

- I've lived in Romania for about six years now, and I only finally made it to visit Bucharest this last week.
- I mean, I've been to the airport there before, but I had never gotten to visit the city
- And honestly, I didn't care all that much about visiting Bucharest.
- It's not like Paris, where they have the Louvre, Napoleon's tomb, the Eiffel tower, or other awesome stuff like that.
- And as far as architecture goes, the city is pretty, but it's not like Madrid or Barcelona, or these other really beautiful places.
- Bucharest is just a big city with crazy drivers and cold people, situated in Eastern Europe.
- But a few days ago, we took my wife's parents back to the Bucharest Airport and decided to stay a few days to see a little of the city.
- The main event for us would be to visit the palace of parliament, otherwise known as the people's house or the people's palace
- Now, I wouldn't be surprised if nobody here has ever heard of this place.
- I hadn't, until I moved to Romania.
- But I have to say, this place was worth the price of admission.
- I've been to other castles and palaces before -
- I visited Versailles when I was in like 6th grade.

- I remember the palace was impressive, and the gardens were especially magnificent.
- But the people's palace - it just blew my mind.
- The palace is the heaviest building in the world, and the second largest administrative building in the world.
- There are plenty of other buildings that cover a larger surface area or have a greater volume - but a lot of those places are like warehouses or airplane factories where there's a lot of open and empty space
- The palace of parliament covers a good bit of surface area and has a good amount of volume, and all of that space is filled up with stuff.
- The palace has over 3,000 rooms and more than 2,800 chandeliers.
- And I don't just mean tiny chandeliers.
- All the chandeliers I saw were pretty big - and one of them that I saw was mind-blowingly big.
- It was situated in one of the first halls that we saw.
- The guide said that it was so large that they planned a unique way for it to be cleaned.
- In the middle of the chandelier there was a room big enough for four small people to stand inside and clean the chandelier.
- A chandelier with a room inside it big enough to hold four people.
- Insane.
- We saw 600 pound curtains.
- A several ton carpet.

- Velvet, satin, and silk drapes inlaid with real gold.
- And of course, marble galore, which is in part what makes the building so massive.
- Now, if you look at the building from the outside, it definitely looks big.
- But it honestly doesn't look as impressive as the stats declare.
- But that's partly because there's a good portion of the building that's underground.
- There are supposedly eight underground levels, including a nuclear bunker as well as 20 kilometers of tunnels.
- In fact, you can look up Top Gear on YouTube and watch an episode where they actually raced their cars in the tunnels underneath the people's palace.
- The whole time I was walking through the palace, I held on to two conflicting emotions.
- One emotion was a feeling of awe at the size and splendor of this amazing feat of architecture.
- The other emotion was one of disgust and anger.
- This building, estimated to have a cost around 4 billion euros in today's money, was built at a time when many of the people were starving.
- And while the palace costs an estimated 6 million for utilities like electricity and heating, many of the people during the time the palace was being built went without heat and had to deal with scheduled blackouts.
- Money was not only being diverted FROM being spent on the people or infrastructure, but it was also being

taken directly from them in the form of taxes, to build a palace that was ironically, or cruelly called, “The People’s Palace.”

- How many of THE PEOPLE, I wonder, were ever served in their palace or had the opportunity to eat and sleep there.
- Calling the palace the people’s palace is of course some pretty overt propaganda, but it wasn’t the only piece of propaganda I observed while touring the palace.
- Early on in the tour we were introduced to a painting that hung on the wall -
- A painting by artist Sabin Balasha which I’ll link in the show notes.
- The painting is entitled “Apoteoza,” and depicts the masses of people ascending up into heaven to be united with God.
- Next to this painting is another one by Balasa.
- In that painting, two people - a man and a woman - are depicted as flying against the background of a blue sky, along with a dove who is accompanying them.
- The imagery is similar to another painting by Balasa, who was Dictator Nicolae Ceaucescu’s right hand painter -
- In this painting entitled Nicolae și Elena Ceaușescu, we can see the dictator and his wife in the foreground, while masses of happy people are in the background, and doves are flying around.
- This floaty imagery, the happiness, the serene blue backgrounds - they’re all characteristic of Balasa’s work

- There's another work beside Apoteoza in which a man, a woman, and a dove are all flying up to the heavens, against a blue background, of course.
- I can't for the life of me find the name of this painting or the year in which it was made, unfortunately, though I have a picture of it which I'll link in the notes.
- The point is, the foremost painter of Ceaucescu's dictatorial reign was someone who created propaganda.
- He created images of a happy, contented, provided for people, and he did so using images and terms of the divine - terms like apoteoza, or apotheosis.
- The whole consolidation of wealth and glory was awe inspiring, yet I knew that this divine palace came at the expense of the people it was supposedly for.
- Wealth was consolidated in the palace, but misery was consolidated everywhere else.

