of public services, economic liberalization, foreign direct investment, and fiscal discipline as well as the downsizing of the government with regard to social spending (Stiglitz, 2006, p.17). Due to the adverse impact of neoliberal policies in low-income and instable countries, Klein claims, these policies can only be implemented when a society is in a state of shock. Consequently, an alliance of corporate and political elites attempts to spread their ideology of neoliberalism or radical market capitalism by choosing shock therapy to realize their goals.

Klein's rather radical claim of "disaster capitalism" has also inspired Gunewardena and Schuller's book (2008) that discusses the recent employment of neoliberal strategies in disaster reconstruction. According to them, businesses, often working hand in hand with governments, are playing an increasingly influential role in disaster recovery as profits can be made (De Waal, 2008, p.xi). Not only companies but also NGOs have started to compete for funding and donations coming from private donors or increasingly from governments and international institutions. Analysing post-disaster reconstruction in the 2006 Tsunami, Hurricane Katrina, and other man-made disasters, Gunewardena and Schuller (2008) highlight recurring patterns of a neoliberal rationality, including the emphasis on rebuilding a strong tourist sector (2008, part 2), focus on foreign investment, or the reliance on the private sector for disaster relief and security (part 4).

Whereas Klein warns against the implementation of the “shock doctrine” in post-disaster situations (Klein, 2007), Schuller stresses the danger of the “disaster *after* the disaster” (2008, p. 18). As multinational firms, NGOs, and international institutions serving mostly the will of the US, view catastrophes as “windows of opportunity” (Schuller, 2008, p. 22) that bring profit and reputation, the victims are no longer the principal beneficiaries of the reconstruction process (Gunewardena, 2008, p. 4).

As reflected in the media, in Haiti, the so-called international community explains its involvement in post-disaster reconstruction by pointing to humanitarian obligations and the need for development. As these discourses have received wide public acceptance and enjoy positive connotations, various providers of disaster relief justify their actions within these narratives. However, as practices of extensive securitization and militarization show - besides emergency relief - instances of power exercise can be observed in Haiti. The adoption of military means to provide humanitarian disaster assistance seems rather paradoxical, as these practices suggest rationalities of regulation and control that inform the response by the international community. Besides instances of securitization, international institutions as well as the US have announced the interest in rebuilding the country. While providing emergency assistance in the direct aftermath of the disaster, they have also developed long-term recovery strategies (Obama, January 15, 2010), which aim to reform the political and economic system of the country.

With regard to the theories of security and control (Duffield, 2007) and disaster capitalism (2008), it needs to be asked whether these practices reflect rationalities of control and regulation as well as neoliberalism. As it can be assumed that the Haitian population does not welcome the ‘intervention’ of the international community, especially with regard to past experiences, the construction and legitimization of power by the international community must be analyzed. Therefore, this thesis outlines the construction of a discourse which

legitimizes both, the long-term involvement of the international community and practices of control and domination. The approaches to security and neoliberalism, which challenge the dominant discourse of benevolence, are used as frameworks guiding my analysis.

However, before dismantling the discourse formation in Haiti, several theoretical underpinnings have to be unpacked to understand the complex construction of power relations.

CHAPTER 2:

UNDERSTANDING THE PRODUCTION OF GLOBAL POWER STRUCTURES

Considering that power does not need to materialize but is constructed in discourses (Schuller, 2008, p. 19), the precise linkages between discourse and power has to be outlined. Therefore, the first section of this chapter presents Foucault's theories on power and knowledge and outlines his concept of governmentality, serving as suitable theoretical framework to examine global power structures. The second section discusses the advantages of this framework with regard to Haiti.

2.1 The Concept of Governmentality

Discourses are fields in which different perspectives or rationalities of the world are presented, each of them struggling to become dominant. Discourses are therefore "open and indefinite describable field of relationships" (Foucault, 2001, p. 54) that construct our understanding of social reality. In his understanding, power is not concentrated in the state but is imminent in every social relation, produced in various centers or through a multitude of networks (Foucault, 2004, in Jessop, 2007, p. 37). As discourses operate by rules of inclusion and exclusion (Foucault, 1972, p.40), participants having the ability to influence discourses, structure our social relations in the world. In other words, power is a practice that produces structural relations through the creation of 'truth' (Jessop, 2001, p.40, 152).

According to Foucault's analyses, modern liberal states have adopted a mentality or governmental rationality which aims at administrating or regulating their society (Ferguson & Gupta, 2002, p. 989). Hence, Foucault developed the concept of governmentality or 'art of government' which refers to the techniques and practices employed by a government in order to achieve the subjugation of the population (Foucault, 1991, Ch. 4, p.92). According to Foucault, 'biopower' is the power which is exercised over the life and death of a population (in Rabinow & Rose, 2006, p. 196). This power is exercised by adopting various techniques and strategies, ranging from disciplinary methods to programs that bring individuals to govern themselves (Merlingen, 2006, p.184), which is legitimized through the formation of discourse that construct these as valid or 'truth'. The exercise of power is therefore the ability to construct a 'truth' or generate knowledge which legitimizes the implementation of various technologies (Gordon, 1991).

Deleuze (1992), for instance, takes this concept of governmentality and argues that our disciplinary society has shifted to a society of control, needed to adapt to the increasing deregulation of the economic system. This shift is visible due to the fact technologies of discipline are now complemented with technologies of the self which bring individuals to work on themselves (Rabinow & Rose, 2006, p. 203), reflected in new mechanisms of surveillance and self control.

Not only have Foucault's ideas have been embraced by scholars of different disciplines, because they permit analysis of current developments in modern liberal states (Rose & Miller, 1992; Mitchell, 1991), his approach has increasingly been used to explain power relations in the international, in particular by referring to the concept of 'global governmentality' (Lemke, 2007; Kiersey, 2009). This idea is related to the increasing development of international institutions, such as the United Nations (UN), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank (WB), as well as the increasing influence of non-

state actors in the political sphere, such as for instance NGOs and business corporations (Rabinow & Rose, 2006, p. 204).

Most prominently, Hardt & Negri (2000) applied Foucault's concept of governmentality which takes the form of 'biopower' to argue that we live in a postmodern Empire governed by a global 'network power'. Biopolitics, they argue, the politics of controlling the population through various means, become the founding blocks of our world order. They stress the notion of Empire, constituted by liberal governments, international institutions, NGOs and the corporate sector, which build an alliance to conquer the world by implementing their ideology of liberalism.

The term 'global governmentality' has also informed other studies that pointed to changes in the mentalities and rationalities of modern governance. Whereas Fraser (1989) uses the term 'global governmentality' to explain the notion of a global government which is visible through the growing creation of international law and institutions, Dean (1999) rejects the idea of the 'hollowing out of government' and therefore, directly links governmentality to power of governments to control a society. Dillon and Reid (2001), in comparison, understand global governmentality as a form of biopolitical securitization of the population which governs without government. Kiersey (2008) understands the concept of governmentality as global governmental rationality, which he equates with the spread of the neoliberal ideology. Despite some conceptual differences, all mentioned Foucauldian IR scholars argue that liberal discourses, moving from a national to an international sphere, can be dismantled as instances of global regulatory power under the framework of neoliberalism (Chandler, 2009, p. 247).

Recent studies employing a Foucauldian approach to power have tried to explain the new technologies of governance in our contemporary world. Some scholars have highlighted shifts in public discourses which justified the implementation of neoliberal policies (Rose &

Miller, 1992; Lemke, 2007), as for instance, Bartelson argues that the term global civil society is primarily a rhetorical function or construction in order to legitimize the idea of a global regulatory government (Bartelson, 2006). Others discussed new practices by governments to exercise their power, as for instance the alliance with NGOs (Sending & Neumann, 2006) and other practices of a re-scaling, such as the shifting of processes to sub-national and supra-national spaces (Brenner, 1999) reflect global processes.

Even though the concept of global governmentality has served as a theoretical framework for a large number of studies, Selby (2007) has stressed that Foucault's concept of governmentality cannot simply be scaled up to the international. As Foucault's theories have been derived from the domestic context of modern liberal societies, Selby claims that his concepts cannot be used to explain the global dynamics due the specificities of the international world order (Selby, 2007, p. 338). Similarly, De Larrinaga, & Doucet (2008) argue that sovereign power remains a source of power in the international because of still existing military might, although this becomes increasingly interlinked with biopolitical power exercise. Chandler (2009) points to the fact that relying on Foucault's concept of governmentality or biopower fails to deconstruct contemporary liberal discourses and reproduces it as "ahistorical abstraction" (p.247). Not only has the idea of global governmentality been criticized for being unsuitable to explain international processes, critics also stressed that the concept of governmentality might explain 'how' power is constituted but it fails to address the question 'why' it is structured in a certain way (Selby, 2007; Jessop, 2006, p.170). However, as argued by Jessop (2006) and Selby (2007), Marxist theories can serve as complementary accounts to explain the exercise of power structuring social relations (2007, p. 35).

While endorsing the criticism related to the limited use of the concept in terms of explaining why power is structured in a certain way, I value the twofold use of the concept of

governmentality. While it is an instrument for highlighting governmental rationalities and political technologies legitimized in dominant discourses, as proposed by Rose & Miller (1992), it also serves as a framework for critically analyzing global power structures linked to notions of neoliberalism. These two functions allow me to research the production of power structures in the post-disaster Haiti, as it enables to deconstruct the structure of the dominant discourse in Haiti, highlight the linkage between rationalities and technologies, as well as link it to claims about a neoliberal global rationality.

2.1 The Advantages of Governmentality Theory for Analyzing Haiti

With regard to Haiti, using the Foucauldian concept of governmentality has several advantages. Merlingen (2006) notes, it first offers a useful toolbox for studying rationalities which legitimize the adoption of certain technologies or policies (p.187) by using a discourse analytic approach. However, as governmentality is also concerned with the study of political technologies, it enables a more technical oriented analysis. In the case of Haiti this means that not only the construction of dominant discourses is dismantled, but also emphasis is put on adopted policy documents. The complementary approach of studying rationalities and technologies contributes to understanding the complex reproduction of power relations in Haiti.

Second, the Foucauldian understanding of power which moves beyond state-centric approaches enables me to explore new modalities of governance in the form of network governance (Merlingen, 2006, p. 185). In Haiti, this aspect is particularly important, given that multiple actors are involved in the rebuilding process. These include not only governmental actors, but NGOs, international institutions and private persons. As power expands national borders as well as the state apparatus, a Foucauldian approach to power is very suitable here.

Finally, the concept of global governmentality, reflecting the argument that a neoliberal rationale governs our world, enables me to explore neoliberal rationalities and technologies. These neoliberal notions are reflected in instances such as the logic to rely on market-based solutions for problems and proposing policies of privatization, market liberalization, and foreign investment. However, as the concept of global governmentality is also linked to notions of control and discipline (Merlingen, 2006, p.191), needed to balance the increasing deregulation of the economic system

Governmentality, thus serves as a framework for deconstructing the dominant discourses and for assessing production of power structures in Haiti. In order to provide a coherent and useful analysis, the next chapter introduces my method of inquiry.

CHAPTER 3:

LINKING POWER TO DISCOURSE – THE METHODOLOGY

Extending Foucault's ideas of the interrelation of discourse and power, as established in the previous chapter, Fairclough (1992), and Wodak and Van Dijk (2003) have developed an approach of critical discourse analysis (CDA) which enables the study of global power structures by deconstructing the formation of discourses. It differs to Foucauldian analysis in that it is textually- and linguistically-oriented, and understands language as an instrument to create social reality (Fairclough, 1992, p. 38). As explained by Fairclough (1992), discourses are social practices of language use which can construct identities, structure social relations and produce knowledge or beliefs (p. 64).

As CDA pays particular attention to the mechanisms that generate and reproduce structures of dominance (Titschner *et al.*, 2003, p.145), Gramsci's concept of hegemony proves useful. Hegemony as the power over a society in terms of its political, economic, cultural and ideological domination can therefore be applied to study the dynamics of

discourses (Fairclough, 1992, p. 92). Actors seek to enact or maintain their hegemony by building alliances with other actors and by shaping the discourse which reproduces their dominant perspective or ideology of the world.

Adopting this method for the study of power production in the field of politics, Rose & Miller (1992) argue that discursive fields reflect certain political rationalities which seek for their conceptualization and moral justification in society. Dominant discourses are hence more likely to be translated into political policies and programs (Rose & Miller, 1992, p. 175; Merlingen, 2006, p. 183). Highlighting not only rationalities but also related political technologies enables the study of technical details in policy papers and contributes to the practical production of power.

Translating this idea into a research strategy means that we should draw attention to the hegemonic rationalities that determine the range of policy options. Highlighting the underlying logic of policies contributes to understanding and explaining the persistence and reproduction of power relations in Haiti. Consequently, as discourses legitimize the adoption of certain policies (Fairclough in Titschner *et al.*, 2003, p. 148), language or concepts are often used strategically to produce dominance.

