2008

The Honest Broker? Canada's Role in Haitian Development

Michele Zebich-Knos
Kennesaw State University, mzebich@kennesaw.edu

The Honest Broker? Canada's Role in Haitian Development[*]

Michele Zebich-Knos

Abstract

Since the early 1990s Canada has played a key role in Haiti's development process. The article explores whether Canada's foreign policy is becoming more reliant on military-assisted solutions, including peacekeeping, as a way to solve Haiti's internal problems and achieve good governance. The article also examines the Canadian concepts called "Responsibility to Protect, React and Rebuild" which are linked to humanitarian intervention, and their implication for Haitian sovereignty. The conclusion cautions against an overly ambitious Canadian development policy for Haiti which has little chance of success.

Key words:Canadian Foreign Policy, Sovereignty, Human Rights Development , Economic Development, Democracy, Haiti, Canada.

After twenty one years of post-Duvalier turmoil, Haiti still ranks as one of the poorest countries in the world. While Haiti has benefited from knowing that it could actually hold presidential elections, as it did in December 1991, December 1995, November 2000, and February 2006, it still seeks a permanent transition to peace as well as significant antipoverty efforts. Neither of these goals has yet to materialize.

Haiti is a country with 80 percent of its citizens under the poverty line, a 2007 per capita GNI of $ 480, and massive unemployment and considerable infrastructure shortcomings (CIA World Fact book, 2007; Library of Congress 2006; World Bank, 2007). These problems coupled with an increasingly high cost of living (*la vie chère*), an unstable public services sector and rising crime rates, are the main concerns of Haitians today.

Haiti is also in dire environmental straits and suffers from severe degradation. Deforestation is extensive and continues as Haitians cut trees for firewood. As a result, most hillsides in this mountainous country are greatly eroded. Ac-

---

cording to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), uncontrolled environmental degradation undermines economic recovery and hampers long-term development. Environmental degradation is especially problematic in the area of food security and lowered crop yields due to soil depletion (An Assessment of the Current Situation, 1995:84).

Unfortunately, the restoration of President Aristide to power in 1994 with the help of the U.S. military, did not resolve the grave economic problems facing most Haitians. As a result, election euphoria of 1990 has given way to resigned acceptance of the fact that no president, even Aristide, could effect real change in such a short time. This sentiment is what President Préval, elected in 1995 and again in 2006, must now accept as reality in 2007. Haitian leaders must tackle the more challenging business of healing their ailing economy against almost insurmountable odds of corruption and criminality. However, it is not sufficient to emphasize economic growth as long as such growth follows traditional patterns of income maldistribution in a country with a small and wealthy Francophone-elite and an impoverished mass of mostly rural, and largely illiterate, Creole-speakers.

30

CANADA: STILL THE HONEST BROKER?

Within the context of this challenging backdrop, Canada, has –since the early 1990s– played a key role in many aspects of Haiti's development and thus ended what Klepak calls "a century of aloofness" in the Americas (Klepak, 2006:677). In July 2007 Prime Minister Harper visited Colombia, Chile and Barbados. He ended his trip in Port-au-Prince, Haiti where he met with President René Préval and announced that a stable Haiti is vital for the "security of our entire region" and also emphasized how "he [Préval] can count on our help to make Haiti more safe [sic] and more prosperous" (BBC Monitoring Service, 2007). What made his speech reflective of Canada's new *security-enabled* development approach is that he prefaced his introductory sentence with the words "I'm proud to be in Port-au-Prince today to demonstrate the support of our government for the United Nations stabilization mission and the 46 Canadians who are serving here" (Prime Minister Statement, 2007). Addressing initial attention to UN peacekeeping and security forces instead of Haiti's own specific needs might be perceived as an insensitive way to convey Canada's intentions –especially to his Haitian audience.

A visit to Cuba on this trip was visibly absent despite its role as contributor to a Canadian foreign policy made in Ottawa and not Washington (McKenna and

Kirk, 2007). This Haitian visit was not happenstance. Rather, it was likely a planned deflection from Canada's Cuba policy, and a reinforcement of Haiti's role as Canada's "most important long-term development assistance beneficiary in the Americas" and is the second largest recipient of Canadian foreign aid after Afghanistan (Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2007).

While Haitian relations are often linked to the United States as a result of its closer geographic proximity, 1915-1934 military occupation, control of its customs' houses until 1941 (Skidmore and Smith, 2005:336) and Miami and New York-centered migration, Canada's foreign policy plays a significant role in facilitating political and economic development within this francophone and Créole-speaking country. Canada provides many millions of dollars worth of foreign assistance to Haitian development. However, these efforts often go unnoticed, especially by the U.S. public, as Canada conducts its low-keyed and less flamboyant-style of foreign policy in the poorest and most politically tumultuous country of the Americas.

The United States is associated with attention-grabbing, and often negative, claims toward, or perceptions of, Haiti. These include those made by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and a member of Congress concerning former president Jean-Bertrand Aristide's psychological stability, as well as media images of capsized boats loaded with desperate Haitian refugees in search of a better life (McCoy, 2000:378). On the contrary, Canada's *Haiti image* is portrayed in a more tempered light in which Haitian immigrants arrive legally by plane already speaking at least one official language (French). Furthering this image is the current Canadian Governor-General, Michaëlle Jean, who is also a Haitian émigré and an honored official at President Préval's inauguration. Engagement between the two countries is seemingly positive with little of the tensions so noticeable between Haiti and the United States. Canada's Haitian population, while located mainly in Québec, is thus an effective source for keeping Haiti on the front burner in Ottawa.

To the south, Haitian-American interests are overshadowed by U.S. preoccupation with Cuba. This is a direct consequence of savvy maneuvering and use of the U.S. political system by Cuban-Americans. Of course, places like Miami, and to a lesser extent, New York are home to not only Cubans, but other Spanish-speaking Latinos. This Latino dominance diminishes the attention paid to Haitian voices for political change. Haitian-Americans are also notably more divided and subtle about their political views than are Cuban-Americans who exhibit strong emotional dislike for the Cuban government and are quick to vilify Fidel Castro, especially when television cameras are rolling. Haitian-Americans rarely get such coverage.