- It would be a whole lot of fun right now to spend the rest of this episode looking at the obvious propaganda and atrocities of communist dictators.
- But you probably already know that that's not where we're headed.
- We've spent our season going deeper and deeper into the weeds, so were not about to jump out now.
- We're ready to see some large scale, hard to see propaganda
- So get your weedwackers ready, cuz here we go.

- I told you earlier that there were a number of measures for building size, and that the people's palace weighs in as the heaviest building in the world.
- But in terms of square footage, there is one other administrative building that ranks higher.
- That building is the pentagon.
- While the pentagon building is estimated to be only a quarter of the cost of the people's palace, close to a trillion dollars passes through their hands every - single - year
- I guess an optimist might argue that at least the pentagon gets used to do stuff rather than sit mostly empty, like the people's palace
- But it seems a bit ominous that the largest administrative building in the world is used to plan wars
- And less than three miles away, at the U.S. capitol building, there is housed a similar painting to Balasha's Apoteoza -
- It is a mural entitled, the apotheosis of washington.
- In the picture, Washington is depicted as having risen unto the gods.
- Washington becoming divine.
- If Washington doesn't suit your fancy, you can hop over to the Lincoln memorial instead, which is half way between the pentagon and the Capitol.
- At the Lincoln memorial you can find a larger than life statue of Lincoln, upon whose statue is written, QUOTE - IN THIS TEMPLE AS IN THE HEARTS OF THE PEOPLE FOR

WHOM HE SAVED THE UNION THE MEMORY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN IS ENSHRINED FOREVER

- And not merely enshrined in a temple, but enshrined as a savior.
- Wow.
- A giant statue of the people's savior enshrined in a temple.
- Huh?
- Interesting.
- See, it's not just Eastern block communist countries that fleece the people and spend exorbitantly.
- It's not just those ignorant and blind communists who can't see through obvious propaganda and corruption.
- It's us too.
- We have our propaganda - our myths
- But what's in a myth?
- A myth by any other name our countrymen would give it, would be called history.
- Myth, or what's often called "history," is a phenomenal tool for attacking injustice.
- Injustice, of course, is something that a nation can't survive with for very long.
- It's something the Bible rails against, and a grave sin for which Israel is sent into exile and Sodom and Gommorah condemned.
- The book of James talks about unjust labor practices and heaps judgments upon those who engage in such things.
- Injustice doesn't sit well with the people, and the people consent to be governed or not.

- But a populous who demands justice will not be a populous that can be fleeced and coerced, and divvying out true justice doesn't allow for buildings like the people's palace or the pentagon to be built.
- It's in this way that myth - or pseudohistory comes in handy.
- What is myth but false justice?
- It's the bark without the bite.
- It's the narrative of justice without the effects of it.
- When you steal from the people to build a four billion dollar building - the palace of parliament - and then hire armed guards to keep all the people out, that's not just
- But if you call it the people's palace, that myth might give them pride about this building they built for their nation.
- When you elevate Washington to the status of divine and praise his fight for some ethereal notions of freedom that was withheld from the colonists - well, Washington could have done just about any other evil and we'd forget about it.
- And that's exactly what we do.
- Forget that Washington rebelled against a government for a tax rate that's a pittance of what we pay today.
- Forget that Washington was a self-interested land speculator which the revolution provided with the ability to keep his lands and obtain more from potential westward expansion that had been prohibited under the British government.

- Forget Washington's extripation of lands from the native americans
- Forget Washington's slaveholding.
- Forget Washington's bemoaning of a weak central government when he sought to put down Shay's Rebellion and the Whiskey Reblion - two tax rebellions which made Washington guilty of the same supposed sins he fought against in the Revolution.
- Forget.
- Yes, that's what we do.
- But forgetfulness is most assured when it has a placeholder - myth
- Forgetting is kind of like trying not to have the YMCA song stuck in your head now that I've mentioned the YMCA song.
- It's there now and you can't really do anything about it.
- The same thing holds for facts.
- You can't just forget things that have happened, but your memory can push those thoughts further and further to the side as you're inundated with other ideas.
- The myth of Washington is large, and it's large because it has to be in order to cover over the injustices.
- And of course this is true elsewhere, with other leaders.
- I mean, Abraham Lincoln is a prime example.
- He's enshrined in a temple as our nation's savior, yet he never sought to save the slaves.
- He wanted to preserve the Union.

