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Abstract: The objective of this article is to demonstrate that heterodoxicality and structural violence in Haiti are intrinsically linked and that dynamics of democratic representation must be seen as a part of a continuous struggle that started during the war of independence. In Haiti’s socio-political and cultural juncture, heterodoxicality must be seen as a mechanism through which opposition can be expressed where cultural and political parts are not fully synchronized, but are still necessary for direct democracy. Furthermore, the prevalence of structural violence cannot delineate from the systematic exploitation that commenced with slavery and proceeded through colonization and the subsequent subaltern dictatorial regimes that functioned as proxies for foreign interests. The non-dialogic culture of Haiti is substantially linked to the tyrannical nature of slavery and its impact on the established institutions and subsequent dictatorial governments (regimes) that brutally emerged and maintained power by force, and in turn, further influenced the cultural path of society. In Haiti, brute and authoritative force were employed regularly, on the one hand to maintain dictatorial power, and on the other, as an attempt to quell the voices and control the actions of the disenfranchised and discontented who sought to resist and fight the rules of the established power.

As France and other colonial powers brought violence to the Caribbean and the colonized world, one colonial subject so understood his subjugated position that he was able to transcend the colonial confines of his homeland, Martinique, to assay and characterize the brutality and dehumanizing conditions suffered in another French colony, Algeria. In his view of the bloody decolonization of Algeria in the 1950s and 1960s, Frantz Fanon, a psychiatrist and member of the Front de Libération Nationale, gave his thoughtful evaluation of the significance and structural impact of colonization in the book Les Damnés de la Terre. Through his informative and transformative writing, conservatives saw Fanon as the apostle of Third World violence who was potentially far more dangerous than the threat of communism. However, for the
oppressed, he was a preacher, a beacon who brought to light the synthesis of their material and psychological conditions.

As Fanon brought the personal and collective sufferings of Algeria to the forefront, so too did Paul Farmer for Haiti. Both doctors understood the frailty of the human condition and the impact of violence and poverty upon it so well, that their individual works have had and are having considerable impact on conscious thought throughout the world. My intellectual amalgamation of the two doctors’ works and writings have served to facilitate my own understanding and reading of Haiti. Although Fanon has been my primary focus, Farmer’s work has scaffolded me through the marasmus of Haiti as he provides medical insight into the neglect that often forms structural violence.

In following the work of Johan Galtung in the 1960s, Paul Farmer, a leading medical anthropologist and doctor of internal medicine, synchronously focused his work around issues of structural violence and social medicine. In his view, the history and manifestation of diseases are inextricably linked to the history and material conditions of society. His work in Haiti and other societies where structural violence has been severe combined his passion for medicine and justice when the social structures of the society serve to prevent the various cadres from developing their potential. In a recent article published in the PLOS Journal of Medicine, Farmer explicates his views on the effects of structural violence:

In its general usage, the word violence often conveys a physical image; however, according to Galtung, it is the ‘avoidable impairment of fundamental human needs or…the impairment of human life, which lowers the actual degree to which someone is able to meet their needs below that which would otherwise be possible’.

Structural violence is often embedded in longstanding ‘ubiquitous social structures, normalized by stable institutions and regular experience’. Because they seem so ordinary in our ways of understanding the world, they appear almost invisible. Disparate access to resources, political power, education, health care, and legal standing are just a few examples. The idea of structural violence is linked very closely to social injustice and the social machinery of oppression. (Farmer et al. 2006: 2)

Likewise, I would argue that structural violence must be understood in social, political, economical, psychological and cultural terms. Since structural violence is “very closely linked to social injustice and the social machinery of oppression,” we must therefore systematically deconstruct the systematization of oppression, both current and historical, in order to reveal their continuous links. Since violence is contrary to accident, it must also be viewed in socio-personal terms as one pursues his interests while assaulting the interest or needs of others.