Yet, as Canada incorporates the military pillar into its development policy toward Haiti, and stresses hemispheric security as Harper is wont to do, we must ask whether this idyllic image described above is still an accurate one. Is Canada's foreign policy becoming more receptive to foreign military solutions to Haiti's internal security problems connected to political violence, gangs and narcotrafficking? And, what effect does this policy have on sovereignty and independent decision making, concepts so greatly cherished by Canada? Before we seek answers to these questions, an explanation of Haiti's overall *development dilemma* is in order so that we can place Canadian policy in its actual working environment.

BACKGROUND TO HAITI'S DILEMMA OF DEVELOPMENT

Haiti and the Many Faces of Development

Many scholars criticize the neoliberal development model that advocates growth through a free trade arena that favors the North and *sound* –according to neoliberal standards–, domestic economic policies. They state that the social and political costs are too great. These policies are often associated with structural adjustments that attempt to drastically cut public spending, reduce the burden of a bloated bureaucracy, and eliminate unprofitable state enterprises in order to generate needed revenue. Korten uses the term *people-centered development* (Korten, 1992:61-66). Hirschman also focuses on grass-roots empowerment and expressed "a revulsion against the worship of the 'gross national product' and of the 'rate of growth' as unique arbiters of economic and human progress" (Hirschman, 1991:39).

Canada's foreign policy toward Haiti appears very compatible with such people-centered development models, but what distinguishes it from Korten and Hirschman's models is the recent militarily-reliant component for achieving its development objectives. Prior to the 1990s, Canadian foreign policy exhibited a greater willingness to work with all types of governments, including enemies of the United States such as the Nicaraguan Sandinistas. However, as we will see in later sections, Canada has altered parts of its foreign policy framework within which it structures its support of Haiti's development process.

Korten takes issue with those who stress that first the economic pie must grow before more people can benefit from it. Instead, he states "people-centered development says take care of equity first, provide people the means to make productive use of their assets, and appropriate growth will take care of itself" (Korten, 1992:65). This is unrealistic in a country such as Haiti for most people

cannot make productive use of their assets because they have so few tangible assets. In order to productively use assets, Haiti's economy must first acquire enough capital investment to produce jobs and expand access to credit so that individuals have the opportunity to save and develop assets. For "progress" to occur, there must be investment in social infrastructure that yields sound macro-economic results and also nourishes personal needs. Investing in health care, transportation systems, and education to name but three areas, can enhance people's quality of life and foster economic growth. Canada invests in all three.

Why was this not done previously in Haiti? Lundahl answers this for us by stating:

> Political life became a concern for small cliques that invested their resources in devices that would allow them to capture or retain the highest office and the spoils that came with it. The government apparatus turned into a mafia –a kleptocracy– that milked the treasury, and ultimately the nation, in order to obtain private incomes . . . The very essence of the political process has been the extraction of rents with the aid of the state apparatus. It would seem strange if the same kind of logic were not present among those who are today's pretenders to the throne... (Lundahl, 1992:401-402).

Thus, inadequate infrastructure and outdated facilities are often the result of institutionalized kleptocracy which siphons money to corrupt individuals rather than spending it on needed improvements. This was all too evident, especially in the past. At Haiti's port facilities, for example, container ships in the 1990s usually paid US $30,000-60,000 more for docking in Haiti than at any other Caribbean port (Cordoba, 1996). One wonders where the extra money went, if not to port improvements that are not apparent to outside observers.

To facilitate Haiti's development process, as Canada and others recognize, one must first tackle numerous deficiencies, such as institutional and governance structures, general infrastructure, education and healthcare simultaneously. Second, one must trust that forces for change both internal and external will have a sufficient impact to counteract the traditional kleptocracy described by Lundahl and others (Maingot, 1988; Dupuy, 1997). This cannot be done using optimum investments in an ideal setting; rather, it must be done with full awareness that current investment levels are insufficient to improve quality of life in the short term. Yet, Haiti has no other option. Achieving the perception of "growth mode" economy amid a slowly improving infrastructure might generate momentum and attract additional investment –as long as it does not implode in another one of its political *bust* cycles. Gradual progress is what external supporters like Canada hope will occur.

33

REVISTA MEXICANA DE ESTUDIOS CANADIENSES

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

Haiti today is at the crossroads of two major problem areas which are connected to improving the economy, furthering socio-economic and human rights development and enabling good governance. These areas include (1) effective political leadership and institutions; and, (2) law and order. Without successful improvements in these arenas, it is unlikely that Haiti's economy will improve thereby making reduction in poverty unlikely. This explains why Canada had adopted the *Responsibility to Protect* framework (which I will detail in a later section) as a comprehensive approach to achieving development goals. It is, after all, a reduction in Haiti's massive poverty that is the foremost development objective, and impediment, to democracy and good governance. Not surprisingly, the 2005 Report of the UN Security Council Mission to Haiti noted that most Haitians with whom UN representatives talked

> . . . identified themselves with the statement of a Transitional Government official that poverty is 'the underlying root of unrest in Haiti,' as well as the consensus view that there could be no genuine stability in the country without the strengthening of its economy. Both the Haitian interlocutors and the mission stressed the need for a long-term strategy to promote development and combat poverty (UN Security Council, S/2005/302, 2005).

The "wait and see" period, so typical of private investors before committing to a new investment, will be extended over many more years if Haiti is unable to demonstrate improvement in these areas. Economic development can easily be thwarted by these non-economic factors. For economic improvement to begin, it becomes necessary to take a multi-prong approach and tackle a host of sub-problems simultaneously within these two main categories.

The first area of concern is that of political leadership and institutions. Haiti's democratic history is practically non-existent and achievement of political stability, as expressed through democratic and sustained leadership change, is not an easy task. Whether Haiti will continue to follow the democratic rule of law is questionable given past tradition. The most recent example of democratic leadership lapses occurred not that long ago in September 1991 when President Jean-Bertrand Aristide was overthrown in a military coup and again in February 2004 when Aristide was ushered out of Haiti –this time by foreign, and mostly U.S., forces (CIA World Fact Book, 2007; Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, 2007).