- The emancipation Proclamation only freed slaves in rebel states.
- I mean, he was very clearly not some leader looking to free everyone, though I'm thankful he made a lot of headway there.
- So he's not the greatest hero, but he's also not a horrendous guy.
- Why is the mythology surrounding him so big, then?
- It's big because racism is one of America's greatest sins.
- If we can elevate Lincoln and the Civil War as this great celebration of freedom for the slaves -
- As this day the North fought so hard to bring about and that Lincoln championed -
- Something that we actually obtained in 1865 -
- Then racism and oppression ceased.
- Look at what we Americans did!
- There's that freedom again.
- But that myth covers over so much evil and sin.
- It covers over the KKK, the lynchings in the North as well as the South.
- It covers over firebombings and unjust housing practices.
- It covers over vagrancy laws and convict leasing.
- It covers over sharecropping and de facto slavery.
- It covers over Anti-miscegenation laws
- It covers over police brutality and an unjust criminal justice system and criminal legislation.
- It covers over red lining, superfund sites in minority communities, and inequities in schooling.

- Slavery may have been ended de jure, but de facto slavery and horrendous oppression and its results continue through today.
- But it's easy to look the other way when it comes to racial injustice, because one's eye is drawn more to the temples of the gods than it is to the oppressed languishing in the streets.
- Look to Washington, the divine, or to Lincoln, the savior.
- Don't avert your eyes the other way.
- Don't peer behind the curtain.
- If you do catch a glimpse, you'll find myth pulling the levers of what you have, up until now, called history.

- Today's episode is going to be dealing with a lot of history, which means we'll also be dealing with a lot of myths - and not just myths of the good kind.
- You know, like elevating leaders as gods.
- We'll also see how myths are used to play up the badness of or inability of others.
- It will be important for you to keep this understanding of myth that we've laid out so far - that myth is often a mask for injustice.

- Before we get into the meat of the episode, I want to recap and clarify the concept of conspiracy here.
- What is a conspiracy?

- There are a lot of ways we could define conspiracy, and really, it can be extremely simple.
- I mean, if you listened to my interview with Robert Meeropol, you know that his parents were executed for CONSPIRACY to commit espionage.
- They were murdered by the state - the United States - for supposedly thinking about and planning to spy.
- That's a conspiracy.
- Two or more people secretly planning to do something illegal or nefarious.
- A conspiracy is generally thought of as a small group of people who work together to accomplish something through secret means.
- But there are a lot of questions that arise from this.
- How small is a small group of people?
- If 49.9% of people plan to do something nefarious, is it still a conspiracy because they're conspiring without the knowledge of a majority?
- Can we add or take away members from the group and it still be the same conspiracy?
- Can the conspiracy be handed off across generations to new members?
- That's sort of a ship of theseus question there.
- Must there be ill intent for it to be a conspiracy, or is the conspiracy determined by outcome regardless of intent?
- All of these questions are going to come into play in today's episode, and I don't really plan on answering most of them.

- The conspiracy I'm putting forward today might be something you don't consider a conspiracy.
- I'm going to be talking about a conspiracy that involves many actors, across several centuries, and with changing methods and objectives.
- And I'm ok if you want to disagree with my categorization of this as a conspiracy.
- That's fine.
- My goal in this season has been to get larger and more complex - to show you how muddied the waters get - while simultaneously giving you the tools to wade through the mud.
- So I guess there's no time like the present.
- Let's jump into the episode.
- Let's wade in the water.

- The famous negro-spiritual song wade in the water is uncomfortably beautiful, depending on which rendition you listen to.
- The song has a note of happy expectation, yet there's also a feeling you get of longing and sadness.
- That expectation and longing are, I think, wrapped up in the line - God's gonna trouble the water.
- If you know your Bible, there might be any number of images that come into your mind.
- You might initially think of the New Testament pool of siloam, where the man who was paralyzed for decades

waited for the angel of the Lord to come and stir up the waters so he could be healed.

- Or perhaps you think of Naaman dipping in and disturbing the river to cure his leprosy.
- Probably most obviously, you'll think of Moses leading Israel to the reed sea, and God parting the waters for them to move towards the promised land.
- I think the Moses line of thinking fits best here because Moses and the promised land were such common themes for those who were enslaved.
- Wherever there is oppression and injustice, God will trouble the waters.
- Babylon the Great, the oppressor of all, will eventually fall.
- It may take 400 years, but the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice, as Dr. King once said, quoting Theodore Parker.