Drawing on the work of Derrida, who argues that discourses have to be studied as mechanisms producing difference, while one element in the binary opposition is privileged (in Milliken, 1998, p. 4), I draw attention to the production of differences in framing the situation of Haiti. Moreover, strategic uses of language in discourses, for instance the repetition of key concepts or the silencing of certain issues, can also reproduce hegemony (Van Dijk, 1998, p.46). As political actors prefer to restrict information, so-called “manipulative silences” Huckin (2002), in order to avoid confrontation or rejection (Chilton & Schäffner, 2003, p.32), I highlight issues rendered invisible in Haiti’s rebuilding discourse. However, Milliken (1998) argues that beyond the text, key participants in the discourse need

also be studied (p. 12) because agents participating in any given discourse have a significant influence in shaping dominant narratives.

Consequently, while embracing the CDA approach of studying the language of texts in order to explain social structures, I argue that additional focus should be put on the agents and their subject position. Only by adopting a hybrid approach to the study of discourses which is structure and agent-oriented, can a comprehensive explanation of the reproduction of power structures can be given. Extending Fairclough's three-dimensional analytical framework (1992, p.73), I first assess the textual and agent level, then put the discursive practice into the historical and social context, as well as finally, interpreting the specific discourse formation as a social practice by stressing its hegemonic underpinnings (Fairclough, 1992, ch.3).

Statements on the formation of a discourse cannot be made by analyzing one text or key documents only but must be based on a range of texts by various authors (Milliken, 1998, p.7); thus I consider official documents and speeches by key participants in disaster relief, including government officials, representatives of international institutions as well as international NGOs. In addition, I study a variety of news articles on the disaster, as public discourse is significantly shaped by the media (Milliken, 1998, p.11). As argued above, not only does the exploration of different 'genre' contribute to understand the inclusionary and exclusionary effects in forming the discourse, but positions and relations between actors need also be included. The two most important policy documents, namely the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment and the Action Plan for National Recovery will then show the translation of dominant narratives into political programs. Analysis of these papers is particularly important as they highlight the practical and technical aspects of power and confirm the study of rationalities. Nevertheless, it needs to be pointed out that due to the actuality of the topic,

further research is necessary to fully evaluate the implications of the discourse as formed at present.

Consequently, the next chapter deconstructs the narratives in Haiti's reconstruction discourse by pointing to dominant elements of formation and unraveling the structural aspects of the hegemonic discourse. As discussed by in the first chapter, disaster recovery is primarily framed within the realms of humanitarianism and development (Donini, 2008; De Waal, 2008), highlighting the moral responsibility and solidarity of the actors. However, with regard to Haiti a deconstruction of these discourses show that rationalities linked to security and neoliberalism have determined the discourse and therefore caused the adoption of technologies associated with political control and economic exploitation.

CHAPTER 4:

DECONSTRUCTING THE DOMINANT DISCOURSE IN HAITI

First, I dismantle the discourse formed around humanitarianism and development which sets the parameters for actions. Rationalities related to security are outlined in section two which is evaluated against rationalities of security, in the second section, and neoliberalism, in the third section. The fifth chapter highlights the translation of the dominant narratives into practical programs and policies, paying specific attention to rules of exclusion. Analyzing the construction of the hegemonic discourse then allows me to explain the reproduction of power relations between Haiti and other actors in the rebuilding process. Drawing on the concept of governmentality, as outlined in the second chapter, I pay particular attention to rationalities and technologies of actors, network governance and the relationship between actors. Moreover, the claim of a neoliberal ideology informing the contemporary dominant discourse that manifest itself in narratives that highlight neoliberal economic solutions to problems as well as new technologies of governance and control is evaluated. In order to fully understand

the response of the international community, blind spots and silences in the discourse need to be presented as these outline their rationalities. This approach allows me to show the intersection of strategic security interests, neoliberal rationalities and ideological considerations as well as neocolonial underpinnings. These are reflected in the adoption of specific technologies which structure power relations in post-earthquake Haiti.

4.1 Acting in the Name of Benevolence - Justifying Involvement?

As we have learned from Derrida, discourses reproduce power structures through the creation of difference, one side having positive, and the other negative connotations. With regard to Haiti, the majority of documents or articles referring to the situation start by framing the country in its superlatives and/or oppositions (Schuller, 2008b, p. 211). On the one hand, reference is made to its glorious past as being the first independent colonial state, in 1804 which liberated itself from slavery and foreign domination, and then compared to its difficult contemporary history. As Bill Clinton puts it, “Unfortunately, ever since the first slave revolt by Haitians in 1791, the country has been beset by abuses caused from within and without. It has never been able to fulfill its potential as a nation” (Clinton, 2010, p. 76). Blurring the possible contribution of foreign influence in Haiti’s turbulent history, Nancy Gibbs, the editor of the TIME magazine, compares the recent disaster with the islands ‘disastrous’ past, “Haiti has been a slow-motion disaster for decades, during which billions of dollars in well-intentioned aid vanished with hardly a trace of lasting progress” (Gibbs, 2010, p. 18). Referring to Haiti’s revolution highlights the potential of the country, while addressing recent political challenges adds to the notion of its inability to help itself or to be responsible for itself.

On the other hand, Haiti is not only compared within its own past but also to other countries by framing the country as the ‘poorest country in the Western/Northern hemisphere’ (Weisbrot & Sandoval, 2007, p. 2; Schuller, 2009, p.143, Schuller, 2007a, p.4;

Gros, 2000, p.221; Schneider, 4 Feb 2010; IMF, 22 Jan 2010). The island's recent past has also caused the popular framing of Haiti as a 'fragile' or 'failed' state (Schuller, 2008b, Clinton, Mar 2010; USAid Haiti, 2007). Comparing Haiti's situation to other states in the Western/Northern hemisphere supposes a close relationship between the Western countries and the idea to help the country to become one of the other countries of the global West/North. In other words, Haiti is framed as the lost brother who has to return to the family of liberal democratic states. The senior vice president of the International Crisis Group, Mark L.Schneider, stresses that it is "an obligation for every nation of this hemisphere and beyond", to "[help] neighbors" in the process of recovery from this natural disaster (Schneider, February 4, 2010). As he underlines the close relationship between countries which belong to one hemisphere, he concludes that these countries are neighbors.

This framing highlights the creation of contrasts by favoring one side in the binary opposition, here clearly the other Northern/Western countries. Referring to the same hemisphere in which Haiti and the other countries are located, sets them into an unequal relationship which produces structures and thus, power.

Adopting the rhetoric of 'failed state' has twofold significance as it firstly implies the continuing importance of sovereign states and thus understands the state as a 'container' (Taylor, 2002), as well as secondly stating that Haiti is unable to manage things itself (Milliken, 1998, p. 6). Framing Haiti in these terms shifts the responsibility for its 'failure' on to the country and hides possible adverse influences by outside factors which may have contributed to Haiti's difficult situation. Moreover, using the word 'fragile' sets Haiti in contrast to the stable, strong states which are able to oversee their own affairs and even have the responsibility to engage in the politics of other states (Milliken, 1998, p. 6). As underlined by Bill Clinton "I've always thought that given the right organization and support, Haiti could become a self-sustaining and very successful country" (Clinton, 2010, p. 76).

Portraying Haiti as the failed, fragile state puts it into the position of being in need of help from a strong, stable state, in other words, a parent which takes care of its child.

The metaphor of a parent-child relationship has also been addressed by Doty (1996), who has analyzed persisting colonial representations between the North and the South. According to the analysis, US foreign policy is still shaped by former colonial encounters which have conceptualized people of colonies as immature, uncivilized, irrational and underdeveloped, who need the guidance of developed, civilized, rational and mature countries as the US (Doty, 1996, p. 134). This oppositional relationship has been complemented with the analogy of passion and reason, which still characterizes representations of Haitians. This underlying notion becomes apparent when Haiti is represented as the exotic ‘Other’ by emphasizing its Creole cultural influences or its voodoo religion. Bill Clinton describes Haiti as “completely unique” because of its “distinctive mix of West African religious and cultural influences” reflected in the “persistence of the voodoo faith, which is practiced alongside Christianity” (Clinton, 2010, p. 76).

According to Bankoff, describing Haiti in terms of its topicality or exoticness are clear remnants from former colonial encounters, in which colonial powers described the ‘Other’ in terms of their mysteriousness (Bankoff, 2001, p. 21). Appreciating the cultural differences however, conceals the colonial history of slavery that caused West African cultural influences in places like Haiti (Gelder, 2000, p. 90). Past encounters characterized by the enslavement of the whole population are not critically reflected but implicitly supported.

Emphasis on difference is also apparent in a confidential document by the US Marines Corps Intelligence Activity, which has estimated future threats from 2005-2015. Haiti, being one of the concerned countries, is described as “Caribbean country with West African problems” because its “Measurements of poverty, youth population, and life expectancy all rank Haiti with most of Africa, in the lowest quarter of countries; this is true

for no other Latin American/Caribbean country” (Marines Corps Intelligence Activity, 2005, p. A-10). Comparing Haiti to the “lost” African continent diverts attention from the structural causes for its ‘underdevelopment’, and indirectly uses its cultural heritage as an explanation.

This notion of supernatural power dominating the island is additionally strengthened by describing Haiti’s past as a “curse”, in words of the French President Sarkozy (Willard, January 14, 2010). He also refers to a “terrible fate” which has “plagued” the country for so long (Sarkozy, January 22, 2010). Sarkozy’s words directly reflect the statement made by the influential US politician and preacher Pat Robertson, who described Haiti’s history in terms of “(they) swore a pact to the devil. (...) But ever since, they have been *cursed* by one thing after the other. Desperately poor.” (Pat Robertson, January 13, 2010, emphasis added). Whereas Robertson received heavy criticism for this statement, similar words by Sarkozy were accepted by the public and media.

Representing Haiti in these terms implies the incapacity of Haitians to improve their situation themselves, while the past experiences are used to legitimize this view. This notion is also expressed by Marine Corps’ report, “Coups and cronyism are the norm in Haiti, and the *self-defeating traditions* will likely persist” (Marines Corps Intelligence Activity, 2005, p. A-10, emphasis added). Adopting similar language, Clinton states that “Haiti is not doomed” by referring to its potentially positive future (Clinton, 2010, p. 79). As Haiti is portrayed as a mysterious entity which has failed to develop in the past, Haiti can only have a better future with the help of the international community. “Together, we are fully committed to building a new Haiti that meets the legitimate and long-held aspirations of the Haitian people for their country” (Cannon, January 25, 2010). This quote can be even understood that the international community decides which aspirations are legitimate and long-held by the Haitians.

Despite stressing Haiti's political problems, often considered as a result of its cultural heritage, describing the country in its failures also hides successes of President Préval in implementing policies. Although these reforms have reduced violence and kidnappings by strengthening the civilian police, introduced judicial reforms, improved economic activities and maintained a stable household (Schneider, February 4, 2010), rendering these achievements invisible additionally legitimizes the engagement of international actors in Haiti's affairs. The image of a weak and incapable government is enforced by putting emphasis on the destroyed National Palace (Romero & Lacey, January 13, 2010), whether by photos or texts, that suggests the collapse of the government.

Hence, dominance is produced by highlighting the negative aspects of Haiti, while comparing them with positive connotations of the international community. Haiti is clearly portrayed as underprivileged and irrational whereas other countries surrounding it have opposite characteristics.

The need for help by the international community is reinforced by stressing the 'solidarity' and 'friendship' with the Haitian population, as has been done in various speeches relating to post-earthquake Haiti. For instance, the UN Secretary-General opened his speech by saying "the international community has come together...dramatically...in solidarity with Haiti and its people" and "today, the United Nations are unified for Haiti" (March 31, 2010a). To further stress the good intentions of the international community, donors have been called "friends of Haiti" (Ban, March 31, 2010a). The US Secretary State, Hillary Rodham Clinton, also thanked "all the countries and international institutions [...] for their immediate response [and] their continuing commitment" and stressed "as fellow human beings, we respond from a position of conscience and morality to help (...)" (March 31, 2010). Similarly the French president, Nicolas Sarkozy, emphasizes the "deep sympathy and absolute solidarity of the French people" to Haiti (Sarkozy, January 22, 2010). Even more empathy was expressed by

the EU Commissioner for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection, Kristalina Georgieva, “When disaster strikes we are all brothers”, citing the words of Henry Dunant, the founder of the ICRC (Georgieva, May 7, 2010).

Highlighting the solidarity felt with Haitians in the aftermath of the catastrophe underlines the ‘good’ and ‘moral’ intentions of the international community with regard to the rebuilding process which legitimizes the involvement in national affairs. This dual rhetoric is clearly visible in Barack Obama’s statement, “We are mobilizing every element of our national capacity: the resources of development agencies, the strength of our armed forces, and most important, the compassion of the American people” (Obama, Januray 15, 2010). Persistent emphasis on the benevolence of the international community is particularly questionable with regard to Haiti’s history, marked by foreign involvement.