Restoration of Aristide after his first coup took place in 1994, only after the United States was on the brink of invading Haiti to achieve this objective through force. Access to power in the Haitian political arena and the public sector in

general has always been based on a clientelist structure whose purpose was to reward those astute enough to align with the right patron in order to find a comfortable niche within the public sector. Government that is responsive to its citizens was, and seemingly still is, absent. Haitian government has traditionally been most responsive to those lucky enough to be employed, or connected in some manner, to its institutions (Oakley and Dziedzic, 1996).

Dupuy describes Haiti as a "prebendary state" in which the political regime and its office holders benefit from politics much as entrepreneurs benefit from private business. That is, they derive not only salary, but also other financial benefits such as those obtained from bribes or outright siphoning of public funds (Dupuy, 1997:21). Lundahl (1992) and others refer to the Haitian state as predatory, or a kleptocracy (Maingot, 1988). Whether prebendary or predatory, the Haitian political system has traditionally functioned as a means for self-enrichment in an economy too feeble to provide much private sector entrepreneurial opportunity to all but a few. Corruption within state institutions has changed very little today (Moreau, 2006:80). The only difference is that foreign development projects are now more reliant on private, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) for much of the project management.

A civic minded bureaucracy bent on the efficient delivery of public services thus became the exception and not the rule. Publicly controlled basic infrastructures such as communications, power, health and education suffered as a result. The picture painted here is that of a public sector wrought with self-aggrandizement and general inefficiency. Today, few would argue that such traits must be corrected before meaningful development will occur. To attract investment, especially in the secondary –or industrial– sector communications and power supply (i.e., electricity) must improve and function on a regular basis. This is not the case today where most Haitian cities still experience near daily power outages.

Let us not forget that infrastructure improvements will also benefit the mass of impoverished Haitians who have come to expect little from public services. Haiti's political shortcomings are widely recognized in the international community and in Canada, in particular, as a major obstacle to development. In order to improve the Haitian economy, the international lending community is united in what steps Haiti needs to take. For better or worse, these steps follow a liberal, free-market approach that include privatization of state owned enterprises, *responsible* government spending, and a reduction of the bloated public sector workforce. These are standard "structural adjustments" known all too well in other parts of the developing world and remain unchanged from what was requested of Haiti in the 1980s. These bitter pill remedies have become

35

wrapped up into current reforms of Haiti's political institutions yet also provide fuel for in-fighting among Haiti's political parties and parliamentary stalemates.

What is demanded is nothing less than a total redefinition of the Haitian State. Outside forces, including Canada, are asking Haiti to produce (1) democratic transfer of political power; (2) a more honest and pared down public sector; and, (3) the privatization of enterprises that have benefited from longstanding political patronage. In short, they are asking Haiti to abandon its past behavior and redefine its traditional clientelist methods. Expecting this to occur in ten or twenty years is unrealistic –especially in a country once called part of the *fifth world* by Mother Teresa (Keller, 2005:35). It is reasonable to expect that corruption and prebendary use of the state will not abruptly disappear. Only with the growth of meaningful, private sector employment opportunities will Haitians alter a view of the State as chief provider.

By 2004, the very reforms needed to improve and enhance Haiti's political institutions proved politically volatile and further destabilized its leadership while President Aristide resorted to more heavy-handed tactics to quell his opponents. Without visible economic improvements in an era of rising expectations, President René Préval faces potential discontent in his second term, just as he did when elected in 1995. He too could easily be undermined by mass demonstrations and parliamentary rivals. Indeed, paramilitary revolts, student demonstrations and parliamentary division ultimately led to Aristide's departure from office in 2004.

Under the second problem area of law and order, judicial reform and the successful operation of Haiti's civilian police force must be demonstrated before significant investment into Haiti's economy will occur. Instances of gross abuse and human rights violations abound during the military regime of General Raoul Cédras (1991-1994), yet allegations of similar actions were also rampant during Aristide's second term in office –and continue today.

Since great abuse was perpetrated at the hands of the military and military-controlled police, the first step was to abolish the military and train a civil police force –yet disarming the Haitian army (FADH) never occurred, which partially explains how insurgents created so much turmoil in 2004. To be effective, such a police force must also be supported by a meaningful judiciary. This is why judicial training, administrative supervision, and courtroom security became objects of concern following the removal of General Cédras and are still part of the development agenda today (An Assessment of the Current Situation, 1995:78).

CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE HAITIAN CASE

Foreign Policy Background

Equipped with a new variation to its traditional foreign policy, Canada has stepped, in recent years, into this turbulent Caribbean context. The policy objectives seek to promote democracy and good governance, support development, alleviate poverty, and enhance Canadian as well as Haitian security. Canada was known for its foreign policy role as honest broker, one in which political leanings were often overlooked in favor of accomplishing social and economic development goals. While the United States has a long history of unilateral Central American and Caribbean economic and military invasions and occupations, Canada's record is devoid of such incursions. In the post-World War II era Canada also stressed a multilateral approach to problem solving in the global arena while the United States is known for its strong critique of the United Nations in particular.

A middle power is how Howard and Donnelly (1990) described Canada's foreign policy orientation. This depiction still holds true today.

> Canada is, or strives to be, a middle power in world politics. Its chief preoccupations are to expand its political influence and to diversify its trade links while maintaining its membership in the western alliance and its extremely important friendly relations with the United States. A principal means to this end is to project an image of tolerance and concern for the Third World [and] by acting as an "honest broker"… between North and South (Howard and Donnelly, 1990:9).