- If we were to search the globe for troubled waters, we'd find plenty.
- But for this series, I want to focus on the troubled waters of what many consider the second independent state in the Western Hemisphere -
- Securing its independence twenty years after the United States secured her independence with the ending of the Revolutionary war.

- That's quite a legacy to have, and it seems like such a history of independence would sow seeds of greatness that would grow and bloom over time.
- But such has not been the case with the island nation of Haiti.

- Haiti has a long and complicated history, most of which I'm not going to get into, some of which I'll probably get wrong, and a lot of which I'll mispronounce because of the French roots.
- So please know in advance that you'll want to check out my reading list, follow some of the links in the show notes,
- And please, Pardon my French.

- Haiti was one of the first places discovered by Christopher Columbus on his infamous first voyage across the sea.
- Of course the islands were inhabited with natives, but that wouldn't last long with the diseases and injustices brought by European rule.
- Within twenty years of contact with Europe, the native population of the Taino people, were just a fraction of what they were when Columbus first arrived.
- The Europeans didn't care too much what happened to the indigenous population, save for the fact that this meant they had no laborers to produce the goods which would make them and their empire rich.

- The promise of vast new lands - and fertile ones at that - jumpstarted the transatlantic slave trade, bringing millions of Africans across the ocean to work in the Americas and in the Caribbean.
- In 1697, the French finally wrested control of Haiti from the Spanish, leaving the Spanish with modern day Dominican Republic.
- At this point in history the French were at the top of their game.
- France pumped so many resources into Haiti that the island soon became its most lucrative territory.
- Haiti was producing so much wealth for the French
 - - coffee, sugar, and lumber - that it came to be known as the pearl of the antilles.
- New products to trade could have been good news - added value to the market.
- However, whenever exorbitant amounts of profit are to be made, that usually comes at a great cost to someone.
- Sometimes that's the consumer who pays more than they should for cheap materials.
- But often times, as is still true today, profits are made on the exploitation of labor.
- For the enslaved Africans who had been imported to Haiti, this exploitation and abuse was a bitter reality.
- Not only were they cheaper to replace than to take care of, but in order to deter uprisings and to keep good order,

terrible forms of abuse, tortures, and executions were implemented -

- Horrific and grisly displays of barbarity that we won't go into here, but which are well documented.
- Just prior to securing Haiti from the Spanish, the French signed into legislation the Code Noir, or what came to be known as the black code.
- In theory, this document limited the injustice to those who were enslaved, but what it really ended up doing was codifying the system of slavery into the very fiber of the nation, making it more difficult to excise.
- It's doubtful how much protection the code noir gave to those who were enslaved.
- I mean, we know how this kind of thing works from much more modern times.
- There were laws against murdering and lynching black men and women, but how many juries in the Jim Crow South ever convicted someone on those charges?
- At the same time, segregation laws were strictly enforced.
- And of course it worked out that way because the people who codified the laws were the people who owned slaves, and the people who owned slaves were the ones who enforced the laws or had influence over those who did.
- So when it came to the code noir, there were forced conversions to Christianity, forced baptisms, prohibitions

of intermarriage, and all that good stuff which was actually enforced.

- But as far as any real protection for the enslaved?
- Not really.
- The Code Noir simply baked slavery deep into the French empire and secured the labor force needed to keep raking in the dough.

- For one hundred years, Haitians struggled under the rule of the French Empire.
- There were slave revolts here and there - an occasional poisoning of plantation owners and their families.
- But nothing ever seemed to get going enough to provide any real hope of freedom.
- But on the evening of August 21 1791, 232 years ago today, the waters were troubled in Haiti.
- Slaves rose up and began to kill their masters and their master's families.
- The uprising spread so quickly and was attended by so many of the enslaved, that it didn't take long for them to gain control of most of the island.
- The fighting for Haiti would last thirteen years.
- In that time, France would abolish slavery -
- In an attempt to quell the rebellion, of course -
- But then they reinstated slavery again only a few years later.
- The Haitians knew that any promises given to them by France - or whites - would be kept.

- They had to fight for their own freedom, and could trust no one in that struggle.
- Eventually, they won.
- An enslaved people - a supposedly inferior people - of a small island nation, rose up and fought one of the most powerful empires of the time
- The Haitian Revolution makes the American Revolution look like a joke!