In 1697, France declared Haiti, then called Saint Domingue, as its new colony and developed a sugar plantation system on the island. Due to the excessive exploitation of slave labor, causing a life expectancy of seven years, the island became the most prosperous colony of France (Schuller, 2007, p.148). For that reason, France and the US did not recognize Haiti’s independence in 1804 and imposed financial sanctions for their benefits. In addition to driving Haiti into bankruptcy and severe poverty, the US occupied the island from 1915 to 1934, based on the fear of losing influence in the area, as Germany and France were increasingly involved in Haiti’s economy. The US occupation was marked by the exploitation the country’s resources as well as the establishment of a powerful military force, needed to keep the Haitian population under their power and control. Although slavery was abolished, the US involvement in the country laid further foundations for economic exploitation and political subjugation, which will be addressed later in detail (Lennox, 1993, p. 696). Considering these rather malignant historical encounters with foreign powers, contributes to

understand the formation of a discourse based on concepts as ‘solidarity’, ‘commitment’ and ‘goodwill’, legitimizing the engagement of the international community.

As presented by Chilton & Schäffner (2002), in political discourses; constructed and used in a strategic way, linguistic terms often carry specific meanings in order to evoke certain feelings attached to them. Emphasizing solidarity or creating a group identity requires the use of words like ‘we’, ‘us’, ‘our’. Additionally, the adoption of words like ‘in our Western hemisphere’ draws attention to the close spatial relationship (Titschner *et al.*, 2003, p. 30). The fact that these terms have been increasingly used in the discourse relating to the disaster response highlights the triggering of positive emotions and affection felt by the international community towards the victims of the earthquake. Dominance is therefore reaffirmed by stressing benevolent intentions.

It is the combination of the narratives, of first, Haiti as a failed state hosting an immature population, and second, the solidarity and moral goodwill of the international community, that lays the foundations for policies designed by the international community. In other words, representations have to be set in context or relationship in order to produce structural effects. These are visible in envisioned policies and reconstruction programs which materialize dominance and power.

Repeated emphasis has been put on has been placed on ‘building back better’, ‘building Haiti anew’, creating a ‘new Haiti’ or ‘re-envisioning’ Haiti (Ban, March 31, 2010a, 2010b; Clarke, March 31, 2010; Oxfam, 2010b; ONE, 2010) presents the formation of a discourse which legitimizes the implementation of various reforms that move beyond disaster relief. Schneider of the International Crisis Group labeled his speech at the Donors’ Conference “Haiti: Building Back Better – and Beyond” (Schneider, February 4, 2010). As stated by the Secretary-General “Our goal is not just to rebuild. It is to “build back better” (Ban, March 31, 2010b) as well as a “wholesale national renewal” (Ban, March 31, 2010a).

Oxfam's Briefing Paper is even called "Haiti: A Once-in-a-Century Chance for Change" which clearly calls for the need to 're-envision' Haiti (Oxfam, 2010b).

Representing the country as a clean slate has caused the call for a "Marshall Plan" for Haiti, by IMF Managing Director, Dominique Strauss-Kahn (January 22, 2010), and the influential development economist, Paul Collier (January 13, 2010) as well as others. Linking Haiti's experiences to the situation after World War II suggests a total destruction of the country and the lead of the US in the rebuilding process which entails large-scale reforms in the economic as well as sector. Implicitly, it may also invoke notions of economic benefits as well as geostrategic considerations by the US.

Moreover, adopting the rhetoric of 'creating Haiti anew' or 'creating a strong nation, an honest one' (Gibbs, 2010, p. 27; ONE, 2010), implicitly states that Haiti has no valuable history or any positive past experiences. Taking the words at face value means that Haiti's population has only a weak or false sense of national identity which is reflected in their past. This suggests that a turbulent history cannot lead to a strong nation or valuable collective memories.

As argued by Welch in the case of Iraq, notes that using the term 'reconstruction', as it has been stressed in various documents (Oxfam, 2010b; Ban, March 31, 2010a), "suggests the remaking of a (...) colonial past when distant world powers dictated control over a political and economic order" (Welch, 2008, p. 262). In a similar vein, Berger, when assessing the discourse of Hurricane Katrina, stresses that catastrophes represent situations that mark a disruption of the status quo, by either breaking with existing norms and ideologies or reinforcing them (2009, p.493). More radically, Lyons (2009) argues that the reconstruction process normally reproduces vulnerabilities and increases inequalities and marginalization not only among communities but also within (p.385). Even though evidence from the reconstruction of several communities after the 2006 Tsunami prove this argument

(Lyons, 2009), in case of Haiti, the disaster is still framed as a positive turning point in history, hence an opportunity to rupture with negative past practices.

Framing the situation in Haiti as a radical turning point in its history devalues its historical and cultural past, highlights the ignorance of the international community and neglects structural causes for Haiti's contemporary situation. The main problem of ignoring large evidence of disaster reconstruction after the 2006 Tsunami is that "natural" disasters are often caused or triggered by political or socio-economic structures that make a community particularly vulnerable (Lyons, 2009; Gunewardena & Schuller, 2008). Failing to consider the impact of policies and dynamics which stir inequality and thus, vulnerability, leads to the recreation of communities which even more prone to disasters. This aspect is also reflected in the fact that disasters are more likely to hit developing than developed countries (Lyons, 2009, p.385).

Bankoff (2001, p. 24) also argues that the problem about avoiding a debate about poverty is that natural hazards are only considered to be disasters when it has a devastating sociopolitical impact. Would less people live in the suburbs of Port-au-Prince, the earthquake would have caused lesser casualties. According to his argumentation, natural disasters are embedded in a historical constructions or imaginations which can be linked to colonial discourse (Bankoff, 2001). As disaster's are dependent on specific disaster-prone geographies, vulnerable societies are hence these which are considered as inferior, weak and different (Bankoff, 2001, p.28).

As the deconstruction of the narrative has shown, humanitarianism highlights goodwill, whereas development legitimizes the actions. Framing Haiti in opposition to Western countries implies that Haiti needs their assistance. Their involvement is legitimized by pointing to their benevolence and solidarity, while being silent on past experiences which have shed negative light on the international community. Forming a discourse in these

narratives contributes to structure the relations between foreign actors and Haiti, which appear to constitute a network or alliance of various participants sharing the same ideas. Constructing an image of solidarity and goodwill, gives the international community free room for all kind of actions and maneuvers, as outlined in the following section.

4.2 Securitizing the Situation- Extending Dominance and Control?

As the analysis has shown, structures of dominance and power are constructed by creating differences and setting them into a context. Dominant actors influence the discourse by framing particular problems and presenting their solutions, as it appears logic or rational for them. According to Duffield (2007), adopted practices in disaster relief reflect rationalities which point to increasing security concerns. The discourse is hence formed around the logic that security is a prerequisite for successful democratic and economic reforms. Even though it is not the purpose to dismiss the importance of security at all, this part draws attention to the construction of the discourse that prioritizes security over basic needs and point to thereof arising problems.

Although the international community influenced the discourse by praising their good and moral intentions in the reconstruction process, they have also framed the catastrophe in terms of instability, as for instance rampant looting, street riots, and sexual abuses in camps (Ban, March 31, 2010a) were frequently addressed in public and official discourses. The IMF brief on the earthquake impact emphasizes - after presenting the number of affected people by the earthquake - “fears [that] the security situation may deteriorate rapidly (...)” by referring the “reports of shooting, looting of shops, and small riots mostly at food distribution points” (IMF, January 22, 2010). The prominent American essayist, Nancy Gibbs, also reported in the TIME special edition that “The more desperate that people became, the more dangerous it was to help them” and that the “crowds got out of control” at the UN food distribution place (Gibbs, 2010, p. 27).

Framing the situation in these words implicitly acknowledges the benevolence and care of the UN while contrasting it to Haitians described as ‘desperate’, causing a ‘dangerous’ situation as ‘crowd got out of control’. This negative image of the Haitian population is reinforced by statements, such as for instance the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-Moon, during the Donors’ Conference, who described the situation in Haiti in terms of “the difficult living conditions in the camps and, in particular, reports of sexual violence against women and children (Ban, January 31, 2010a). The image of a dangerous and deteriorating security situation was strengthened by stressing the damage of prisons causing the escape of criminals in the public media (BBC, January 22, 2010).

Representing Haiti as dangerous and unsafe legitimizes the adoption of solutions related to securitization and control. As these practices are proposed by the international community, power structures over the Haitian population are reinforced. The militarization of the response clearly supports this argumentation.

Even though some NGOs and UN agencies repeatedly have argued that the situation has been rather calm, the international community attributed this condition to the efforts of the UN and US troops. This contrast between the ‘good’ international community and the ‘bad’ Haitians is also apparent in the IMF evaluation, which praises the help of the “presence of 9,000 UN troops and police, and the arrival of U.S. troops” which contributed to, a “fairly calm (...) overall security situation” (IMF, January 22, 2010).

But not only have government officials underlined the need for security in the country, NGOs such as for instance, CARE International also aspires to “build back a *safer*, stronger Haiti” (May 14, 2010, emphasis added). Similarly, the International Crisis Group, often considered progressive, prioritizes security and the rule of law as the foundations for a successful rebuilding (Schneider, February 4, 2010). These representations indicate the need to stabilize and restore order in the country, and hence justify according technologies or

policies in order to do so. This rationale of security as a prerequisite for development was also promoted before the earthquake, as US Institute for Peace in its Special Report on Haiti argues that Haiti's road to success is determined by "ensuring that [urgently needed resources] are used effectively to strengthen security and improve public safety, relieve poverty and promote sustained growth" (Maguire, 2009). Considering the focus on security also before the earthquake may indicate that the disaster has a functional use to trigger the legitimization and implementation of policies, aiming at increased control and regulation of the Haitian population. It becomes also apparent that the focus on security is not only emphasized by the US or UN military but also various other actors, such as for instance NGOs, think tanks, international institutions and others. This aspect reveals notions of networked governance and spreading rationality linked to security.

Frequent reference to the security situation has also been acknowledged during the creation of discourses with regard to other recent disasters. Tierney *et al.* (2006), for instance, analyzed the reporting about disasters and the resulting creation of a "disaster myth" in the media, which influenced the individual as well as official responses to the catastrophe (p. 58). Tierney *et al.*'s study has shown that in the case of Hurricane Katrina, the media constructed an image of rampant looting and violent and dangerous behavior (Tierney *et al.*, 2006). The construction of social disorder legitimized the securitization of the disaster by the employment of military personnel (Tierney *et al.*, 2006). The repeated emphasis on threats to security therefore normalizes the employment of army forces as they appear to be the only solution to the problematic situation.

This rationale of prioritizing security by militarizing the situation is apparent in the response by the UN. An analysis of various speeches of the Secretary General show that the UN mostly relies on activities by the MINUSTAH Stabilization Mission, which has a mandate to restore peace and security in the country since the exiling of former Haitian

president, Bertrand Aristide, in 2004. Even though other UN agencies, namely UNDP, UNICEF, OCHA, UNHCR, WFP, UNPF, WHO, have responded to the disaster, the Secretary General primarily addresses the importance of the MINUSTAH mission in the situation (Ban, January 18, 2010; Ban, February 18, 2010; Ban, February 24, 2010). This means precisely an increase of 2,000 military personnel and 1,500 police, who are employed to secure the situation in Haiti (UN, March 31 2010). This will be an addition of 30 percent of troops and 67 percent of police presence until June as expected at present (Ban, January 18, 2010). Besides the deployment of extra staff, the UN has also announced the training of local police officers to maintain peace and order, on the grounds that only a third of the Haitian National Police is operating (Mulet, January 25, 2010). The increase of military troops in the aftermath of the earthquake is legitimized by highlighting its provision of stability, contrasting it to the unstable situation, and its ability to coordinate humanitarian assistance, contrasting to the chaotic situation.

The US has also declared its close cooperation with the UN MINUSTAH in terms of providing security, reflected in an interview given by USAid Administrator Raj Shah, who stated that the US prefer to work with UN personnel rather than the Haitian police (Mills & Shah, January 15, 2010). This reveals not close collaboration of the US and the UN, but also the international military power, easily able to control the island.

It is also important to note the hierarchy of priorities adopted by the US disaster response. The priority of security over direct emergency assistance in form of food and water supplies, shelter, and medical help is also outlined by Admiral Rogers of the Joint Task Force who stresses the ‘stable’ environment necessary for the distribution of assistance (Kirby *et al.*, January 18, 2010). In similar terms, Lieutenant K.P. Keen claims that “security is the key component of a humanitarian assistance operation where we need to create a safe and secure environment to ensure we’re able to everything we can” (CBS, January 17, 2010).