The objective of this article is to demonstrate that heterodoxicality and structural violence in Haiti are intrinsically linked and that dynamics of democratic representation must be seen as a part of a continuous struggle that started during the war of independence. In Haiti’s socio-political and cultural juncture, heterodoxicality must be seen as a mechanism through which opposition can be expressed where cultural and political parts are not fully synchronized, but are still necessary for direct democracy. Furthermore, the prevalence of structural violence cannot delineate from the systematic exploitation that commenced with slavery and proceeded through colonization and the subsequent subaltern dictatorial regimes that functioned as proxies for foreign
interests.

The marginality of Haiti as a nation and the subsequent political chaos that has ensued is directly linked to the colonial controls that affect the world in all of its sociopolitical realms. Consequently, in 2007, Haitians are paying for the uprising of their forefathers two hundred and three years ago. As Frantz Fanon correctly attested in *The Wretched of the Earth*, “[c]olonial domination, because it is total and tends to oversimplify, very soon manages to disrupt in spectacular fashion the cultural life of a conquered people” (1968: 236). Although in Haiti we are dealing with post-colonialism, the matrix of power relations and the consequences thereof must be examined through the colonial paradigm.

Even in the years following its independence from the tyrannical French Republic, Haiti experienced continued tyrannical regimes. What is unique about the Haitian experience is that, whether ruled by a French, American, or Haitian dictator, a significant portion of the population has always resisted and won against tyranny, albeit the results have always been short lived. Hence, there is the existence of a rebellious culture that is struggling to establish the goals and promises of the 1804 Revolution. Thus, an effort to be “the masters of our land” and fulfill the principles of “Liberty, Equality and Fraternity” has produced sociopolitical contradictions that fuel heterodoxy.

Haiti is a painfully complex society with a rich and tragic history that is rooted in Europe’s colonial conquest of the “New World.” Although young as a nation, founded in 1804, it is the second republic in the Americas and the first true democratic nation in the world. At that time of its inception, European nations were ruled by monarchies, and the United States, after winning its independence from England, constituted itself into a democratic republic where slavery was structurally legal and human rights were limited to prescribed groups. Haiti’s majority black inhabitants rose from the vicious chains of slavery to establish freedom as a primary pillar of humanness as it extended freedom and citizenship to several colonial soldiers and thousands of white Polish subjects that the French brought to Saint-Domingue as indentured servants.

The socio-political birth of the Haitian Revolution was midwifed by the French colonial violence that permeated throughout the conquered territories. Among the colonies, Saint-Domingue, in particular, was bestially violent. When the demand for sugar production increased tremendously, the amount of newly imported slaves surpassed a number that the French could maintain in its systematically violent regimen of control. Inherent contradictions within the slave system brought masters and slaves to a quasi-symbiotic relationship, whereby the brutal dehumanization of the slaves reflected the brutal psychical characteristics of the master and proliferated the plantations in a tenacious cycle of violence. Fanon, in *The Wretched of the Earth*, keenly remarked that the “violence of the colonial regime and the counter-violence of the native balance each other and respond to each other in an extraordinary reciprocal homogeneity” (1968:88). Hence, the masters’ system of brutality became the slaves’ tools of retaliation during their quest for freedom and enforcement of power during nationhood.

Since the inception of the Haitian Republic, movements to both establish universal human rights in the presence of Western controlled slavery and dismantle the notion of colonial supremacy were vehemently and intelligently argued at the turn of the 19th century. The prolific Haitian intellectual, Antenor Firmin (1885), rejected the view of white intellectual superiority and class hierarchy, and became one amongst many Haitian intellectuals (Masillon Coicou 1867-1908; Jean Price-Mars 1876-1969; Jacques Roumain 1907-1944;
and Jacques-Stephen Alexis 1922-1961) who fought against internal social contradictions as well as external repressive forces. Many of these writers, poets and intellectuals came from wealthy and modest classes and their voices against socio-economic injustice made them exponents against the structural apartheid that still permeates the country. Unfortunately, their lives were relatively short lived and not fully instituted into the national dialogue against poverty, colonialism, and servitudes; they all, except for Price-Mars and Roumain, faced death for their heterodoxy.