While the United States was in the throes of a Cold War and fighting 1980s era, pro-Communist governments directly as in Grenada, or by proxy, in Nicaragua, Canada stuck to its foreign policy of moderation and balance. Balance was needed to keep the U.S. superpower content and convinced that its northern neighbor sided with the anti-Communist approach so evident in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Canada was, and is still, a NATO member. Nevertheless, while the United States maintained a predominantly East-West approach to its foreign policy, Canada pursued a North-South approach –one that emphasized development and human rights unconnected to communism.

This notion of balance translated into a Canadian policy that seemingly took no sides despite its NATO membership; and instead, sought what was best for the achievement of noble societal goals, i.e. poverty alleviation. This enabled Canada to interact, for example, with Sandinista forces as the United States actively funded and supported the Contra rebels in Nicaragua during the 1980s. As long as Canada balanced its NATO commitments accordingly, it would not incur the wrath of its southern neighbor and largest trading partner. Thus, Canada became

known for foreign policy based on an intermediary and non-threatening role, or *honest broker*, aimed at solving socio-economic problems without becoming embroiled in Cold War political machinations. In other words, Canada played both sides of the fence –and this worked well to portray it as the nice, non-confrontational *honest broker* living next to a dogmatic and arrogant neighbor. Consensus seeking thus became a proud Canadian value in the Cold War as it had been in Canada's past history.

While not officially pro-Sandinista during the 1980s, it did support the legal Nicaraguan government and sent over $12 million in 1987-1988 to further its development and humanitarian goals Canada also supported multilateral efforts during those war-torn years to achieve lasting peace and bring an end to Central America's civil wars. In 1986 it vigorously condemned U.S. actions to mine Nicaraguan harbors and, by 1990, Canada had given $ 580,000 to the Nicaraguan government for its presidential election effort, balloting supplies, and electoral media campaigns (Howard and Donnelly, 1990:8). Canada was clearly trying to project three foreign policy elements: its own sovereignty vis-à-vis the United States, multilateralism, and tolerant concern for less developed countries (LDCs). As noted by Howard and Donnelly there were "strong nationalist reasons for Canada to have an independent foreign policy toward Nicaragua, as it has had toward Cuba since the Castro revolution" (p. 10). This independent attitude, was good for domestic consumption and played well among Canadian voters. It also explains why Canada was not a member of the Organization of American States (OAS) during the Cold War. Yet, as I will explain in later paragraphs, this changed noticeably in January 1990 when Canada joined the OAS. This event helped shift Canada away from a role of balance to one of expanded engagement –including support for an international military presence– this time in Haiti.

Haiti has not changed, but Canada's foreign policy approach to the hemisphere's poorest country has evolved from an economic development, anti-poverty model to include achievement of political stability and good governance. These two latter objectives would be helped along by multilateral forces, on an *as-needed* basis. Ironically, the term as-needed appears to have shifted to a permanent basis. Nevertheless, Canada has not altered its strategic world-view as purveyor of tolerance and concern for LDCs. Instead, it changed its tactics. While one development policy goal is still poverty alleviation, Canada has expanded the acceptable methods with which to achieve this goal. This came about as multinational organizations, particularly the United Nations, altered its view of the mechanics of multilateral intervention for humanitarian causes and sovereignty. For better or worse, Canada's multilateral policy ironically intersected,

and came into closer harmony with, the more interventionist policy followed by the United States toward Haiti.

RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT AND HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION

In a 2005 Pew Research Center survey, almost ninety-four percent of Canadian respondents believe that Canada is "well-liked" by other countries (Pew Global Attitudes Project, 2005). This attitude may derive from Canada's multilateral approach in which it considers itself a friend of the world –especially the Third World, and countries like Haiti in particular. As the world's problems evolved in the 1990s and early twenty-first century toward post-Cold War threats related to failed or fragile states' inability to resolve their internal problems, working for the common good in a multilateral team became enmeshed with the use of military intervention.

After OAS urging, the United States invaded Haiti in October 1994 to facilitate the successful routing of General Cédras and his coup plotters from power and the return of Jean-Bertrand Aristide to the presidency. For Canada to justify its shift to multilateral military support as a tool for development and democratic governance, it had to create and conceptualize a framework that fit its new approach. This twenty-first century approach came to be known as the 3-Ds: diplomacy, defense and development and not only projected a stern front against terrorists, but also incorporated the military into Canada's traditional development policies for the developing world (Thompson, 2005). The military was needed because, unlike the Sandinista example, Canada no longer tolerated *problem* governments of countries whose citizens it was trying to help. This is certainly true of Haiti under Aristide after his return to the presidency in 1994, and again, after his 2000 reelection.

Specifically, the 3-Ds rely on a more complex framework developed by Canada's International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) and contained in *The Responsibility to Protect* report issued in December 2001. This report spells out how –and why– Canada should intervene to protect the well-being of those in need, despite the possible conflict of sovereignty rights. While the report mentions examples from around the world, this paper confines itself to how Canada's policies relate to the Haitian example only.

Canada's *responsibility to protect* policy is based on the well-recognized international legal principle called humanitarian intervention which states that, despite recognition of sovereignty, states have a right to intervene militarily in another sovereign state, provided humanitarian disaster warrants such interven-

tion. The report thus reiterates the "question of when, if ever, it is appropriate for states to take coercive –and in particular military– action, against another state for the purpose of protecting people at risk in that other state" (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001:VII).

The answer to this question is a resounding yes to multilateral intervention: "sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their own citizens from avoidable catastrophe –from mass murder and rape, from starvation– but that when they are unwilling or unable to do so, that responsibility must be borne by the broader community of states" (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001:VIII).

Linking to the multilateral aspect, the report goes on to clarify that "where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect" (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001:XI). This language provides Canada with a broad brush with which to justify intervention and diminishes its traditional honest broker role which implies that Canada will not take sides.