Even though this analysis has shown the growing reliance on security practices in the aftermath of the earthquake, is a set of problems that arises from prioritizing security over other forms of disaster relief. First, in the direct aftermath of the disaster, emergency relief should primarily focus on the basic needs of the victims. Serving their demands would obviously decrease the likelihood of looting and stealing. Moreover, focusing rebuilding shelter and houses would also diminish the vulnerability of women and girls to becoming subjects of sexual abuse. Second, adopting a rhetoric that legitimizes military control moves people from a position of victims to criminals that may justify the use of force. This is particularly problematic with regard to Haiti's history for military regimes, as many people are still traumatized from these experiences in their past. Finally, relying on military means also opens possibilities of increasing control and regulation of the Haitian population by the international community. This is for instance reflected in the fact that the UN and US ignore the Haitian police and therefore circumvent local structures but impose their own principles. As outlined here, adopting a rationality that relies on security solutions to problems has various negative effects in the case of Haiti and primarily strengthens the power of the dominant actors.

The increased possibility to subjugate the Haitian population to the dictates of the international community is also highlighted by the control of borders and migration flows. Hillary Rodham Clinton's speech legitimized the US interest in building a stable Haiti through strengthening the rule of law and creating economic opportunities by indirectly addressing the problem of migration, "so that Haitians don't have to (...) *leave* their country to find work". "And if Haiti can do all of those things [create strong, transparent, accountable institutions] with our help, it will become an engine for progress and prosperity generating opportunity and fostering *greater stability* for *itself* and for *countries throughout the hemisphere and beyond*" (Rodham Clinton, March 31, 2010, emphasis added).

This quote highlights the problem of refugee flows, experienced by the US after the military coup which led to the exiling of the former president Bertrand Aristide in 1991 (Zanotti, 2008, p. 543). Controlling the Haitian population is therefore extended to the concept of societal security, developed by Ole Waever (1993), arguing that states are concerned with cohesion of their social identity. States fear threats that could challenge the collective identity of their society as this would lead to the breakdown of the society and state. Similarly, as showed by William Walters (2006), increasing emphasis on border controls can also be linked to Deleuze's concept of societies of control which underlines the importance of regulating a population. Applying these theoretical approaches as well as a historical perspective to Haiti serves to explain the rationale of the US with regard to the control of Haiti's airport after the disaster.

As the airport serves as the linchpin, connecting Haiti to the outside world, the US is able restrict and even eliminate the outflow of Haitians to their or other countries. Due to the proximity and large Haitian diaspora, it is obvious that many Haitians desire to leave their devastated lives and country. Although it is common practice that states aim to implement restrictive immigration policies based on the claim that migrants constitute economic burdens to the country, to understand the case of Haiti migrants aspiring to go to the US, past encounters need to be examined in depth.

Haitian migrants have never been welcomed in the US, and the US has often even contributed to the problematic political and economic conditions in Haiti. The two most significant waves of Haitian refugees arriving in the US were in the 1960s and 1970s under the dictatorships of François Duvalier, and Jean-Claude Duvalier. Initially claiming to grant asylum to the Haitian refugees who experienced massive violations of human rights and severe economic deprivation, the US only recognized refugees in the beginning, but refused permanent resident status. While between 1972 and 1980 approximately 50,000 Haitians fled

the atrocities of their dictator by boat to South Florida, only 25 were recognized (Lennox, 1993, p.700). Despite denying refugee status to the majority of Haitians, the US employed additional techniques aiming at deporting ‘Haiti’s boat people’ (Stepick, 1982) and preventing further influxes.

First, the policy of accelerated deportation meant that it was decided on the deportation of Haitians before arrival by systematically denying them a fair procedure, as for instance interviews were shortened from one hour to fifteen minutes (Lennox, 1993, p. 700). Second, in the 1980s, the US facilitated the incarceration of Haitians in so-called detention facilities. These prison-like facilities hosted the refugees before sending the majority back and became the home for cases which were too delicate to ignore the principle of *non-refoulement*¹. As a third measure to prevent the arrival of more Haitians, regarded as “serious national problem” by the Reagan administration (Lennox, 1993, p.703), US coast guards were authorized to interdict boats coming from Haiti.

The 1990s were also marked by political instability, several military coups, and the consequent adoption of sanctions against Haiti, conditions that caused further flows of migrants to the US, the “Haitian refugee crisis” (Lennox, 1993; Doyle, 1994, p. 56). Even though the strict US policy against Haitian refugees was largely criticized by lawyers, human rights activists and government officials, such as for instance the Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor in the Clinton administration, John Shattuck (Koh, 1994, p. 2433), the policy of sea interdiction, detention and *refoulement* has been continued. Instead of changing the policy, the Clinton administration was committed to restore democracy by send the exiled former president, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, and a ship of US soldiers to Haiti (Pastor, 1996), however, this idea failed largely due to the resistance of the junta in power (Doyle, 1994, p. 56). Similar policies were also observable under Bush

¹ The principle of *non-refoulement* is an established preemptive norm in international that prohibits the return of a refugee “in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where his life would be threatened on account of his (...) political opinion”. (International Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951, Art. 33 (1))

(Wasem, March 31, 2010, p.6) and are also sustained by Obama as only Haitian already residing in the US received temporary protection status (Preston, January 15, 2010). This is justified by the “fear of mass migration” (Wasem, March 31, 2010, p.15).

Reasons for denying Haitian’s asylum in the US are based on two arguments. First, the US claimed that Haitians are all economic, not political migrants, thereby ignoring all established reports of massive human rights violations and hiding any role in contributing to the devastating conditions in Haiti (Stepick, 1982, p.165). The persistent and severe political persecution was based on the constant power struggle between the elites backed up by the US and the Haitian military forces, trained by the US during the occupation, and parties who had the support of the ordinary and rural Haitians (Hallward, 2004, p. 38). Even though the US claimed to support democratization processes in Haiti, it mostly allied with the rightwing and brutal Haitian elites, as these served more their interests (Koh, 1994, p. 2392). With regard to the economy, the US worsened the circumstances by implementing an embargo and other sanctions which primarily affected the ordinary population (Lennox, 1993, p. 704, 706).

Second, as Haiti was not a communist country, there was no geopolitical interest in recognizing refugees, in contrast to Cuban refugees, who almost all received permanent refugee status (Stepick, 1982, p. 16). For instance, in 1975 and 1976, the US granted asylum to 5% who fled rightist regimes in contrast to 95% fleeing communist countries (Stepick, 1982, p. 173). This ideological discrimination was based on the rationale that communism undermines individual freedom and self-determination (Lennox, 1993, p. 712). Thus, as argued by Lennox in 1993, the immigration policy towards Haiti has been shaped by discrimination that can be traced back to past encounters. Lene Hansen (2006, p.38) also outlines that societal securitization functions by constructing immigrants as the threatening ‘Other’ to the own national identity. Similar conclusions can be drawn today when explaining

the rationale for controlling the airport after the earth-quake, which reproduces global hegemonic structures in favor of the dominant powers, in this case the US.

But not only does the control of the airport enable the US to eliminate the outflow of Haitians, the US can also regulate of the inflow of emergency assistance. This point has largely been criticized by humanitarian organizations, such as for instance *Medicine sans Frontière*, Red Cross and World Food Program, who argued that the US was turning back airplanes carrying relief commodities and personnel while giving priority to US military flights (Schofield, January 19, 2010; Thompson & Cave, January 16, 2010). The French Cooperation Minister Alain Joyandet expressed a similar sentiment by saying “This is about helping Haiti, not about occupying Haiti” (Schofield, January 19, 2010). Not only does this statement point to the militarization of Haiti by the US, but it also shows the interest of in the island on the part France’s, who had been the former colonial master. Geopolitical considerations play a role in determining the nature and intensity of post-disaster relief. As the US is afraid of an increasing influence of the French, who might justify their engagement based on the same language, it aims to expand its influence by demonstrating power.

In addition to threats of former colonial powers, the US also fears growing influence of communist or socialist countries, such as for instance Cuba and Venezuela. Although these rivalries date back to the past, the US feels threatened by the emerging leftist and anti-American Latin continent which is reflected in a variety of contemporary US policies (Sullivan, 2006, p.9). This fear is often hidden by highlighting drug smuggling activities between the Latin American countries.

Roberts’ article (January 13, 2010), published by the influential Heritage Foundation, summarizes the importance of the US military quite bluntly because it can “interrupt the nightly flights of cocaine to Haiti and the Dominican Republic from the Venezuelan coast” as well as “prevent any large-scale movement by Haitians to take to the sea in dangerous and

rickety watercraft to try to enter the U.S. illegally.” Moreover, “the U.S. should implement a strong and vigorous public diplomacy effort to counter the negative propaganda certain to emanate from the Castro-Chavez camp” which will reaffirm the US, “powerful force for good” in this continent and in the world (Roberts, January 13, 2010). Interestingly, the homepage is links the Red Cross for donations, which points to an alliance between the ‘conservative’ US and the humanitarian organization and underlines the notion of network governance structuring power relations in post-earthquake Haiti.

Due to the fact that the Heritage Foundation is a highly influential think tank in the US, proved amongst others by Naomi Klein (2007), these abridgements should not simply be dismissed, especially when considering that this is an adjusted version. The previous article introduced the reader to the earthquake by describing the situation as “opportunities of the US” to “improve the public image of the United States in the region”. These statements reveal clearly the rationalities related to the national security considerations and economic benefits for the US.

The problem associated with this securitization and militarization is hence the extension of excessive control by foreign actors and the political subjugation of the Haitian nation as well as the failure to meet direct demands of the affected community. Similar effects are observable with regard to economic reforms.

4.3 Reforming the Economic System – Implementing Neoliberal Policies?

This section lays out the construction of a discourse that draws on the logic of economic development and long-term recovery which is considered to be beneficial for Haiti. As shown in the previous sections, adopting a discourse which highlights the fragility or instability of the Haitian state legitimizes the regulation and controlling of the society by institutionalization and, in a following step, the implementation of economic restructuring

programs, aiming to stabilize the country in the long term. However, as laid out, practical implications for Haiti's future can rather be associated with subjugation.

According to the dominant logic, long-term rebuilding is envisioned to go hand in hand with reforming the whole economic system, the only mechanism able to move the population out of poverty. However, as can be revealed from the discourse, economic restructuring is interlinked with opening the country for foreign investment. This foreign influence is legitimized by emphasizing that companies will create jobs and opportunities, and therefore help the Haitian population to 'jumpstart' their economy again after the earthquake.

This rationale can be revealed when analyzing the speech delivered at the Donors' Conference by Hillary Rodham Clinton, who referred to the "needs of jobs", the growing economy in the pre-earthquake phase by the "opening of new factories" and the "launching of two international chain hotels" (Rodham Clinton, March 31, 2010). During a briefing, she referred to the hopeful future of Haiti before the earthquake hit the island by stating that "500 businesses from all over the world" were "signing contracts" and "opening factories." (Rodham Clinton, January 15, 2010). These phrases clearly highlight the focus put on foreign private investors coming to Haiti as the main promoters of economic development. Moreover, large-scale companies are favored as they can provide a large number of jobs and have experience in their business.

Whereas Rodham Clinton was primarily referring to the importance of foreign investors in general, US economic intentions were finally unfolded during the Haiti Reconstruction Business on April 20, 2010. Still emphasizing the mutual opportunities for Haitian and US businesses, the conference held by the US Department of Commerce, deconstructing the speeches and proposals by highlights the rhetorical and manipulative functions of these phrases. Commerce Secretary Gary Locke, for instance, addressed the

audience of 300 US companies, saying “the private sector will play a critical role in providing these opportunities through trade and investment that will benefit people in both Haiti and the United States” (Locke, April 20, 2010). Besides stressing the mutual investment benefits due to “Haiti has tremendous economic potential” (Locke, April 20, 2010), he also adopted the rationale of linking economic growth with human progress by stating that “Haiti can gain greater economic independence, and the Haitian people can contribute *meaningfully* to the *progress* of their nation. The U.S. government is there to be a *partner* in that effort” (Locke, April 20, 2010, emphasis added). He strengthened the importance of the US by highlighting that this conference “mark the beginning of *fruitful partnerships* where the U.S. business community plays a *key role* in Haiti’s reconstruction and recovery” (Locke, April 20, 2010, emphasis added).

These statements clearly reveal the interests of the US to incorporate their private sector in the rebuilding process as this brings profits to the US. To justify their involvement, stress is put on the opportunities for both countries and economic development as an engine for progress in general. The problem with this framing on the one hand, is the overemphasis of economic solutions to development. As the disaster is primarily framed in property losses and economic opportunities, psychological and emotional consequences are ignored, even though they are of huge importance for national recovery (Cox *et al.*, 2008). In the words of Locke, only economic growth is a ‘meaningful’ contribution to the development of a nation. On the other hand, using terms as ‘partner’, ‘fruitful partnerships’, ‘greater economic independence’ implies a balanced or equal relationship between the US and Haiti. These representations therefore divert the attention from the obvious imbalances in power and economic influence, clearing benefitting the US economy. The words ‘key role’ appear therefore more appropriate and suitable for future engagement of the US in Haiti. As outlined

policies underlying a neoliberal rationality primarily benefit hegemonic actors, who are able to compete on the world market, and therefore, reconfirm their economic dominance.