The relevance of heterodoxy and the discursive tradition must be viewed in the context of establishing healthy democracy and public reasoning where discussions and lawful arguments are critically important. However, the presence of structural violence is the antithesis of democracy given the absence of universal education and the overall respect for the dignity of the human person. In attempts to constantly remind the government of its mandate and to also forefront, during democratic lapses, the needs of the disenfranchised, “activists” for popular democracy usually take to the streets as a way to utilize such public space as a democratic forum to pronounce their agenda. In Haiti, activism means acting against, to be in diametrical opposition where dialogue is impossible. With the downfall of the Duvalier regimes, father and son (1957-1986), and the rise of popular consciousness, the vast majority of the population is constantly demanding proper representation in government. Due to the oligarchic nature of power and the urgency of unmet needs, the people seem to be in constant opposition to regimes that fail to serve their interests. It has become common to hear on the radio or television the following, “do not ask me what I want; I know I do not want this current government.” Such a statement may seem contradictory in and of itself, but in the context of Haiti’s historical and socio-political alienation of the masses, clarity in dialogue can at times be a rarity.

The arguments and counter arguments presented against the Duvalier family dictatorship that lasted three decades (1957-1986) were always in activists terms, culturally heated and in secret, and as Paul Farmer remarked, “[t]heir were hard years for the Haitian poor, beaten down by a family dictatorship, …father and son, ruled through violence, largely directed at people whose conditions of existence were similar to Chouchou Louis” (2005: 36). Our current heterodoxical state is problematic; for it resides in the volatile realm of argumentation that borders violence. Furthermore, in light of our dictatorial existence, contrary points of view are seen as being snub and prohibitive. As was the unfortunate case of Chouchou Louis, as reported by Farmer (2005), a poor landless peasant who had supported President Jean-Bertrand Aristide in a landslide victory in 1990 and was violently disposed of by a military coup that took place in September 1991 and lasted until October 1994. During those three years of military rule and economic embargo, approximately seven thousand people were reported killed. Chouchou Louis was arrested from a public bus in the town of Hinche, brought to a police station and beaten to death by the military for innocently asking an indirect rhetorical question about democracy. Chouchou was a victim of the paramilitary machine and his death did not figure into the statistics.

As many Haitian scholars and writers have attested (Hurbon 1987, Metellus 1987, Trouillot 1990, Dupuy 1997, Sylvain 2002), albeit in various formulations, we are living in a savage state of degradation that has systematically affected all aspects of Haitian life: ecological, social, etc… Since the advance of Capitalism in the Americas, Haiti’s primary status remains desperate in light of the most egregious exploitative and dehumanizing of conditions. Haiti’s abject misery lies in the social binaries (rich vs.
poor) where social classes form the foundation of systematic violence. Within the consequentially contradictory binary of economic possessions, the elite class perpetuates a proliferation of self-meaning in their effort at maintaining social differences; but the affects of the structural violence have bound the elite class to all the substrata, that a relationship of deference and quasi-subalternity becomes the modality, the mode of daily operations:

Having to realize, accept, and finally admit the violent tendencies or aspect of one’s country is very painful, but necessary” (Sylvain: 145). One must absolutely introspect, reflect and socio-diagnose one’s milieu as Fanon did; for any subject must ultimately understand his or her own subjectivity and frailty in order to analyze and deconstruct the socio-cultural origins of psychological phenomena like virulent violent behaviors. Having witnessed various forms of violence at an early age, violence and social inequalities are engrained in my consciousness. […] I had seen my share of violence and finally realized the depth of the country’s psychosis. […] I knew the level of violence that existed in the country, but to actually document, and interview various victims of violence and to finally admit one’s fear for one’s country was very devastating (Sylvain: 151-52).