40

CALLING IN THE MILITARY

Clearly Canada took sides, and reserved the right, for example, to decide whether the Haitian government in 2004 was unable to halt the insurgency that gained momentum on February 5 in Gonaïves and was led by former members of the disbanded military, Guy Philippe and Louis-Jodel Chamblain. Canada was not the only state to take this view which was shared by many in the international community including the United States. The solution to this internal Haitian political problem was deemed to require intervention just as it had in 1994 to restore Aristide to office. This time the outcome would be very different and, on February 29, 2004, President Aristide was ushered by U.S. forces to a plane destined for the Central African Republic while Canadian forces secured the airport (Engler and Fenton, 2005:19). These foreign forces acted under Multinational Interim Force (February-June, 2004) auspices and were authorized by UN Security Council Resolution 1529 (UN Press Release SC/8015, 2004). It appeared that Aristide was the victim of those who were ostensibly trying to save his life. He claims, however, that he was forced out in a coup d'état by U.S. troops and did not abandon Haiti willingly. Needless to say, Aristide takes a dim view of his current exile, holds Canada partially responsible, and stated in a 2005 interview from South Africa that

> What we need is to move from elections to elections, not coup d'état to coup d'état . . . The United States, France, Canada and so many others should do something to repair, if they can, what they did. Because what they did is a crime (Aristide interview with Amy Goodman, quoted in Engler and Fenton, 2005:20).

The Canadian foreign policy pillar of supporting "good governance" was certainly not met in the second Aristide administration, and international patience was wearing thin. This pillar focused on respect for human rights, democratic procedure and a functioning and responsive bureaucracy (Keating 2001:210). Aristide was no pristine leader and his 2000 reelection was marred by allegations that voter turnout was at a mere ten percent. The voice of this former priest was becoming more isolated from his citizenry and, by late 2003, opposition political parties, Fanmi Lavalas break-off party OPL, and other civil society groups called for his resignation (United Nations, MINUSTAH, 2007).

On January 31, 2004, the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) devised a Prior Action Plan to facilitate crisis mediation. This plan was followed by an actual implementation plan created by the Group of Six which included Canada, CARICOM, the European Union, France, the OAS and the United States. Canada was a player in this attempt to stave off more violence and thus conveyed a graduated and tempered approach – one that values diplomacy first before military action, in keeping with its 3-D policy. Aristide also agreed to the plan which called for reforms and a new cabinet. By doing so he would be able to serve out his term in office. However, opposition leaders would not agree and the chaos escalated until insurgents marched to take over the capital, Port-au-Prince (United Nations, MINUSTAH, 2007).

In early morning February 29, 2004 Aristide resigned. By the evening of February 29, the Permanent Representative of Haiti to the United Nations, acting under the auspices of interim president Boniface Alexandre, formally requested UN assistance, which was already on the ground by the 29th. Yet, military involvement at the last minute, rather than before, as Aristide requested, did not go unnoticed by Engler and Fenton (2005). They argue that this was a planned action and ask why troops were involved at the coup's culmination to oust Aristide rather than days sooner (Engler and Fenton 2005:18-19). Earlier assistance might have kept Aristide in office, something that many powers did not want. Alexandre's request included not only military assistance, but also economic aid, and authorized an international force to enter Haiti. Through UN Security Council Resolution 1529 the Multilateral Interim Force (MIF) was created and aimed at maintaining order and conflict avoidance in the short term – but only after Aristide was out of the picture.

In April 2004 Security Council Resolution 1542 called for the creation of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) and by June of that

year, MIF was folded into this more complex entity. MINUSTAH's mission has gradually increased from maintaining law and order in the absence of a well-trained police force to one in which "MINUSTAH remained committed to mobilizing resources for projects that make an immediate difference in people's lives" (United Nations, MINUSTAH, 2007). Its mission in Haiti has been extended since its inception and current authorization (S/RES/1743) expires on October 15, 2007, with the likelihood that it will be renewed.

Within a multilateral context, Canada's foreign policy thus justified intervention into a fragile state like Haiti after the 2004 uprising. The presumption is that the Aristide government was unable, or unwilling, to stop the violence and even provoked more violence by targeting opponents. This situation prevented Aristide's government from helping his people, many of whom are in dire economic straits. The end result was military assistance (intervention?) by the United States, France and Canada which resulted in President Aristide being ushered out of Haiti and taken to exile in Africa. With an armed international stabilization force (MINUSTAH) in place, Canada can say that it used diplomacy first by supporting the Prior Action Plan, and when it did not succeed, only then did it agree to a military solution to quell the violence and create at least a semblance of good governance.

Now that MINUSTAH is present in Haiti, Canada's third pillar –development can be viably tackled. Canada not only welcomes MINUSTAH's role, but also actively contributes military and police personnel to its effort. At the height of the crisis in March 2004 there were 450 Canadian military personnel in Haiti while the number has decreased to 46 by July 2007 (National Defence, 2006; Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, 2007).

If we examine long term United Nations military involvement in Haiti, as Table 1 reveals, we notice that Canada is a continuous participant and has, unfailingly, contributed military and/or police personnel to each UN peacekeeping mission to Haiti. This is in keeping with its 3-D view of foreign policy, but also raises questions about an overextended foreign outreach that may have other motives.

Keating (2001) cautions Canadians against "taking up the 'White Man's burden'" and notes that they are generally wary of foreign intervention and/or occupation, even for democracy promotion. He reminds us that Canadian foreign policy makers have traditionally avoided such foreign entanglements lest they be perceived as overly pushy and resemble their southern neighbor. Yet Keating also recognizes that "in the post-Cold War environment Canadians in and out of public office have been infected with the crusading spirit and have decided that promoting democracy and related noble causes such as human security is indeed a worthwhile activity deserving of official support and public resources" (Keating,

TABLE 1. STATE PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS MILITARY MISSIONS TO HAITI

UN MISSION	DURATION	CONTRIBUTORS OF MILITARY OR POLICE BY COUNTRY
United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH)	September 1993-June 1996	Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Canada, Dijbouti, France, Guatemala, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Mali, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United States
United Nations Support Mission in Haiti (UNSMIH)	July 1996-July 1997	Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Canada, Dijbouti, France, India, Mali, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United States
United Nations Transition Mission in Haiti (UNTMIH)	August-November 1997	Argentina, Benin, Canada, France, India, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, United States
United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH)	December 1997-March 2000	Argentina, Benin, Canada, France, India, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, United States
United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH)	June 2004-Present	*Military Personnel:* Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Jordan, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Phillipines, Sri Lanka, United States and Uruguay *Police Personnel:* Argentina, Benin, Brasil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Guinea, Jordan, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Togo, Turkey, United States, Uruguay and Yemen.