However, framing the economic relations between the countries as ‘partnerships’ should not be dismissed per se, because the US is working closely with Haitian officials who support the engagement of the US in Haiti. Therefore, attention should also be paid to the people cooperating with the US. The Haitian tourism minister, Patrick Delatour, who was invited to the Haiti Business Dialogue, is now leading the commission of the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment and in charge of laying the foundations for Haiti’s reconstruction. During his keynote speech at the Haiti Business Dialogue, Delatour pointed to the “refoundation” instead of “reconstruction” of the country in order to become a “mother state, dynamic state, competitive state, open state”. To arrive there, Delatour argues that the economy has to be restructured by investing in decentralization and infrastructure, including the building of three international airports, roads and ports, in order to develop agriculture, garment industry and tourism.

Despite bemoaning the loss of “most of the hotels”, Delatour mentioned the Hotel Montana which collapsed during the earthquake as the “national symbol of then resilience” and the “symbol of the whole reconstruction of Haiti” (Delatour, April 20, 2010), based on the fact that the owners are committed to rebuild the hotel. Considering that the majority of the population is poor and lives in shanty towns around the city, the Hotel Montana does not have any meaning or symbolic function for the local population, whereas it might have for visiting foreigners.

Delatour also addressed the interests of the US by his efforts to adopt laws that allows for “tax exemption for US companies investing in long-term Haiti” and that “agrees with the principle that we will be in an emergency state for the next 18 month”. This allows the “[creation] of agencies that will be able to plan, design, and then implement a designed

decision of development of the country” (Delatour, 2010). During his speech, Delatour appeared like a marionette serving and reproducing the interests of the US, underlined by silences and hesitations of the minister.

When evaluating his suitability for this position, several aspects concerning his background seem rather striking. First of all, Delatour is the vice president, now on ‘sabbatical’ as stated on the website, of the GDG Concrete & Construction Company that he opened 2000 with his cousin (GDG Concrete & Construction, 2010). As this company is the major concrete supplier in Haiti, Delatour benefits from reconstruction projects. Being an American Haitian company and having constructed the US embassy and other American companies, it can be assumed that he holds close relations with the country and is interested in extending this ‘partnership’. Finally, being the minister of tourism may be problematic for the sustainable and inclusionary rebuilding process of the country, because according to the theory of disaster capitalism, reconstruction efforts focusing on the tourist sector have primarily led to the segregation and marginalization of the local population from their native communities (Gunewardena, 2008; Stonich, 2008; Alexander, 2008). The collaboration between the US and local officials underlined the importance networking for strengthening and maintaining dominance and control over the discourse.

But not only is the US cooperating with the Haitian official elite (Hallward, 2004, p. 38), the IMF can also be understood as an ally of the US, as it primarily promotes US interests. The IMF is also very open about the “unique occasion to try to rebuild Haitian economy” by focusing on the involvement of the private sector (Strauss-Kahn, April 1 2010). The IMF Review of Haiti also emphasized the destroyed economic infrastructure and the government’s undermined capacity to collect revenues through taxes and customs (IMF, January 22, 2010, p.3). Pointing to the weak, incapable government and collapsed economic systems therefore legitimizes the engagement of the IMF by providing loans to the

government. Even though the IMF focuses on the economy, the commonly acknowledged adverse effect of IMF loans and Haiti's problematic past experiences with Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) are not mentioned in the discourse at any point. These blind spots in the discourse are important due to their practical implications.

With the end of the Duvalier dictatorship in 1986, Haiti, a highly indebted country, received conditional loans by the IMF that demanded the implementation policies as adopted by the Washington Consensus (Gros, 2008, p. 7). Based on the idea that countries should exploit their comparative advantage to generate the best possible growth and contribute to development, it was argued that Haiti has to fully open its economy to the world market. The consequent currency reform that detached the gourde from the US dollar did not result in the expected stimulation of the agricultural export market, but caused inflation, increased Haiti's trade deficit and weakened the state.

Likewise, the policy of trade liberalization, as demanded by the IMF, destroyed the Haiti's food sovereignty in rice production, as highly subsidized rice from the US was dumped into the island (Rosset, 2009, p. 17). Despite the suffering of many rice farmers, the government lost large parts of its revenue which was formerly extracted from import tariffs. Although it can be argued that the subsidized rice flowing into Haiti has benefitted consumers, the food riots in 2008 following the increase of rice price in the world demonstrated Haiti's dependence and vulnerability (Gros, 2008). Similarly, Haitian poultry industry was wiped out due to the inability to compete with the cheap poultry products coming from the US (Rosset, 2009, p.17). In addition to the destruction of main Haitian agricultural industries, policies compelling the country to lift customs duties weakened the government's ability to stabilize the situation significantly. In Gros' words, the policies introduced by the IMF had a "double whammy" effect (2008, p.11) because they undermined sustainable economic growth by opening the island to unfair international competition,

income growth declined steadily (Hornbeck, 2009, p.3) and decreased the ability of the country to control the consequent instability.

Finally, as the past has shown, developing the textile industry has not generated economic benefits for Haiti, as proposed by the preferential trade agreement (PTA) ‘HOPE Act’ between the US and Haiti in 2006, and expanded in 2008 (Hornbeck, 2009). Although it is claimed that this program benefits the development of a Haitian textile industry due to duty-free access for Haitian apparel exports, so far, it has not yielded positive results in terms of poverty reduction (Hornbeck, 2009, p. 5). First, even though rules of origin have been expanded, most components, yarns and fabrics need in the textile businesses originated from the US. In 2005, about two-thirds of yarns and fabrics were imported from the US (Gelb, 2005, p. 3). Second, quotas still apply and certain apparel has been excluded as for instance t-shirts. Moreover, unions are forbidden by the constitutions and complaints about labor standards punished with leave (Bell & Field, May 5, 2010). It appears that this ‘benevolent’ policy has primarily benefitted US interests, an argument which is supported by confidential reports for the US Congress (Gelb, 2005; Hornbeck, 2009).

This clearly states that Haiti would only qualify for a PTA, if it had implemented a large number of reforms, such as “market-based economy, minimum government interference that protects private property rights, the rule of law, the elimination of barriers to U.S. trade and investment [...]” (Gelb, 2005, p.2). Moreover, the report stated that “on the positive side”, production costs are cheaper than in other Caribbean countries and Haiti has a large number of unemployed or underemployed people, “a labor pool readily available for training and the incorporation into Haitian textile industry work force” (Gelb, 2010, p.6). This exploitative notion has been supported by a research report for the textile sector which also highlights the “relatively low costs of labor” and “quality and efficiency of production”

(Textile and Apparel Research Report, 2006). The geographical proximity is an additional positive aspect for US as well Haitian traders.

Having established that neoliberal policies as implemented in Haiti hurt farmers and consumers as well as weakening the Haitian government, while benefitting large-scale businesses that are competitive on the world market, one has to question the causes for adopting a neoliberal rationality by US and international institutions. As past experiences show, the opening of the market to foreign investment has not moved Haiti out of poverty but widened the inequality in the country (Hallward, 2004).

In post-earthquake Haiti, several cases are representative for highlighting the ongoing neoliberal rationality as imposed in Haiti. First, Monsanto, an US-based multinational company and the leading producer of genetically modified seeds, has donated 60,000 seed sacks (475 tons). Whereas Haitian farmers rightly describe this donation as a serious “attack” on the agricultural sector due to the seeds ability to destroy the traditional biodiversity, Haitian officials frame this event as “a fabulous Easter gift” (Bell, May 17, 2010). Moreover, the privatization of the national telephone company TELECO in the first week of May 2010, a main source of government revenue and provider of more than 5,000 jobs, marks the increasing influence of foreign investors and the loss of control by the Haitian government, as well as causing the firing of hundreds of employees (Hervé, May 8, 2010).

With regard to trade policies, the former HOPE Act was extended by HELP Act after the earthquake, which expands the duty-free access to the US textile market. However, quotas remain restrictive, only certain apparel is included, and no minimum wage or fixed labor standards are specified (Bell & Field, May 20, 2010). Additionally, as components for production are still imported, mostly from the US (Hornbeck, 2009, p. 10), it remains rather questionable whether these programs contribute to sustainable and independent development

in Haiti. So far, the textile industry has not generated any spill-over effects and positively affected any other economic sectors.

Not only have past neoliberal reforms undermined any opportunity to build a sustainable and independent economic system in Haiti, policies have also contributed to excessive urbanization and thus, the extensive development of slums around the capital (Rosset, 2009, p.17). This slumification is the result of the destruction of the agricultural sector, the prospects of industrial employment in the cities (Davis, 2006, p. 14), and the consequent impoverishment of the Haitian population which is dictated by foreign influences. The point here is that these conditions have largely contributed the devastating impact of the earthquake by triggering the vulnerability of the population to the disaster. Although the IMF argues that environmental degradation is caused by poverty which in turn contributes to the vulnerability to natural disasters, it does not answer the question why Haiti is actually so poor (IMF, January 22, 2010 p.4). Hence, the IMF might intentionally try to divert attention from this question of reasons for Haiti's conditions, because it fears to be challenged on its responsibility for contributing to the situation.

The most significant problem associated with neoliberal policies is the lack of national industry development and the loss of local ownership, two prerequisites for a sustainable and less vulnerable economic system serving the interests of the Haitian population (Gunewardena & Schuller, 2008). This problem of ignoring regional expertise and local initiatives, the only engine for lasting progress and improvement of national well-being, can also be revealed when analyzing policy proposals. The context of the drafting and the two documents that lay the foundation for further reconstruction processes, are subject of the next chapter. Emphasis is put on the structural and practical effects of construction this hegemonic discourse.

CHAPTER 5:

TRANSFORMING RATIONALITIES INTO PRACTICES

The discourse, as shaped in Haiti, has highlighted rationalities of security concerns and economic reforms which are widely believed to generate social progress and stability nationally and globally. As rationalities set the parameters for the possible range of policies, the two key documents which have been adopted so far confirm my analysis in the forth chapter. Actors involved in drafting the documents presented their proposal at the International Donors' Conference. This chapter outlines the practical implications legitimized by the discourse and thus, the production of global power relations.

5.1 The International Donors' Conference Towards a Future for Haiti

The International Donors' Conference on March 31, 2010 was the most important gathering of the international community to decide on longer term responses to the disaster. Although the conference was organized in the UN headquarters in New York and invited all member states, the special rules of participation reflect the exclusionary mechanism of discourses (Milliken, 1996, p. 8). Therefore, as access to engage in discussions and contribute to policy proposals is restricted, it reaffirms the dominance of certain actors who can translate their rationalities into technologies.

Whereas the Haitian government, UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki Moon, the Special Envoy to Haiti, Bill Clinton, and the US State Secretary, Hillary Rodham Clinton, appear to have played a major role in shaping the rebuilding process, opinions by other state and non-state actors, such as for instance local government delegations, MINUSTAH stakeholders and NGOs, were sidelined from the conference (UN, March 31, 2010a). According to the UN's FAQ leaflet, the dominance of the US is only "natural" due to their status as the principle donor as well as the involvement of the UN, legitimized by its "long-established valuable role in Haiti" and its ability to "mobilize a truly global response" (UN, March 31, 2010a).

Whereas the UN has invited Brazil, Canada, the EU, France and Spain as co-chairs to the conference, justified by being “major supporters of Haiti” (UN, March 31, 2010a), countries, such as for instance Venezuela and Cuba are marginalized.

This highlights the structural effects of the dominant discourse as Venezuela pledged 2.5 billion and donated more than two million contributions in kind, in comparison to the US, which pledged 2.1 billion and had no in-kind contributions (Government of the Republic of Haiti, 2010). Consulting the UN’s FAQ leaflet (March 31, 2010a), only countries which have made financial contributions for long-term recovery and reconstruction are invited to speak. This implies that countries that have provided extensive humanitarian assistance or in-kind support were not given a voice.

This decision is particularly meaningful when taking into consideration that countries, such as Cuba, have been major providers of humanitarian assistance. Cuba has promised to reform the entire national health system and is also committed to training Haitian doctors in Cuba. As has been calculated by Kirk *et al.* (April 23, 2010), the monetary value of Cuba’s contribution is four-times as that of France and almost twice as that of Canada. Moreover, in relation to GDP, Cuba’s donation is 155 times that of the US and provides three times as many medical staff as the US (Kirk & Kirk, April 1, 2010). Whereas financial donations from countries are pledged, Cuba is actively engaging in the rebuilding process which saves lives and treats Haitians. In addition to its highly praised health care system, Cuba is also known for its emergency risk management due to its extensive experience with natural catastrophes (UN, 2004). Although Cuba serves as a successful role model for the increasingly renowned Community Based Disaster Management approach, based on strengthening local capacity and coordination as well as investing in social capital (Oxfam, 2004), best-practice techniques, such as educating programs, are not incorporated into the policy proposals. Hence, the

sidelining of certain countries mirrors their exclusion from drafting policy proposals for Haiti's future and reaffirms the structural effects of the dominant discourse formation.