- While researching the Haitian revolution, I wanted so badly to find a revolutionary to latch on to as good.
- I mean, the story is so epic, and the bad guys are so bad
- It's like watching an anti-Nazi movie today.
- You just don't feel too bad for the Nazis getting pummeled, and you understand a bit of the violent excess that the protagonists divvy out.

-
- I sort of feel that way with the Haitian Revolution too.
- The French - or any imperialist for that matter - were just as bad as the Nazis.
- Bartoleme de las casas was writing already in the early 1500's how bad the brutality towards natives and slaves were in the territories.
- The tortures and travesties were no less brutal than what occurred under the Nazi regime, and actually, at least it seems to me, were often more evil in the sense that imperialists seemed to derive pleasure out of the suffering of their victims.

- I've read enough Holocaust literature to know that the Nazis weren't gentle executioners, but, but their violence so often seems like indifference.
- They might shoot a prisoner like they would a stray dog, without a second thought.
- They may choose not to waste resources on those they deemed subhuman.
- But even Mengele's brutal experiments - as far as I've read - weren't done out of a sadistic desire to bring about pain in victims.
- He may not have cared about a victim's pain, but he didn't pursue the pain of victims for his own enjoyment as much as it seems those in the slaveholding system seemed to.
- The type of thing the imperialists were doing in the Caribbean was just as sadistic as what the Nazis were doing, with the added element that the violence was more often done with an aim towards creating suffering.
- This added element probably came from the fact that while the Nazis were mostly interested in eradication, Imperialists were interested in utilization.
- They wanted to maintain a labor force and protect themselves from revolt, which meant that fear and submission were important to them, and those things - they thought - could be brought about through the infliction of severe pain.

- Toussaint.
- When they revealed his name I was ecstatic.
- I knew that 99.9% of movie watchers wouldn't get that reference, but it was brilliant.
- This anti-imperial movie dropped a huge, hidden message at the end of the film, and I loved it.
- Yet, as I have done a lot more research on Haiti since then, I've come to recognize that even the heroes are villains themselves.
- Toussaint's cause may resonate with me and I may understand why he did what he did, but he made some terribly oppressive decisions.
- He declared himself ruler for life.
- He implemented de facto slavery in removing certain rights and implementing certain restrictions.
- He betrayed fellow enslaved people in neighboring islands for good standing with some of the non-French empires.
- He mandated that Catholicism be followed.
- I mean - I'd rather have Toussaint win than any of the Imperialists - but Haiti's George Washington is just like the U.S.'s George Washington -
- He's overshadowed by his own set of compromises and evils.
- I guess the point of going on that little rabbit trail is that this episode is really about the complexity of motives and actions.

- While I'm going to end up picking on the U.S. a lot, I want to make sure you as a hearer don't fall into the trap of thinking that I'm simply untangling a narrative and restructuring the good guys and bad guys.
- There is almost always complexity all around.
- But since the U.S. has had the power to assert its will on the world and it has had the means to propagandize the world more effectively, my goal is to focus on uncovering that truth in this episode.

- Anyway, back to the story of Haiti - sort of.
- Because Haiti began its revolt right in the middle of the French Revolution, so I want to zoom over to France for a few minutes.
- There is a lot we could discuss in regard to the French Revolution, the legal system, the empire, the humanist sentiment carried by some, and a bunch of other things which could influence our discussion on Haiti.
- But you can read about all that.
- I actually want to focus on a more off-the-beaten-path fellow by the name of Nicolas Condorcet.
- I'm hopeful that his story will reinforce and expound on some of the concepts we've discussed this season.
- But before we get to his story, you need to understand some basics about the French Revolution.

- The French Revolution started fresh on the heels of the American revolution - less than a decade after the

American Revolution ended - and a year before the last of the thirteen colonies ratified the Constitution.

- The Revolution was perhaps inspired in part by the American revolution, and it was certainly influenced by the debt the French took on from aiding the Americans in fighting Great Britain.
- France was in a great deal of debt for a number of reasons and had been having some agricultural difficulty, and all that came to a head.
- A lot of revolutions revolve around food and money, and this one was no different.
- When the masses are having trouble getting food to eat or paying their bills - especially when this is a result of inequity and injustice - they get pretty upset.
- So King Louis knows that things aren't looking good for him if he doesn't appease the vast majority of the population, so he calls for a tax that goes against custom and actually requires the aristocracy and nobles to put some skin in the game.
- Yeah, rich people paying taxes - how dare he?
- Of course the rich people are also the ones who are used to having a lot of power in the government, so they're not particularly worried.
- They'll just convene this special session of government and make sure they remain exempt from taxes.
- The masses don't need their bread, but the rich need their caviar - funded by the taxation of the masses.