Source: United Nations, MINUSTAH, *Background Fact & Figures*, 2007, http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/minustah/facts.html (accessed July 14, 2007).

2001:208). It appears that the end of the Cold War had a great influence on Canadian foreign policy and sparked the idealistic desire to facilitate democracy, human rights, and anti-poverty policies. After all, many scholars and practitioners exhibited this renewed hope in democracy's expansion; and, Francis Fukyama's book, *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992), further encouraged policy makers toward this end.

THE RESPONSIBILITY TO REBUILD... AND PREVENT

Canadian Electoral Support

The previous section explained Canada's defense, or reactive, portion of its foreign policy which includes the (1) responsibility to *prevent*; (2) responsibility to *react*; and, (3) responsibility to *rebuild* (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001:XI). Let us now focus on Canada's role in rebuilding Haiti, otherwise, referred to as development assistance. However, rebuilding also includes prevention which addresses the root causes of poverty and political unrest that often lead to violence and ensuing intervention in Haiti. Prevention can conceptually include not only economic development projects, but also expert Canadian assistance to facilitate fair and free elections

The end of the Cold War era also explains why Canada was now able to join a regional organization which now focused on democracy building and not the U.S. dominated anti-Communist agenda. Canada officially joined the OAS in January 1990 and, by June 1990, supported creation of the Unit for the Promotion of Democracy (UPSD), known to those of us who worked under its tutelage in Haiti simply as the *Democracy Unit*. Most notably, the Democracy Unit was responsible for coordinating, aiding and sending observers to Haiti's 1990 presidential election which is considered to be Haiti's first free election. Keating reminds us that former Canadian ambassador, John Graham, was its first director (Keating, 2001:211).

During the 1991 elections, Chief Electoral Officer Pierre-F. Coté served as head of Québec's Electoral Mission to Haiti, and was named coordinator of the Democracy Unit's foreign election observers mission to Haiti and Personal Representative to the OAS Secretary-General. This Québec-led OAS mission also provided the bulk of Canadian assistance to Haiti's Provisional Electoral Council, known by its French-language acronym, CEP (Chief Electoral Officer of Québec/ Directeur Général des Elections du Québec, 1991). Table 2. reveals the numerous election missions while Québec's electoral assistance was a natural fit with francophone Haiti. As we see from Table 2. there is a longstanding French-

Canadian role since Haiti's first, albeit unsuccessful, attempt at presidential elections in 1987. That first election came after the 1986 coup against president-for-life Jean-Claude (Baby Doc) Duvalier.

TABLE 2. HAITI MISSIONS CONDUCTED BY THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER OF QUÉBEC

DATE	MISSION GOAL	ORGANIZATIONAL AUSPICES	TYPE OF MISSION
11/1987	Observer	N/A	Observer Mission
3/1990-2/1991	Coordinator of OAS Mission and Personal Representative to the OAS Secretary-General	Organization of American States -OAS	Technical Assistance Mission
1/1993-10/1993	Technical Assistance	OAS	Technical Assistance Mission
1/1997-2/1997	Analysis of Haitian Diaspora voting in Haitian Elections	Québec Ministry of International Relations	Analysis and Evaluation Mission
7/2004-7/2004	Donors Conference on Haiti	Québec Ministry of International Relations	Meeting of Experts
8/2004-9/2004	Legal Consultation on electoral laws	Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	Technical Assistance Mission

Source: Chief Electoral Officer of Québec (2007) *Liste des missions à l'étranger par année financière*. http://www.electionsquebec.qc.ca/fr/missions.asp?t=m&r=a&annee=tous&tb=o (Accessed July 25, 2007).

Electoral support from the Canadian government extended into the 2006 Haitian elections. Elections Canada, which is responsible for federal and provincial elections management, was selected to oversee Canada's observer mission to these elections (Elections Canada, 2007). The International Mission for Monitoring Haitian Elections (IMMHE) was established on June 16, 2005, dur-

ing the Montréal International Conference on Haiti and completed its mission to observe the February 7, 2006 elections. INNHE was later replaced by the Canadian Mission for Accompanying Haitian Elections (CMAHE) and Jean-Pierre Kingsley, Chief Electoral Officer of Canada, was selected as head of CMAHE which sent two observer teams to Haiti. To facilitate sound electoral processes, CMAHE observations and expertise were shared with Haiti's Provisional Electoral Council (CEP). As such, CMAHE characterized its work as making a "significant contribution to Haiti's long-term development, particularly with respect to the development of democratic practices (Elections Canada, 2007:1).

FINANCIAL COMMITMENT TO DEVELOPMENT

The Montréal International Conference on Haiti (June 16-17, 2005) was a bilateral endeavor co-sponsored by the governments of Haiti and Canada with the goal of ensuring democratic elections in Haiti and support for socio-economic improvements which would take Haiti beyond the transitional government period (Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, 2007). The Montreal Conference was a later iteration of what was recognized in the July 2004 International Donors Conference held in Washington, D.C. In that conference the international donor community committed to spend $400 million to achieve development goals set forth in the *Interim Cooperation Framework, 2004-2006* (ICF, 2004). The ICF was formulated by the United Nations, European Commission, World Bank, and Inter-American Bank in consultation with the Interim Haitian government and forms the basis for the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) projects in Haiti.

CANADA-HAITI COOPERATION

CIDA's relationship with Haiti is based not only on the ICF, but also on a past development track record stemming as far back as 1968. By 1994-2004, Canada provided more than $ Cdn 600 million, or $US 564 million, in development assistance to Haiti (CIDA, 2004:6). According to CIDA, development assistance focuses on the following ICF-related pillars:
  - Political governance issues including security, policing, prisons, and electoral processes;
  - Institutional and local development, land-use planning and decentralization;
  - Economic revitalization, jobs creation and infrastructure development;
  - Improvement of public services –education, water, sanitation, and health (CIDA, 2006).