Through our discordant history, Haiti has evolved with disparate convictions, divergent and contradictory customs and a rebellious character, causing constant socio-cultural shifting as pressures are applied to bend the popular will to submission. As a result of asymmetrical violence and abject neglect, Haiti seems to be fighting itself as various groups grapple for power and structural deprivation becomes congruent to the high incidence of inequality and impromptu military coups that arbitrate power. Thus, any attempt to examine Haiti’s past history, current contentious politics, and overall culture, inescapably involves serious arguments; for polarization rather than consensus has been the norm of the society. “The black leaders who arose in the battle against the slaveowners were in complete agreement with the masses of slaves on one point and one point alone: that slavery should be abolished” (Trouillot 1990: 44). Despite the necessity and the glory of the Haitian Revolution, the nation argued against itself due to a lack of vision during the post-revolutionary process and various interests fought for their own visions as to what would be the future of the nation.

 Unlike the Constitutional Convention of the United States, where a common interest resulted in the declaration and establishment of the legal and sociopolitical path of the States, Haiti’s path was carved by members of the military that came to power. Its new leader would have to write a new constitution in order to guarantee his interests in relation to the state. From 1804 to 1987, Haiti has gone through twenty-two constitutions. Haiti is a volatile and a highly argumentative society rather than a democratically dialogic one. The conscious or sub-conscious memory of the plantation has driven the peasants and the sub-working class to what seems like a constant state of maroonage, and as Trouillot (1990) attested, “illiterate though they were, they knew that the plantation system was close to slavery and they rejected it” (50). It is such forms of rejection the colonialists in their proprietary gazes viewed as being indolent, after all the whipping whips and the dehumanizing imposed labor have yet to decamp the Western Centers.

The systematic dehumanization of the African slaves as well as their Creole de-
scendants predicated the predominance of structural violence in Haiti. Today, such dehumanization persists in a ravaging capacity in the slums, bare mountains and desolated plains. From the time of slavery to our pseudo-independence, we have witnessed stages of private/public desolation within the realm of structural violence facilitated by various forms of dictatorships that silenced the private sphere and sealed off the public political arena against dissent. At various degrees and times, totalitarianism has gnawed at both the private and public spheres, pushing Haitians into further desolation where the uprooted and the de-potentialized person is further removed from society and cast in a constant dehumanized state.

Poverty does not necessarily equate to dehumanization for as long as one’s dignity and human potential are maintained; however, dehumanization systematically anchors poverty and strips dignity and all human potential. The dehumanized life bathes in the marasmus morasses of the slums where socio-economic conditions negate privacy as well as minimal personal private space. One fourth of Haitians in Haiti grate a scrappy survival-like-existence in the wretched slums where the spatial and sanitary environment is a violent affront to the psyche. Although Fanon reminds us that “a government which calls itself a national government ought to take responsibility for the totality of the nation” (1968: 201); we must also contextualize history as well as economic burdens absorbed by colonized states while demanding democratic responsibility and transparancy.

To fully grasp the political complexity of Haitian society today, it is paramount to comprehend the institutional network of slavery and its impact on the slaves and the socio-cultural relations/institutions that sprung from its remnants. Acknowledging the inherent dehumanization of slaves could be the basis of restructuring and thus tracing the non-dialogic aspect of a culture that has inherited the structural brute force of slavery where absolute power is fierce and all institutions are directly linked to the plantation system. Here again, Fanon’s observation was acute when looking at the colonialist and native relationship; in his view, the “settler pits brute force against the weight of numbers. He is an exhibitionist. His preoccupation with security makes him remind the native out loud that there he alone is master” (1968: 53). In a word, the paradigm of power exhibited was one of absolute force for maximum compliance. Consequently, the totalitarian and tyrannical equations learned from the colonial powers were passed down to a supposedly independent nation that remains fully dependent on foreign market needs and dictum.

Colonialism and neo-colonialism foreshadow Haitian democracy in ways that the imperial powers might not recognize. Considering a former colony that is “malfunctioning,” forgotten or ignored, one must take note of the colonial policies and “dictatorial” acts that produce or push polar reactions, one of hate and one of subaltern. The results of such a dynamic would be one of contradiction and tension. A constant violent tug between for and against, whether directly or indirectly, exists on behalf of the colonial powers. In Haiti as in many Third World countries, imperial powers rule by proxy. For the imperial or colonial subject is constantly questioning his/her existence in relation to the former master. In the words of Frantz Fanon, “colonialism forces the people it dominates to ask themselves the question constantly: ‘In reality, who am I?’” (1968: 250).