But not only countries located in the 'wrong' ideological camp have been marginalized from contributions; other important actors have also not been giving a hearing. As stated in the document, titled "A Voice for the Voiceless", the civil society has been consulted in order to "ensure that the opinions of average Haitian citizens on the country's reconstruction and development could be heard" ("A Voice for the Voiceless", March 31, 2010). In series of focus groups around the country 1750 Haitians have been asked their opinion, constituting 0,02 percent of the total population (p.2). The title of the document which aims to include the views of the Haitian population seems therefore rather ironical as well as additionally implying the invisibility of the Haitian civil society and stressing the benevolence of the international community who gives them their voice back.

Despite the rather limited interviewing of the Haitian population in the rebuilding process, acknowledging of their interests does not necessarily translate their visions into the policy proposals (UN, March 31, 2010a). This instrumental approach to civil society runs clearly against the principle of democracy, rendering the adopted rhetoric by the international community as non-credible or fake. This rhetorical façade also becomes visible in terms like 'local ownership', 'Haitian responsibility' and 'Haitian-led reconstruction', considering the minimal involvement of the Haitian population in the drafting process. Moreover, as has been identified by scholars such as Brenner (1999) transferring the responsibility to the locals makes them the scapegoat if reforms do not generate the expected results. Even though the majority of Haitians, including Haitian officials, have not contributed to the policy proposals and envisioned reforms, they have to take charge of them and can thus, be blamed for failure.

Equally important and vital to the reconstruction process is the inclusion of the large number of NGOs, as they continuously provide general public services, as health care,

education, sanitation (Schuller, 2007b, 2009). According to the UN document, there were several events for NGOs organized before March 25; however, their contributions are only summarized and briefly presented at the Donors' conference. Hence, the exclusionary rules in terms of participation in the conference reflect the practical impact of the dominant discourse as it lays the framework for policy choices. The next section outlines the adopted policies.

5.2 The Two Main Policy Documents Deciding on Haiti's Future

The Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) is a technical evaluation of the damages and losses caused by the earthquake as well as a needs examination of the population and the country. This assessment, a joint draft of the Haitian government and international community is "an integral part" of Action Plan for National Recovery and Development in Haiti (Action Plan) (2010, p.3), which incorporates the policy proposals of the assessment and constitutes the major document laying the foundation for far-reaching reforms in the future.

The two documents, presented at the conference, additionally mirror the domination of the US and UN in translating identified set of problems of the situation into solutions or policies, as these were drafted in joint effort by Haitians representatives and the international community. The influence of the international community is clearly visible through included statements, such as for instance "talks have made us [Haitians] aware of the expectations of our international partners (...) for the future" (Action Plan, 2010, p. 3) and that "the strong, positive support of bilateral donors, who have exhibited a great interest in the exercise [of reconstruction]" (PDNA, 2010, p. 2) is acknowledged. Considering these terms as well as the exclusionary rules described earlier, phrases like "this proposal is Haitian because, despite the very tight schedule, key sectors of Haitian society were consulted" (Action Plan, 2010, p. 3) appear to have a simple rhetorical function. These phrases not only reaffirm the dominance of international actors in Haiti but also directly legitimize their involvement in the long-term

reconstruction process. Practically, as their 'expectations' and 'interests' are met, international actors have more control over the process than Haitians have.

Both documents begin with stressing the importance for regarding this event as a “window of opportunity” and “rendezvous with history” (Action Plan, 2010, p. 3), as well as stating that these proposals “go further than traditional post-disaster assessments” and “lay the foundations for a fresh start in the country’s development efforts” (PDNA, 2010, p. 1). Schuller (2008a, p.22) argues that the term “windows of opportunity” is increasingly used to describe in instable and fragile situations which are exploited to implement structural changes in the interest of donors. Although both documents demonstrate that the disaster primarily affected human lives, infrastructure and environment, emphasis is put on restructuring of governance, especially referring to policies providing security and implementing the rule of law (PDNA, 2010, p. 5). The preface of the Action Plan clearly expresses that in order to cope with the disaster “new ways to cooperate” must be found as well as the “strengthening the state [is] central to our action”, thereby adopting recommendations of the international community (Action Plan, 2010, p.1). This shows that the two priorities are new forms of cooperation and partnership as well as institutional reforms relating to governance.

First, this means the building of “regional partnerships” and the development of infrastructure, including roads, ports and airports, suitable for “economic and social development needs” (Action Plan, 2010, p.1). The Action Plan outlines programs of ‘territorial rebuilding’ in the first chapter which include the cleaning and reconstruction of infrastructure in the devastated areas as well as new land and urban planning. A new network of highways, three international airports and ports are envisioned to give tourists, patients, students and citizens (mentioned in this sequence) access to their needs (p.13). It is also highlighted that territorial rebuilding demands the appropriation of private land for public use and therefore a reallocation of land ownership, because Haiti’s officials are determined not

“to return to the prevailing situation before the earthquake. [...] To do so, the State has the judicial capacity to intervene” (p. 12).

Addressing the infrastructure in linking it to building new ways of cooperation and regional partnerships clearly reveals the economic interest of the international community. Profits can be made from rebuilding the island with regard to reconstruction work, education systems, hospitals and more, and at the same time an improved infrastructure enhances economic incentives for foreign investment (Schuller, 2008a, p.23).

Moreover, increased access can also mean increased control, linking this to the focus on institutional reconstruction under the framework of ‘governance’. Whereas governance might be associated with ‘good governance’ and democracy promotion, the PDNA primarily focuses on improving the state of law, justice and public security. A list of proposals are set out which include among others the improvement of infrastructure to be able to provide justice and security, the protection of vulnerable people by strengthening the police force and implementing preventive measures, the reform the penal system to increase productivity and combat corruption, structural reforms in the justice system to guarantee conformity with international instruments, as well as reforms in the justice, police and prison system in the long term (PDNA, 2010, p. 10). Adopting a similar rationale, the Action Plan states that “institutional restructuring (...) is at the heart” of rebuilding process (Government of Haiti, March 2010a, p. 40).

Although this might suggest a strengthening of Haiti’s state and thus sovereignty, Morley and McGillion (1997, p. 363) and others argue that the problem of focusing on institutional rebuilding is the simple preservation of state institutions. Whereas these include judiciaries, prisons, civil bureaucracies and the police, programs and institutions contributing to democratic empowerment are marginalized. Transforming verbalized security concerns into policies, increases the only the disciplinary and coercive power of the state. As the

Haitian government aligns and allies itself with the international community or is co-opted by their dominance, it is an extended mechanism of control by foreign actors. Hence, this institutionalization of the rule of law by reforming the justice and prison system underlines the will of the international community in support of the Haitian government to regulate the society. Zanotti's assessment (2008) of the MINUSTAH mission also highlighted the focus on reforms on coercive measures, linking it to Foucault's notion of disciplinary power. The rationale informing these policies can be linked to neoliberalism, as only a disciplined and regulated society can be adapted to the needs for unregulated economic production.

Similarly, Shamsie (2004) argues that institution building can also be attributed to an underlying capitalist rationality because it creates the suitable political institutions that ensure its development in the longer term (p. 1103). The meaning of governance has therefore been blurred, as it does not necessarily imply the empowerment or emancipation of the people but an improved 'governmentability' of the people, causing a business-friendly environment. The consequent subjugation of the population to the state or actors in possession of power is also reflected in the reallocation of land and resources, which is in the hands of the state and cannot be challenged by the population. As in the case of Haiti, the state works closely with the international community, it can be assumed that international actors will primarily appropriate land to their economic benefit.

This argument of the notion of governance as a mechanism of control is supported when considering the legal rules of implementing these proposals. As outlined in the Action Plan, a Haiti Interim Committee for the Reconstruction (HIRC) has been established, which carries out the policies and distribute the funds accordingly (p.52). Donations are collected through the Multi-Donor Trust Fund and administered by the World Bank. As the HIRC is composed of thirteen foreigners and twelve Haitians, co-chaired by the Haitian Prime

Minister, Jean-Max Bellerive, and the UN special envoy, Bill Clinton, the power balance slightly favors the international community.

As stated by the Action Plan, the HIRC mandate must be carried out in a state of emergency in order to have “*necessary powers to carry out its mission effectively*” (Action Plan, 2010, p. 52, emphasis added). As a result, on April 8, 2010, the government extended the state of emergency for another eighteen months, causing the suspension of the rule of law (Palmer, May 5, 2010). Adopting emergency measures allows President Préval to stay in office longer than his expected term, ending in February 2011, as well as giving the HIRC the power to take funds and implement measures without prior approval by the national parliament (Palmer, May 5, 2011). Interestingly, the job announcement for Executive Director for HIRC states that “Leadership experience in highly efficient and structured organizations, such as the *military*, is an advantage” (Korn/Ferry International, April 2010, emphasis added)

Hence, there is a clear linkage between policies of control and discipline and neoliberal economic reforms, described as “disciplinary neoliberalism” by Gill (1995). Considering the domination of foreigners in the rebuilding process and the extension of the emergency state, it can be expected that reconstruction efforts will not contribute to sustainable development and national liberation. Although President Préval has the right to veto (Action Plan, 2010, p.52), measures and policies adopted until present rather assume the strengthening of economic and political control of the international community over the Haitian population.

CONCLUSION

“In times of tragedy, the United States of America steps forward and helps. That is who we are. That is what we do. For decades, America's leadership has been founded in part on the fact that we do not use our power to subjugate others, we use it to lift them up” (Obama, January 15, 2010).

After having analyzed the construction of the dominant discourse and its implications in post-earthquake Haiti, this quote by the US president, Barack H. Obama, is heavy with irony. Considering the case of Haiti, an adjusted version would say “We use our power to subjugate others; we use it to lift ourselves up”.

The Foucauldian concept of governmentality has served as a fruitful framework to outline the complex construction of the discourse that reproduces global power structures and inequality. The analytic deconstruction of the discourse in Haiti after the earthquake has revealed that the international community has shaped a discourse formed around narratives of humanitarian solidarity and development needs. However, as the analysis has highlighted, rationalities that inform the discourse can also be linked to security concerns and economic considerations. These were clearly reflected in the militarization of the rebuilding process and in long-term policies for Haiti's development.

The rather adverse effects of these dominant rationalities, at least in the case of Haiti, were revealed by an analysis of past encounters between foreign actors and Haitians as well as evaluating the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment and the Action Plan for National Recovery and Reconstruction. The assessment of the two major documents has demonstrated the practical implications of these dominant rationalities, which can be associated with the political and economic subjugation of Haiti.

In addition to the analysis of rationalities and technologies, I have outlined the structural aspect of the construction of the dominant discourse. The concept of networked governance is suitable to explain the production of power and dominance as alliances between various actors have been highlighted. Therefore, it can be seen that the so-called

‘international community’ is primarily constituted by the US, other Western governments, the UN and its partner institutions WB and IMF, and various international NGOs, whereas countries such as for instance Cuba and Venezuela have largely been excluded from the discourse. Moreover, the co-option of local officials and elites has highlighted the techniques of governance that reaffirm the control by the dominant actors.

Considering these notions of political control and economic dominance, I have shown that the theory of global governmentality is useful to conceptualize the contemporary neoliberal rationality which governs our world. This is reflected in the adoption of policies that emphasize economic deregulation and liberalization on the one hand, and practices of disciplinary power and coercive control, on the other. As this case has outlined, disaster relief in Haiti informed by a neoliberal rationality, however, leads to the political and economic subjugation of the country.

While this thesis has outlined how dominance is constructed in discourse and exercised through various techniques in the case of Haiti, it serves as an example for contemporary responses to disasters. Having showed the adverse implications for the Haitian population when policies are informed by a neoliberal rationality, I propose that future disaster assistance has to be reformed in order to meet the needs of the affected community. Maintaining a neoliberal rationality to disaster relief will lead to further political control and economic exploitation of affected countries by dominant actors and thus, contribute to global inequality. Therefore, this thesis provides a starting point to rethink contemporary approaches to disaster relief, and develop strategies which will serve the needs of the affected communities and alter global power structures.