Projects are ambitious if only in a numerical sense and range from making micro-loans to 100 women in the communities of Haute St-Marc, Goyavier and Betrand, to vaccinating 384,344 children against diphtheria, tuberculosis and polio (CIDA, 2007b). Many of the projects are small scale and reveal very concrete outputs. This specificity results from lessons learned in the field; that is, to keep project design "simple and well-defined . . . with modest objectives" (World Bank, 2006).

Despite the urge to expect only small advances, the whirlwind of international conferences in which Haiti is discussed as if it were a sick patient awaiting major surgery, contributed to what CIDA (2004) calls a donor-driven agenda imposed on the Haitian government. This exuberance for pouring massive amounts of money and expertise into Haiti, often with conditions attached, resulted in "poor commitment and ineffective implementation" (CIDA, 2004:11). Lack of visible change can also contribute to donor fatigue which may cause donors to remove their support altogether. After the contentious 2000 elections, conditionality was imposed with the intention to promote transparency, and sound economic and fiscal policies. CIDA (2004) questions whether such conditionality actually worked especially since, by February 2004, the Haitian government experienced some of the worst political turmoil since the1991 coup.

CIDA projects are administered either through the Haitian government as partner, or, through an NGO. Partnering with a government noted for mismanagement and corruption poses obvious questions of efficacy, but the proliferation of NGO links to CIDA projects raises its own set of concerns. The myriad of NGOs involved in development projects resembles a shot gun approach that, if left unchecked, may also not yield the desired results. Yet, NGO partnerships will continue to be tapped as long as Haiti's governmental institutions exhibit inefficient and corrupt practices and NGOs remain closely linked to civil society in donors' eyes.

Shamsie (2004) argues that reliance on NGOs is productive because it not only helps development goals, but also fosters democracy. As representatives of civil society, NGOs nurture democratic practice in a country whose elite manipulated such groups to keep democracy at bay and bolster a system that favored their well being –not that of the masses (Shamsie, 2004:1106). However, beyond their democracy building and development function we must keep their activities in perspective and remind ourselves that they are unelected actors whose own transparency may be harder to monitor and whose internal infrastructure may rely too heavily on the whim of international donors and non-profit foundations who fund them. As such, they must be regarded as a vital actor, but not a substitute for the creation of sound public institutions.

Compounding this issue is the confusion surrounding uncoordinated donor activities where USAID, for example, may fund private sector project delivery while

another donor funds a public ministry to do the same work (CIDA, 2004:13). Project duplication is the result, can be costly, and is of little didactic value to Haitians who are watching the outsider *experts* who purport to know how to help Haiti.

Despite CIDA's resolve to work with Haiti, its frustration clearly shows by its depiction of Canada-Haiti cooperation as a "difficult partnership" (CIDA, 2004). The United States' historical dealings with Haiti coupled with an unpopular military occupation from 1915-1934 resulted in rather low expectations for that country. On the contrary, Haiti's lack of sustained progress despite numerous international financial, security and other efforts, visibly wears on the more idealistic Canadian development agency.

Perhaps CIDA thought its commitment and sincerity might somehow be sufficient to convince Haitians to make the projects succeed, thus leading it closer to the golden prize of sustained development. Admittedly, its projects are numerous, and taken individually, perhaps accomplish their stated objectives, but in the big picture they "did not seem to provide a critical mass of results" (CIDA, 2004:12). Infrastructure, governance, and rule of law work very well in Canada, and are a source of pride. However, to expect that these same qualities will materialize in the near future under the guise of sustainable development and good governance in Haiti is a frustrating exercise in humility.

Daudelin (2007) urges a 'time for modesty' and cautions Canada's policy makers against overreach. Similar to the World Bank's recommendation, Daudelin urges CIDA to maintain realistic objectives rather than grandiose ones (Daudelin, 2007:21). Robert Fatton also recognizes the obvious – that "the 'international community' does not have the appetite for long-term ventures in state-building" (Fatton, 2006:23). This means that expanding CIDA's role to include an Office for Democratic Governance, which was created in October 2006, might also fall into the dustbin of unsuccessful attempts to help Haiti (CIDA, 2007a; Perlin and Wood, 2007:6). Haiti is still Haiti –with all its political baggage and enduring poverty. And, Rome was not built in a day.

REFERENCES

US House of Representatives; An Assessment of the Current Situation in Haiti: Hearings before the House Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on International Relations. One Hundred Four Congress, Sess. 1 (1995, October 12). Washington D.C.

Amy Goodman Interview with Jean-Bertrand Aristide In: Engler, Yves and Anthony Fenton. 2005. *Canada in Haiti: Waging War on the Poor Majority*. (Vancouver: Red Publishing, and Black Point; NS: Fernwood Publishing).

BBC Monitoring Service. 2007, July 24. *BBC Monitoring International Reports*. "Haitian President, Canadian Prime Minister Hold Joint News Conference." Lexis Nexus.

Canadian International Development Agency. 2007a. Office for Democratic Governance. http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CanadaCorps. Accessed July 27, 2007.

Canadian International Development Agency. 2007b. Haiti: CIDA-funded projects. http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca. Accessed July 16, 2007.

Canadian International Development Agency. 2004 December. *Canadian Cooperation with Haiti: Reflecting on a Decade of "Difficult Partnership.*

Canadian International Development Agency. 2006 July. Canada-Haiti Cooperation – Interim Cooperation Framework Result Summary (April 2004-March 2006) – Final Report. http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca. Accessed July 16, 2007.

Chief Electoral Officer of Québec /Directeur Général des Elections du Québec. 2007. *Liste des missions à l'étranger par année financière.* http://www.electionsquebec.qc.ca/fr/missions.asp?t= m&r= a&annee= tous&tb= o (Accessed July 25, 2007).