- But to the surprise of the rich, there is a lot more commoner influence in government now, and the aristocracy are outnumbered.
- Not to worry, though, because France's government was modeled just like the U.N. -
- You know, you've got a hundred countries that get a vote, but five - the original nuclear powers - they get to veto what everyone else says.
- Well, it was the same thing with France.
- It didn't matter if all the more numerous commoners wanted something.
- The 1% could veto all that.
- A veto of the masses in a revolutionary climate, however, is a deathwish.
- It didn't take long for the aristocracy to recognize that they had to cede ground to the commoners, and maybe go without caviar at every meal so the peasants could have bread.
- And that right there - that's what finally clicked for me in regard to the French Revolution.
- See, the American revolution didn't change much at all.
- If you were an American before the revolution and after, your life didn't change much.
- In fact, if you talk to Daniel Shays or those involved in the Whiskey rebellion, they might argue that it was a bit better under the British because they were taxed less.
- But overall, the economic and social lines remained the same.

- All that changed with the American Revolution was a change in rulers.
 - The aristocracy still ran the show immediately following the Revolution - and they still do.
 - Just look at the education of our presidents since Theodore Roosevelt and you can see that over half of our presidents since then have attended one of the 8 Ivy League colleges, and many others have attended prestigious universities like Stanford, Duke, or others.
 - Or you could look at the net worth of each of the presidents.
 - Less than 20% of our 46 presidents have had a net worth under a million dollars adjusted for inflation.
 - Our most recent president before Biden - Donald Trump - eclipsed the net worth of all the other presidents, at 3 billion dollars.
 - But the runner up in net worth is actually our first president, George Washington, coming in at close to one billion dollars in net worth.
 - So as far as Revolutions go, the American Revolution wasn't all that revolutionary.
 - Power changed hands from one aristocrat to another,
 - From one taxpayer to another.
-
- The French Revolution, on the other hand, was not just a political revolution, but a social one.

- The masses were demanding that they gain some equality in their representation.
- Of course, the Haitian revolution was like this second type - like the French Revolution.
- It wasn't just seeking for power to change hands, but for society to be re-formed.
- While there were many reasons different individuals and factions chose to support or not support each of these revolutions, there were certainly some who took issue with the social aspect of the revolutions.
- Some Americans refused to support the French Revolution because they viewed a social upheaval as a loss of order.
- The masses couldn't possibly be able to make appropriate decisions.
- The United States never lost its class of aristocracy or experts who ran the show.
- The electoral college is a prime example of this safeguard against the masses.
- People don't vote for a president, but rather for experts to
 - hopefully - represent us in selecting a president.
- It's the electoral college that picks a president, not the people.
- So the idea of a social revolution for some Americans was not pleasant.
- We have a similar case with the Haitian Revolution.
- A social revolution there was particularly unsavory for slaveholders in the United States.

- A successful rebellion in Haiti could influence and inspire slaves in the States to revolt - and in fact, it ended up doing just that.
- A rebellion known as Gabriel's rebellion had the opportunity of being the largest uprising of its time had it gotten off the ground, but it was hampered by an informant.
- Gabriel, the mastermind of the insurrection, was inspired in part by the Haitian Revolution.
- So the fears of slaves being influenced by observing the social revolution in Haiti weren't at all unfounded.
- Both the French and Haitian Revolutions were of a different substance than the American Revolution.
- That history of despising social revolutions continues to today.
- In an article written by Naom Chomsky, entitled, the threat of a good example, he details how a tiny country like Grenada can be a threat to the U.S. merely by its example of a successful social revolution.
- It's important to note that by a successful or "good" example, we don't mean that it's without significant moral problems or that it's an ideal example.
- What is meant is rather that the example demonstrates a social change where the will of the masses is actually better represented, as control is wrested out of the aristocracy's hands.
- Speaking of this idea, the power of a good example, Chomsky writes, QUOTE

- The weaker and poorer a country is, the more dangerous it is as an example. If a tiny, poor country like Grenada can succeed in bringing about a better life for its people, some other place that has more resources will ask, "why not us?"
- END QUOTE
- Researching the Haitian Revolution, then, helped me to understand a lot more about U.S. history.
- It helped me understand why we weren't all gung-ho in helping the French, why we didn't like the Haitian revolution, and why we have some of these seemingly random conflicts, coups, and wars, with small countries like Grenada.
- Social revolutions are dangerous because the U.S. has never really had one.
- The same people - or at least the same type of person - has been running the show since the colonial days under Great Britain.