REFERENCE LIST

- “A Voice for the Voiceless”. (2010, March 31). An initiative to include the Haitian people’s views. *International Donors’ Conference Towards a Future for Haiti*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, www.haiticonference.org
- Action Plan for National Recovery and Development for Haiti. Immediate Key Initiatives for the Future. (2010). *Government of the Republic of Haiti*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, from www.haiticonference.org
- Albala-Betrand, J.M. (2000). Responses to Complex Humanitarian Emergencies and Natural Disasters: An Analytical Comparison. *Third World Quarterly*, 21(2), 215-227.
- Ban, K.M.. (2010, January 13). *Briefing to the General Assembly. Emergency in Haiti*. Retrieved on 26 March 2010 from www.un.org
- Ban, K.M.. (2010, January 18). *Remarks at Launch of Revised Haiti Flash Appeal*. Retrieved on 26 March 2010 from www.un.org
- Ban, K.M.. (2010, January 22). *Remarks to the General Assembly to Haiti*. Retrieved on 26 March 2010 from www.un.org
- Ban, K.M. (2010a, March 31). Opening Remarks to the Closing Press Conference. *International Donors’ Conference Towards a Future for Haiti*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, from www.haiticonference.org
- Ban, K.M. (2010b, March 31). Opening Remarks to the Haiti Donors Conference. *International Donors’ Conference Towards a Future for Haiti*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, from www.haiticonference.org
- Bankoff, G. (2001). Redering the World Unsafe: ‘Vulnerability’ as the Western Discourse. *Disasters*, 25(1), 19-35.
- Barry, A., Osborne, T. and Rose, N. (eds) (1996) Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neoliberalism and Rationalities of Government, London, UCL Press.
- Bartelson, J. (2006). Making Sense of Global Civil Society. *European Journal of International Relations*, 12 (3), 371-395.
- Bell, B. (2010, May 17). *Haitian Farmers Commit to Burning Monsanto Hybrid Seeds*. Retrieved on May 12, 2010, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/beverly-bell/haitian-farmers-commit-to_b_578807.html
- Bell, B. & Field, T. (2010, May 20). Poverty-Wage Assembly Plants as Development Strategy in Haiti: An Interview with the Center for the Promotion of Women Rights. *Other Worlds*. Retrieved on May 30, 2010, from <http://www.otherworldsarepossible.org/another-haiti-possible/poverty-wage-assembly-plants-development-strategy-haiti-interview-center-prom>
- Braziel, J.E. (2006). Haiti, Guantánamo, and the “One Indispensible Nation”: U.S. Imperialism, “Apparent States”, and Postcolonial Problematics of Sovereignty. *Cultural Critique*, 64, 127-160.
- Bello, W. (2006). The Rise of the Relief and Reconstruction Complex. *CADTM*. Retrieved on May 15, 2010 from <http://www.tagesschau.de/multimedia/sendung/ts19692.html>
- Berger, D. (2009). Constructing Crime, Framing Disaster. Routines of Criminalization and Crisis in Hurricane Katrina. *Punishment & Society*, 11(4), 491-510.
- Brenner, N. (1999). Beyond State-Centrism? Space, Territoriality, and Geographical Scale in Globalization Studies. *Theory and Society*, 28 (1), 39-78.
- Cannon, L. (2010, January 25). Introductory Remarks by Minister Cannon at Ministerial Preparatory Conference on Haiti. Retrieved from <http://www.international.gc.ca/media/aff/speeches-discours/2010/2010-01.aspx?lang=eng>
- CARE International. (14 May 2010). Three Months after the Earthquake: CARE International is standing with Haitians to seize the future. Retrieved on May 15, 2010, from

- <http://www.care-international.org/Media-Releases/three-months-after-the-quake-standing-with-haitians-to-seize-the-future.html>
- CBS. (January 17, 2010). Face the Nation. Interview with USAid Administrator Rajiv Shah and Lieutenant General P.K. Keen. *USAid Speeches*. Retrieved in April 10, 2010, from www.usaid.gov
- Chandler, D. (2009). War Without End(s): Grounding the Discourse of 'Global War'. *Security Dialogue*, 40(3), 243-262.
- Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (2002). Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse (Ch.1). In *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. P.A. Chilton, & C. Schaeffner (Eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chong, A. (2010). Lessons from the Haiti Earthquake Protecting Small States. *RSIS Commentaries. Rajarathan School of International Studies*. Retrieved on April 26, 2010, from www.rsis.edu.org
- Clarke, H. (2010, March 31). Chair of UN Development Group. On the occasion of the International Donors' Conference Towards a New Future for Haiti. *International Donors' Conference Towards a Future for Haiti*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, from www.haiticonference.org
- Clinton, B. (2010). What Haiti Needs. In TIME, *Haiti: Tragedy and Hope* (pp. 76-79). New York: TIME Books.
- Collier, P. & Warnholz, J.-M. (2010, January 13). We Need A Marshall Plan for Haiti. Retrieved on May 24, 2010, from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/opinions/we-need-a-marshall-plan-for-haiti/article1430309/>
- Cox, R. S. ;Long, B.C.; Jones, M.J.; Handler, J.& R. (2008). Sequestering of Suffering: Critical Discourse Analysis of Natural Disaster Media Coverage. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 13(49), 469-480.
- Crush, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Power and Development*. London: Routledge.
- Davis, M. (2006). *Planet of Slums* (pp.1-50). London: Verso.
- Delatour, P. (2010, May 20). Keynote Remarks. *U.S. Department of Commerce's Haiti Reconstruction Business Dialogue*. Retrieved on May 25, 2010, from <http://blog.trade.gov/2010/04/30/secretary-of-commerce-hosts-haiti-reconstruction-business-dialogue/>
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the Societies of Control. *The MIT Press*, 59, 3-7.
- Dean, M. (2009). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. Sage Publications.
- De Larrinaga, M. & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign Power and Biopolitics of Human Security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), 517-537.
- De Waal, A. (2008). Foreword. In N. Gunewardena, & M. Schuller, (Eds.). *Capitalizing on Catastrophe. Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reconstruction* (pp.ix-xiv) Plymouth: AltaMira Press.
- Dillon, M. and Reid, J. (2001) Global Liberal Governance: Biopolitics, Security and War. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 30, 41-66.
- Donini, A. (2008). Through a Glass, Darkly. Humanitarianism and Empire. In N. Gunewardena, & M. Schuller (Eds.). *Capitalizing on Catastrophe. Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reconstruction* (pp.29-46). Plymouth: AltaMira Press.
- Doty, R.L. (1996). *Imperial Encounters*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Doyle, K. (1994). Hollow Diplomacy in Haiti. *World Policy Journal*, 11(1), 50-58.
- Dupuy, A. (2006). Haiti Election 2006: A Pyrrhic Victory for René Préval? *Latin American Perspectives*, 148(3), 132-141.

- Duffield, M. (2007). *Development, Security and the Unending War. Governing the World of Peoples*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Elliot, K.A. (2010, January 25). Haitian Recovery, Sweatshop Jobs, and the Role of Trade Preferences. *Center for Global Development*. Retrieved on May 20, 2010, from <http://blogs.cgdev.org/globaldevelopment/2010/01/haitian-recovery-sweatshop-jobs-and-the-role-of-trade-preferences.php>
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development. The Making and the Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Ferguson, J. (2006). *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order* (pp. 89- 112). Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Ferguson, J. & Gupta, A. (2002). Spatializing States: Toward an ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality. *American Ethnologist*, 29(4), 981-1002.
- Ferguson, J. (1993). The Duvalier Dictatorship and Its Legacy of Crisis in Haiti. In *Modern Caribbean Politics*. Anthony Payne and Paul Sutton (Eds.) Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge & the Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1994). The Right of Life over Power and Death. In P. Rabinow. *The Foucault Reader* (pp. 258-272). New York: Pantheon Books
- Foucault, M. (1988) Interviews on Power in L. D. Kritzman ed., *Michel Foucault. Politics, Philosophy, Culture*. Routledge Chapman & Hall. pp.: 166-73, 96-109.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Lectures on "Politics and the study of discourse" and "Questions of methods"; "Governmentality". In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, (eds.). G. Buchell; C. Gordon, and P. Miller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly Practices. Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- GDG Concrete & Construction. (2010). Personnel. Retrieved on May 20, 2010, from <http://www.gdgbeton.com/english/personnel.html>
- Gelb, B.A. (2005). Haitian Textile Industry: Impact of Proposed Trade Assistance. *Congressional Research Service*. Retrieved on May 15, 2010, from <http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/3919.pdf>
- Gelder, K. (2000). Postcolonial Voodoo. *Postcolonial Studies*, 3(1), 89-98.
- Georgieva, K. (7 May 2010). "When disaster strikes we are all brothers". *Commissioner Georgieva's Blog*: Retrieved on May 15, 2010 from <http://blogs.ec.europa.eu/georgieva/when-disaster-strikes-we-are-all-brothers/>
- Gibbs, N. (2010). Lost City. In TIME, *Haiti: Tragedy and Hope*. (pp. 16-28). New York: TIME Books.
- Gill, S. (1995). Globalization, Market Civilization, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism. *Millennium* 23(3), 399-423.
- Gordon, C. (1991). „Governmental Rationality: An Introduction.“ In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, (Eds.). G. Buchell; C. Gordon, and P. Miller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Government of the Republic of Haiti, (2010). List of Donor/Pledges. *Plateforme pur la Refondation d'Haiti*. <http://www.refondatyalitics/rc?sessionId=12752862870593043>

- Gros, J.-G. (2008). Indigestible Recipe: Rice, Chicken Wings, and International Financial Institutions. Or Hunger Politics in Haiti. *Journal of Black Studies*.1-13
- Gros, J.-G. (2000). Haiti: The Political Economy and Sociology of Decay and Renewal. *Latin American Review*, 35(3), 211-226.
- Gros, J.-G. (1996). Towards a taxonomy of failed states in the New World Order: decaying Somalia, Liberia, Rwanda and Haiti. *Third World Quarterly*, 17 (3), 455-472.
- Gunewardena, N. (2008). Human Security versus Neoliberal Approaches to Disaster Recovery. In N. Gunewardena, & M. Schuller (Eds.). *Capitalizing on Catastrophe. Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reconstruction* (pp.3-16). Plymouth: AltaMira Press.
- Gunewardena, N. & Schuller, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Capitalizing on Catastrophe. Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reconstruction*. Plymouth: AltaMira Press.
- Haiti police appeal for help over escaped prisoners. (2010, Januray 22). *BBC News*. Retrieved on May 10, 2010, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8474293.stm>
- Hallward, P. (2004). Option Zero in Haiti. *New Left Review*, 27, 23-47
- Hansen, L. (2006). *Security as a Practice. Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge.
- Hardy, C.; Harley, B. & Phillips, N. (2004). Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solitudes?. *Qualitative Methods*, 2 (1), 4-15.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Harvard University Press.
- Healing Haiti Reports. (2010). *Al Jazeera*. Retrieved on April 12, 2010, from <http://english.aljazeera.net/focus/haitiearthquake/>
- Hervé, J.M. (2010, May 8). Teleco, Haiti's State Phone Company, Finally Privatized. *HaitiAnalysis*. Retrieved on May 10, 2010, from <http://www.haitianalysis.com/2010/5/8/teleco-haiti-s-state-phone-company-finally-privatized>
- Hornbeck, J.F. (2009). The Haitian Economy and the HOPE Act. *Congressional Research Service RL34687*. Retrieved on May 5, 2010, from http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RL34687_20090911.pdf
- Huckin, T. (2002). Textual Silence and the Discourse of Homelessness. *Discourse & Society*, 13 (3), 347- 372.
- International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). (2010). *Haiti Earthquake Situation*. Retrieved from www.icrc.org
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2010, 22 January). Haiti. Sixth Review Under the Extended Credit Facility, Request for Waiver of Performance Criterion and Augmentation of Access. Retrieved from <http://www.cepr.net/documents/publications/imf-2009-10.pdf>
- Joseph, J. (2009). Governmentality of What? Populations, States and International Organisations. *Global Society*, 23 (4), 413 – 427.
- Jessop, B. (2001). Bringing the State Back in (Yet again): Reviews, Revisions, Rejections and Redirections. *International Review of Sociology*, 11(2), 149-173.
- Jessop, B. (2007). From Micro-powers to Governmentality: Foucault's work on statehood, state formation, statecraft and state power. *Political Geography*, 26, 34-40.
- Kelly, M. (2008). International Biopolitics: Foucault, Globalization and Imperialism. *Theoria* 119. Retrieved on April 15, 2010, from http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/3887/1/Theoria_-_final.pdf
- Kirby, J.; Callaghan, T.; Rogers, M.; Stevermer, A. (2010, January 18). Press Briefing on the U.S. Government Response to the Haiti Earthquake. *USAid Speeches* Retrieved on 22 March 2010 from www.usaid.gov
- Kiersey, N. (2009). Neoliberal Political Economy and the Subjectivity of Crisis: Why