Chief Electoral Officer of Québec/Directeur Général des Elections du Québec. 1991 June. *Rapport A L"Assemblée National Sur La Participation Du Directeur Général des Elections A La Tenue D'Elections En République D'Haïti.* Sainte-Foy, Québec.

Cordoba, J. 1996, January 11. "Politics Bogs Down Privatization in Haiti." *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A 10.

Daudelin, Jean. 2007. "Canada and the Americas: a Time for Modesty." *Behind the Headlines.* Canadian Institute of International Affairs. Vol. 64(3), pp.1-28.

Dupuy, A. 1997. *Haiti in the New World Order: The Limits of the Democratic Revolution* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).

Elections Canada. 2007, February 16. *Canadian Mission for Accompanying Haitian Elections (CMAHE): Final Report on the December 3, 2006 Elections.*

Engler, Yves and Anthony Fenton. 2005. *Canada in Haiti: Waging War on the Poor Majority* (Vancouver: Red Publishing, and Black Point; NS: Fernwood Publishing).

Fatton, Robert. 2006. "The Fall of Aristide and Haiti's Current Predicament." in Shamsie, Yasmine and Andrew S. Thompson (eds.) *Haiti: Hope for a Fragile State.* Pp. 15-24 (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press).

Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, Ministry. 2007. "Montréal International Conference on Haiti – 2005" http://geo.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/library/montrealconference-en.aspx. Accessed July 20, 2007.

Fuyyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press).

Hirschman A.O. Quoted in: J.K. Black. 1991. *Development in Theory and Practice: Bridging the Gap* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).

Howard, Rhoda E. and Jack Donnelley. 1990. *Confronting Revolution in Nicaragua: U.S. and Canadian Responses.* Case no.507. Publication of the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Interim Cooperation Framework, 2004-2006. 2004 July. Summary Report prepared by the Republic of Haiti, European Commission, Inter-American Development Bank, United Nations, and World Bank.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. 2001 December. *The Responsibility to Protect.* Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre).

Keating, Tom. 2001. "Promoting Democracy in Haiti: Assessing the Practical and Ethical Implications" in Rosalind Irwin (ed.). *Ethics and Security in Canadian Foreign Policy.* pp. 208-226 (Vancouver: UBC Press).

Keller, Tony. 2005 December 19. "Three Smarter Ways to Save the World." *Maclean's*, 35.

Klepak, Hal. 2006. "Haiti and Cuba: Test Cases for Canada, but tests of what?" *International Journal - Canadian Institute of International Affairs.* vol. 61, num. 3.

Korten, D.C. 1992. "People Centered Development: Alternative for a World in Crisis" in K.E. Bauzon (ed.) *Development and Democratization in the Third World* (Philadelphia: Crane Russak).

Lundahl, M. 1992. *Politics or Markets: Essays on Haitian Underdevelopment* (New York: Routledge).

Maingot, A.P. 1988. *Haiti: Problems of a Transition to Democracy in an Authoritarian Soft State* (Miami: Institute of Latin American Studies, University of Miami).

McCoy, Dorcas Eva. 2000. In Stuart S. Nagel (ed.). *Handbook of Global International Policy* (New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc).

McKenna, Peter and John Kirk. 2007, July 24. "Sí, an Americas policy without Havana." *The Globe and Mail*, A19.

Moreau, Col. Jacques. 2006. "Reflections on the Situation in Haiti and the Ongoing UN Mission" in Yasmine Shamsie and Andrew S. Thompson (eds.). *Haiti Hope for a Fragile State* (Waterloo: Wilfed Laurier University Press).

National Defence Ministry of Canada. 2006. Backgrounder: Operation HAMLET – Canadian Forces commitment in Haiti. http://www.forces.gc.ca. Accessed July 23, 2007.

Oakley, R. and Dziedzic, M. 1996, June. Sustaining Success in Haiti. *National Defense University Strategic Forum*, no. 77.

Perlin, George and Wood, Bernard. 2007 February 15. Co-Chairs' Report on "A Dialogue on Canada's Approach to Democratic Development." Collaborative event sponsored by members of Canada's Democracy Council. Ottawa.

Pew Global Attitudes Project. 2005. "16-Country Global Attitudes Report: Canada. Released June 23, 2005." http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID= 247. Accessed July 10, 2007.

Prime Minister of Canada. 2007 July 20. "Statement by the Prime Minister on his visit to Haiti." http://www.pm.gc.ca Accessed July 23, 2007.

Shamsie, Yasmine. 2004. "Building 'low-intensity' democracy in Haiti: the OAS contribution." *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 25, num. 6, pp. 1097-1115.

Skidmore, Thomas E. and Smith, Peter H. 2005. *Modern Latin America* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Thompson, Andrew S. 2005. *Canada in Haiti: Considering the 3-D Approach, November 3-4, 2005 Conference Report*. Waterloo, Ontario.

United Nations Security Council. 2005. *Report of the Security Council Mission to Haiti, 13 to 16 April 2005*. S/2005/302.

United Nations Security Council. 2004. Press Release. SC/8015.

United Nations Support Mission in Haiti, MINUSTAH. 2007. "Background." http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/minustah/. Accessed July 14, 2007.

United Nations Support Mission in Haiti, *MINUSTAH, Background Fact & Figures*, 2007, http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/minustah/facts.html. Accessed July 14, 2007.

United States Central Intelligence Agency. 2007. *CIA World Fact book 2007*. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/. Accessed July 27, 2007.

United States Library of Congress. 2006 May. *Country Profile: Haiti*. http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/profiles/Haiti.pdf. Accessed July 20, 2007.

World Bank. 2007. "Haiti Data Profile." In *World Development Indicators Database, April 2007.* http://devdata.worldbank.org/external/CPProfile.asp?SelectedCountry= HTI&CCODE= HTI&CNAME= Haiti&PTYPE= CP (Acessed July 15, 2007).

World Bank. 2006. "Project Information Document (PID) Appraisal Stage: Haiti Electricity Loss Reduction Project." Report no. 35860.