- Good examples are a threat not only on the national level, but also on the individual level.
- One thing that is true of all revolutions, whether social or political, is that it is difficult to find a moderate.
- You're all in one way, or the other.
- Nobody likes a moderate.
- If you're on the far right, a moderate looks like they're on the left, and if you're far to the left, a moderate looks like they're on the right.

- So being a moderate means you're fighting on two fronts.
- You're everyone's enemy.
- Yet every Revolution has those who try to allow reason to prevail.
- They keep their heads, which often means they end up losing them.
- One of those moderates who kept his head in the French Revolution, for a little while, anyway, was named Nicolas Condorcet.
- I actually came across Condorcet's name while reading a book on conspiracy entitled, "What to Believe Now."
- Condorcet developed an important theory we'll get to in a moment - a theory referenced in the book I was reading.
- But I didn't know anything about the guy until I was actually talking with my cousin.
- We were having a conversation about how we felt like we were both moderates and couldn't identify with any of the political poles.
- And of course, it's usually the moderates who get pummeled by both sides, as we've already mentioned.
- And then I referenced Condorcet's theorem to make a point in our discussion.
- Well, my cousin looked up Condorcet's story, and wouldn't you know it, he lost his head in large part because he was a moderate.
- He was a revolutionary, but not revolutionary enough for the extreme revolutionaries who took over.

- So, Condorcet lost his head in the French Revolution exactly because he kept it.
- Anyway, Condorcet ended up developing this theorem that is extremely helpful in understanding the threat that propaganda poses to democracies - and why I think it's easy to argue that an effective, moral democracy couldn't possibly exist.
- His theory is also going to help us understand why there is a lot of power in a good example.

- So Condorcet had this idea known as the jury theorem.
- It has a number of points, but the main idea is that if you have a group of rational and INDEPENDENT actors -
- And that word is extremely important here -
INDEPENDENT
- Then you'll end up with a greater than 50% chance that a decision based on a large group's vote will result in the best possible decision.
- The idea is that because people are rational, they have a better than 50/50 chance of choosing the right or best answer.
- Now, if you only had three people voting, it's possible that you ended up getting two chumps who are either nefarious characters or ignoramuses who get you a bad majority.
- Just like you could flip a coin three times and end up with two tails, or even three. It wouldn't be that unlikely.

- But the more people you get involved, the more you're going to approximate to the true mean, which for rational people, would be higher than 50% for the good.
- You can see this jury theorem in a more real world example when we look at Francis Galton's identification of the wisdom of crowds.
- Galton attended a farmer's fair and had a group of about 800 people guess the weight of a bull when it was butchered.
- Many of these people were farmers and experts in this kind of thing.
- Well, when he got the results in for a 1,198 pound bull, the mean of the collective was less than 1 lb off the true weight,
- And this collective mean was closer to the real weight than the actual winner.
- Now, this scenario is a little different than the jury theorem, as there's less than a 50/50 chance of getting the answer right.
- But all of the actors were independent - making their own decisions without outside influence -
- and all were rational - they had certain ideas about weight and farm animals and such.
- So collectively, the group was able to do better than the individual at approximating the best answer.
- There is a very significant wisdom in crowds, but with these caveats -
- The crowd must remain rational and independent.

- Well, that's exactly where crowds don't remain.
- Gustave Le Bon - a Frenchman writing a century after the revolution - composed what I think is a brilliant book entitled, "The Crowd."
- When I read the book I expected that it was going to be dated and cumbersome, but it was actually one of the best pieces I read in regard to propaganda and crowd psychology.
- Sure, he had some abrasive views, like the idea that women were much more easily swayed.
- But overall, it was a very insightful read.
- Le Bon talks about how easily crowds are manipulated and explains that it isn't reason and explanation that will stir a crowd up or calm a crowd down.
- Rather, it's imagery and key phrases.
- It's a particular form of speech and presentation.
- An individual may be rational and independent, but put him or her in a crowd and they become malleable to whoever the authority figure is, or as Le Bon puts it, the one with prestige.
- So a crowd will throw off rationality in that they cling to key ideals and abstracts rather than logical argumentation,
- And they will also throw off independence in that they will look to leading figures in the crowd and follow them.
- The work of Condorcet and Le Bon have a lot to teach us, then, in regard to propaganda.