Haiti was a newly liberated slave-society that remained stratified along color and class lines where the vast majority of blacks were poor, landless and illiterate. Education was reserved for the privileged few, namely the mulatto elites, who were sent to France to be educated. Even when education became relatively accessible and com-
pursory under the reigns of Alexander Pétion (1806-1818) and Henry Christophe (1806-1820), the country was facing an international embargo. At the same time, it was also embarked in its first civil war, and the Vatican, which was the main provider of public education, did not recognize Haiti as a nation until the Concordat of 1860. The Concordat officially brought Haiti under the spiritual sphere of the Roman Catholic Church, and Catholic instruction became the main staple for the predominantly black nation that was still fighting colonialism and attempting to establish a viable state in the midst of the slave-owned societies of the Americas. Despite the establishment of the new school system and various edifices constructed in the country, the “urban élites had already tuned the educational system so that it would serve their needs exclusively” (Trouillot 1990: 51).

Thus, education and leisure remained confined to the inheritors of the economically exploitative plantation system.

Leisure, viewed in the confines of capital, was a bourgeois affair, and did not enter the realm of existence for the slaves or ex-slaves. For, a slave was a machine of production. And an exslave, despite independence, remained confined to the plantation. The issue of land ownership and land control during post-independence became the primary issue that imploded the nation and further paralyzed the revolution following the seizure of land and property by the state. As noted by Haitian political anthropologist, Michel-Rolph Trouillot, “Dessalines [the first president and then emperor of the republic] wanted...to have the state to act as supreme landlord, with the generals and high officials acting as managers or lessees of government property” (1990: 45).

The colonial structures of governance and economic production that had already conquered the eastern part of the island, now the Dominican Republic were recreated and mimicked in the newly established nation. The new leaders of the Haitian republic, especially the officers, went on a rampage seizing land and establishing a feudal economic system that lasted until the American occupation in 1915. The oligarchic military and the aristocratic class that depended on the impoverished Haitian peasantry controlled the feudal system. From 1804 to 1915, the country went through two major civil wars, fourteen constitutions, twenty violent military coups, and the disastrous occupation of the Dominican Republic in order to abolish slavery and repay the colonial debt to French slave masters who had lost their property during the Revolution. Under duress, President Boyer (1818-1843), in his quest for recognition from France and later the United States, installed a severe feudal system throughout the island in order to increase revenues for the state. Such militarized agriculture, and even milder forms of the plantation system, conflicted with the masses’ vision of freedom” (Trouillot 1990: 50), a freedom fought for, promised, but never delivered due to the militaristic and oligarchic structure of the nation and the acrid contempt revealed by European and U.S. leaders towards Haitians and their bravely won independence. As a result, repression became systematic and all institutions fell under the purview of the oligarchic state. Many schools and scholarly institutions were closed and the remaining intellectuals were either imprisoned or exiled. By the 1840s, the island spiraled into chaos as a recalcitrant dictatorship took the helm that made the Dominicans even more hateful of Haitians than they had already been.

President Boyer regretted his mistakes: occupation of the Dominican Republic for twenty-two years, and the establishment of an austere feudal system throughout the island, which can be argued, resulted in an auto-destructive campaign. Such socio-political self-destruction, or suicidal behavior, as Fanon calls it, “proves to the settler...that these men are not reasonable hu-
man beings” (1968: 54). In the views of the Dominicans, the Spaniards were far better masters; and in later years, the Dominican Republic was returned as a colony to Spain. However, the hatred of Haitians by Dominican elites is echoed in the present and has permeated throughout the culture. Haiti’s quest to satisfy France’s colonial demand for reparations led to an accelerated militaristic path that became its own form of auto-colonialism. Fanon’s keen observation about the intersection of national stagnation and treason was on point when he wrote that the “people stagnate deplorably in unbearable poverty; slowly they awaken to the unutterable treason of their leaders. This awakening is all the more acute in that the bourgeoisie is incapable of learning its lesson” (1968: 167). In Haiti, the bourgeoisie is retrograde and its members act as if they were absentee colonialists.