- Governmentality is Not Hollow. *Global Society*, 23(4), 363 – 386.
- Kirk, E.J.; Kirk, J.M.; Girvan, N. (April 23, 2010). Media Distortion regarding Cuba's Humanitarian Activities in Haiti. Retrieved on May 10, 2010, from <http://hcvanalysis.wordpress.com/2010/04/24/media-distortion-regarding-cubas-humanitarian-activities-in-haiti/>
- Kirk, E.J. & Kirk, J.M. (April 1, 2010). Cuban Medical Aid to Haiti. Retrieved on May 10, 2010, from <http://www.counterpunch.org/kirk04012010.html>
- Klein, N. (2006). *The Shock Doctrine*. London: Penguin Books.
- Koh, H.H.(1994). The "Haiti Paradigm" in the United States Human Rights Policy. *The Yale Law Journal*, 33(8), 2391-2435.
- Korn/Ferry International. (2010, April). Confidential Position Specification. Interim Haiti Reconstruction Commission (IHRC). Executive Director. Retrieved on May 20, 2010, from http://www.refondation.ht/resources/IHRC_Position_Spec-English.pdf
- Kreps, G.A. (1984). Sociological Inquiry and Disaster Research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10, 309-330.
- Lemke, T. (2002). Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique. *Rethinking Marxism* 14, 49-64.
- Lemke, T. (2001). 'The Birth of Bio-Politics' – Michel Foucault's Lecture at the Collège de France on Neo-Liberal Governmentality. *Economy & Society*, 30(2), 190-207.
- Lennox, M. (1993). Refugees, Racism, and Reparations: A Critique of the United States' Haitian Immigration Policy. *Stanford Law Review* 45 (3), 687-724.
- Locke, G. (2010, May 20). Remarks at Haiti Business Reconstruction Dialogue. U.S. Department of Commerce's Haiti Reconstruction Business Dialogue. Retrived on May 25, 2010, from <http://www.commerce.gov/news/secretary-speeches/2010/04/20/remarks-haiti-business-reconstruction-dialogue>
- Lyons, M. (2009). Building Back Better: The Large-Sclae Impact of Small-Scale Approaches to Reconstruction. *World Development*, 37(2), 385-398.
- Maguire, R. (2009). Haiti after the Donors' Conference. *US Institute of Peace*. Retrieved on May 10, 2010, from http://www.usip.org/files/haiti_after_donors_conference.pdf
- Marines Corps Intelligence Activity. (2005). *Marine Corps Midrange Threat Estimate: 2005-2015*. Department of Defense Intelligence. Retrieved from <http://file.wikileaks.org/file/us-marines-mid-range-threat-assessment-2005.pdf>
- Medicine Sans Frontière (MSF). (2010, January 19). Doctors Without Borders Plane with Lifesaving Medical Supplies Diverted Again from Landing in Haiti. *Press Release*. Retrieved on May 15, 2010, from <http://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/press/release.cfm?id=4176>
- Merlingen, M. (2006). 'Foucault and World Politics: Promises and Challenges of Extending Governmentality Theory to the European and Beyond', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 35, 181-96.
- Milliken, J. (1998). The Study of Discourse in International Relations: Reflections on Research and Methodology. *CEU Working Paper IRES*. No. 98/2.
- Mills, C. & Shah, R. (2010, January 15). On-The-Record Briefing by State Department Counselor Cheryl Mills and USAid Administrator Raj Shah. The Situation in Haiti. *USAid Speeches*. Retrieved on 22 March 2010 from www.usaid.gov
- Mitchell, T. (1991) "The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and their Critics" *American Political Science Review*, 85(1), 77-96.
- Morley, M. & McGillion. (1997). "Disobedient" Generals and the Politics of Redemocratization: The Clinton Administration and Haiti. *Political Science Quarterly*, 112(3), 363-384.
- Mulet, E. (2010, January 25). Haiti Earthquake. *UN Assessment*. Retrieved on 26 March 2010 from www.un.org

- Mulet, E. (2010, February 24). Press Conference on Situation in Haiti by Secretary-General's Acting Principal Deputy Special Representative. Retrieved on 26 March 2010 from www.un.org
- Neumann, I. (2008) 'Discourse Analysis' in: *Qualitative Methods in International Relations* (pp. 61-77). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nyers, P. (2006) *Rethinking Refugees. Beyond States of Emergency*. New York: Routledge.
- Obama, B. (2010, January 15). Why Haiti Matters. *Newsweek*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/01/14/why-haiti-matters.html>
- Oxfam. (2004). CUBA. Weathering the Storm: Lessons in Risk Reduction from Cuba. Retrieved from http://www.preventionweb.net/files/1900_VL206102.pdf
- Oxfam. (2010a). *Major Earthquake in Haiti*. Retrieved on May 10, 2010, from <http://www.oxfam.org/en/emergencies/haiti-earthquake>
- Oxfam. (2010b). Haiti: A Once-in-a-Century Chance for Change. Beyond Reconstruction: Re-envisioning Haiti with Equity, Fairness, and Opportunity. *136 Oxfam Briefing Paper*.
- Palmer, D. (2010, May 5). U.S. House approves trade bill to help Haiti. *Reuters*. Retrieved on May 15, 2010, from <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6443Z320100505>
- Pastor, R. A. (1996). The Clinton Administration and the Americas: The Postwar Rhythm and Blues. *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, 38(4), 99-128.
- Pelling, M. & Dill, K. (2006). 'Natural' Disasters as Catalysts of Political Action. *Chatham House*. ISP&NSC Briefing Paper 06/01, 4-6. Retrieved on May 15, 2010 from <http://burmalibrary.org/docs4/Pelling-Disasters-1.pdf>
- Pels, P. (1997). The Anthropology of Colonialism: Culture, History, and the Emergence of Western Governmentality. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26, 163-183.
- Press Conference on Situation of Haiti. (2010, March 9). *UN Press Conference*. Retrieved on 26 March 2010 from www.un.org
- Preston, J. (2010, January 15). Haitians Illegally in U.S. Given Protected Status. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/16/world/americas/16immig.html>
- Rabinow, M. (1984). *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Rabinow, P. & Rose, N. (2006). Biopower Today. *BioSocieties* 1, 195-217.
- Roberts, J.M. (2010, January 13). Things to Remember when Helping Haiti. *The Heritage Foundation*. Retrieved on May 8, 2010, from <http://blog.heritage.org/2010/01/13/things-to-remember-while-helping-haiti/>
- Robertson, P. (Januray 13, 2010). Pat Robertson: Haiti 'Cursed' By 'Pact To The Devil'. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved on May 8, 2010, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/13/pat-robertson-haiti-curse_n_422099.h
- Rodham Clinton, H. (2010, January 15). Clinton Briefing on Situation in Haiti. Retrieved on May 14, 2010, from <http://www.america.gov/st/texttrans-english/2010/January/20100115201154ihecuor0.974754.html>
- Rodham Clinton, H. (2010, January 22). Remarks by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton. *USAid Speeches*. Retrieved on 22 March 2010 from www.usaid.gov
- Rodham Clinton, H. (2010, March 31). Remarks at the International Donors' Conference Towards a New Future for Haiti. *International Donors' Conference Towards a Future for Haiti*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, from www.haiticonference.org
- Romero, S; Lacey, M. (January 13, 2010). Fierce Quake Devastates Haitian Capital. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/13/world/americas/13haiti.html>
- Rose, N. and Miller, P. (1992). Political Power Beyond the State. The Problematics of the Government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43(1), 173-205.

- Rosset, P. (2009). Food Sovereignty in Latin America: Confronting the 'New' Crisis. *NACLA Report on the Americas*. Retrieved from <http://www.pcusa.org/foodcrisis/resources/rosset.pdf>
- Sarkozy, N. (2010, January 22). New Year Greeting to the Diplomatic Corps. Retrieved on May 14, 2010, from <http://ambafrance-us.org/spip.php?article1505>
- Schofield, H. (2010, January 19). Sarkozy quells Haiti rift with US. *BBC News*. Retrieved on May 18, 2010, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8468211.stm>
- Schuller, M. (2007). Invasion or Infusion? Understanding the Role of NGOs in Contemporary Haiti. *The Journal of Haitian Studies*, 13(2), 96-119.
- Schuller, M. (2008a). Deconstructing the Disaster after the Disaster: Conceptualizing Disaster Capitalism. In N. Gunewardena, & M. Schuller (Eds.). *Capitalizing on Catastrophe. Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reconstruction*. (pp.17-28). Plymouth: AltaMira Press
- Schuller, M. (2008b). "Haiti is Finished!". Haiti's End of the History Meets the Ends of Capitalism. In N. Gunewardena, & M. Schuller (Eds.). *Capitalizing on Catastrophe. Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reconstruction* (pp. 191-214). Plymouth: AltaMira Press.
- Schuller, M. (2009). Gluing Globalization: NGOs as Intermediaries in Haiti. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 32(1), 84-104.
- Sending, O. J. and Neumann, I. (2006). 'Governance to Governmentality: Analyzing NGOs, States, and Power', *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(3), 651-672.
- Selby, J. (2007). Engaging Foucault: Discourse, Liberal Governance and the Limits of Foucauldian IR, *International Relations*, 21, 324-45.
- Shamsie, Y. (2004). Building 'low-intensity' democracy in Haiti: the OAS Contribution. *Third Worlds Quarterly*, 25(6), 1097-1115.
- Stallings, R. A. (2002). Weberian Political Sociology and Sociological Disaster Studies. *Sociological Forum*, 17(2), 281-305.
- Stepick, A. (1982). Haitian Boat People: A Study in the Conflicting Forces Shaping U.S. Immigration Policy. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 47(2), 163-196.
- Stepick, A. & Portes, A. (1986). Flight into Despair: A Profile of Recent Haitian Refugees in South Florida. *International Migration Review*, 20(2), 329-350.
- Stiglitz, J. (2006). *Making Globalization Work* (pp. 3-103). London: Allen Lane.
- Strauss-Kahn, D. (2010, January 22). Why We Need a "Marshall Plan" for Haiti. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved on May 10, 2010, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dominique-strausskahn/why-we-need-a-marshall-pl_b_432919.html
- Strauss-Kahn, D. (2010, March 31). Statement by the IMF Managing Director Dominique Strauss-Kahn during the International Donors Conference Towards a New Future for Haiti. *IMF Press Release*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, from www.haiticonference.org
- Sullivan, M.P. (2006). Caribbean Region: Issues in U.S. Relations. *Congressional Research Service*. RL32160. Retrieved on May 30, 2010, from <http://file.wikileaks.org/file/crs/RL32160.pdf>
- Taylor, P.J. (2002). The State as Container: Territoriality in the Modern World System. in N. Brenner; B. Jessop; M. Jones, G. MacLeod (Eds.). *State/Space: A Reader* (pp. 101-115). New York: Blackwell Publishing.
- Textile and Apparel Haiti Research Report. (2006). Abstract. *Fashion Infomat*. Retrieved on May 17, 2010, from <http://fashion.informat.com/research/infre0000276.html>
- Thompson, G & Cave, D. (2010, January 16). Officials Strain to Distribute Aid to Haiti as Violence Rises. *New York Times*. Retrieved on May 10, 2010, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/17/world/americas/17haiti.html>

- Tierney, K; Bevc, C. & Kulgowski, E. (2006). Metaphors Matter: Disaster Myth, Media Frames and Their Consequences in Hurricane Katrina. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 604, 57-81.
- Titschner, S.; Meyer, M.; Wodak, R.; Vetter, E. (2003). Two Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis. (Ch.11). In *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. S. Titschner; M. Meyer; R. Wodak & E. Vetter (Eds.). London: Sage Publications.
- Trouillot, M.-R. (2001). The Anthropology of the State in the Age of Globalization. *Current Anthropology*, 41(1), 125-137.
- United Nations. (2004). Cuba: A Model in Hurricane Risk Management. *Press Release IHA/943*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/iha943.doc.htm>
- United Nations. (2010a, March 31). Frequently Asked Questions. *International Donors' Conference Towards a Future for Haiti*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, from www.haiticonference.org
- United Nations. (2010b, March 31). The Construction of the Situation on the Ground: MINUSTAH's role in the International Response after the Earthquake in Haiti. *International Donors' Conference Towards a Future for Haiti*. Retrieved on April 6, 2010, from www.haiticonference.org
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Critical Discourse Analysis. (Ch. 18). In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. D. Schiffrin; D. Tannen; H. E. Hamilton. (Eds.). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Walters, W. (2006). Border/Control. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9(2), 187-203.
- Wasem, R.E. (2010, March 31). U.S. Immigration Policy Towards Haitians. Retrieved on June 1, 2010, from <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS21349.pdf>
- Waeber, O. (1993). Societal Security : The Concept. In O. Weaver; B. Buzan; M. Kelstrup ; P. Lemaitre (Eds.) *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe (Ch.2)*. London: Pinter.
- Weisbrot, M. & Sandoval, L. (2007). Debt Cancellation for Haiti: No Reason for Further Delays. *Center for Economic and Policy Research*. Retrieved from www.cepr.net.
- Welch, M. (2008). Ordering Iraq: Reflections on Power, Discourse, & Neocolonialism. *Critical Criminology*, 16, 257-269.
- Willard, A. (2010, January 14). France's Sarkozy says time to end Haiti's "curse". *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60D4TU20100114>
- Young, R. J.C. (1995). *Foucault on Race and Colonialism*. Retrieved on May 7, 2010, from <http://robertjcyoung.com/Foucault.pdf>
- Zanotti, L. (2008). Imagining Democracy, Building Unsustainable Institutions: The UN Peacekeeping Operation in Haiti. *Security Dialogue*, 39 (5), 539-561.