The influence of colonial powers, formerly or otherwise, contributes to the lack of development and independent growth in democratic cultures. For, this influence ceaselessly impedes upon the national development of its colony or former dependent state. The hegemonic culture of the imperial powers runs counter to the independence of their “subjects.” In a word, developing countries are always under the yoke of the colonial or imperial powers (Puerto Rico vis-à-vis the United States, Martinique vis-à-vis France, etc…). Since democracy must intrinsically be culturally based and can never be prescriptive, developing countries are constantly mired in institutional problems in order to find their voice, their internal identity. Haiti is the quintessential example of a country that is battling itself as a result of both external pressures and internal tensions that corrode viable means of establishing democracy. Paul Farmer brilliantly wrote in his book, Pathologies of Power, that: “AIDS and political violence are two leading causes of death among young adults. These afflictions are not the result of accident or a force majeure; they are the consequences, direct or indirect, of human agency” (2005: 40). The abject neglect of the poor, the unconstrained use of power by the military, the systematic lack of investment by the rich and the coercive foreign policies that foster dictatorial rule and corruption, has brought the country to its weeping knees.

As groups and individuals reveal their desire for power by challenging the state apparatus, there soon emerges a convergence of “national interest” with popular expressions that seems to produce an idealized inter-discursive paradigm. However, due to the heteroglotic composition of this convergence, counter-discursivity has arisen and divergence has returned within the heterodoxical matrix of the country. Thus, consensus within the heterogeneity of interests and ideas is never the norm; and it seems as if the “I” is constantly in disagreement with the “we,” and the “we” is always ambiguous. As a result, what could be the grounds for a healthy debate within the context of popular democracy becomes argumentative and can be perceived as being non-dialogic.

The choice of words used, argumentative and non-dialogic, are not only intentional, but reflect a concrete observation that points to a relatively non-discursive culture. This culture seems to be in a constant state of chaos as it struggles to maintain nationhood in light of external pressures and internal strife. Qualifying Haiti as a non-discursive culture does not categorize it as a malfunctioning society with an inherent problem; rather, this qualification is a procedural one that is rooted in history and is therefore temporal and conditional. That is, the non-dialogic aspect of Haitian culture is historical and thus contextual. The heterodoxical roots of Haiti go back to the plantations where slaves were working mules, not positing people, who were to be only seen and not heard; and even during the height of our successful revolution, Draconian control was main-
tained in order to ensure the safety of the nation as well as to instill fear in the hearts of the French and any other colonial powers that had the ambition of reconquering Haiti. The rebellious and volatile characteristics of Haiti must be viewed in their historical context especially when socio-political conflicts, civil war, and coup d’états have led to brutal violence. As a result of the unresolved issues since independence, we are witnessing what Fanon considered to be the curse of the colonized man who “will first manifest this aggressiveness which has been deposited in his bones against his own people” (1968: 52). Self-hatred and repression are the implosive socio-catalysts.

The basis for understanding Haiti’s argumentative/rebellious culture should be viewed in the context of a society that rose out of bondage and is still involved in one of the most rigid and atrocious class struggles. Fragmented, creolized and hybridized, Haiti does not have a democratic tradition, nor a continuous history of critical thought to reflect upon. The original inhabitants, the Tainos, were wiped out within the first 20 years of Spanish conquest. Haiti’s history is one of survival where pondering, reflecting and analyzing belongs to those with leisurely time. The slave’s time and labor were not his, and even after independence, the nation had to defend itself against colonial powers that held colonies in its vicinity and had intentions of repossessing it.

The non-dialogic culture of Haiti is substantially linked to the tyrannical nature of slavery and its impact on the established institutions and subsequent dictatorial governments (regimes) that brutally emerged and maintained power by force, and in turn, further influenced the cultural path of society. In Haiti, brute and authoritative force were employed regularly, on the one hand to maintain dictatorial power, and on the other, as an attempt to quell the voices and control the actions of the disenfranchised and discontented who sought to resist and fight the rules of the established power.
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