- We may adore a democratic form of government for the theoretical good it could be if Condorcet's ideals held -
- But Le Bon helps us to see that masses - or crowds - tend to be just like a school of fish or a flock of birds.
- They move in unison.
- All the actors may individually move, but they move in response to and in tandem with the others.
- Understanding how crowds function and how democracy can be controlled by those who know how to properly manipulate people, we can understand more why there are so many abstract, undefined, and assumed ideals used to make a point rather than rational argumentation.
- We're sending aid to freedom fighters who are fighting terrorists.
- There's no argument there.
- Just a cut and dry good versus evil.
- And this was the story of Afghanistan several decades ago, when we sent money and weapons to help the Taliban fight off invaders.
- Yet about 5-10 years ago, we assassinated an Iranian General named Soleimani who was giving money and weapons to Iraq's to fight the U.S.
- Yet Soleimani was a terrorist for doing the exact same thing the U.S. did in Afghanistan - giving Iraqi fighters assistance in defending their homeland, and in part exacting revenge on the U.S. for the destabilizing coup and oppressive dictator they installed in Iran in the 1950's.

- But nobody talked about that.
 - Nobody dealt with the history of Iran and why they hated us.
 - Nobody dealt with the fact that the U.S. were insurgents in Iraq and that by our own definitions, we were terrorists fighting freedom fighters.
 - We just threw out key words and immediately secured buy-in from the masses.
 - In a democracy, then, propaganda and group-think undermine rationality and independence.
 - When you have the vast majority of Americans polarized into two competing parties - two competing masses - two competing crowds -
 - Nobody is thinking for themselves, and therefore the nation won't come to rational and good conclusions, they'll come to manufactured conclusions - and because they are able to vote - they'll think they got to choose for themselves.
 - In a sense, everyone in the crowd does choose for themselves just like the fish or the birds each move independently.
 - But they all move as one as a result of the influence of others on them.
-
- With a little background on the French Revolution, Condorcet's jury theorem, Le Bon, and the wisdom of

crowds - let's return to this idea that a good example can be a threat.

- Even though the events of the French and Haitian revolutions were occurring a hundred years before Le Bon's research on crowds, most people seemed to understand how crowds functioned, even if they never developed a primer on how it worked.
- They understood that a free black nation who gained their freedom through violence could easily incite the people that they enslaved to be influenced towards a violent uprising.
- Enslavers have long relied on systems of fear - REAL FEAR - to control their slaves.
- You know, a lot of times today, politicians will use false fears or overblown fears to control the masses.
- But there wasn't any need for slaveholders to restrain their coercion.
- Their slaves were property by law and they could do pretty much as they pleased de jure, and certainly they could do what they wanted de facto.
- It didn't matter whether there were laws against excessive abuse or murder of a slave if you knew you'd never be convicted for such a thing.
- So terror - real terror - was driven into the enslaved, and being in fear of something that is truly fearful is the only rational response.
- You do whatever you can do to avoid that which is fearful.

- Avoid the whip. Avoid the dogs. Survive.
- The slave response of compliance was the rational response to the slave system.
- Interestingly, most of what Le Bon points out in “The Crowd” is how the crowd can be manipulated for evil and mindless actions.
- But he does also note several times how the crowd can be moved to do something more heroic and more unimaginable than any individual.
- It may be hard to get a single person to run head long to their grisly death, but it’s often much easier to get a whole crowd of soldiers to do so.
- The crowd amplifies the bad, but it can also amplify the noble.
- It can make one irrational unto despicable feats, or irrational unto honorable ones.
- In a system of slavery where real fear was present and rationality declared compliance as the answer for most people, only the thinking of a crowd could incite the enslaved to embrace that which was irrational - rebellion.
- The Haitian revolution, merely by being attempted, was enough to inspire the enslaved.
- Gabriel’s rebellion, which was inspired by the events in Haiti, occurred four years before Haitian independence was ensured.
- If the mere example of irrational rebellion could inspire the enslaved to rise up, what would a successful example be able to do - in showing not only that rebellion

was an option, but that it wasn't as irrational as everyone thought.

- Success was possible.
- Overall, the United States was not too keen on Haiti's success in becoming a good example.
- There were trade benefits and a few other minor positives for the U.S. in regard to Haiti's rebellion, but its threat as a good example was too problematic to embrace the revolution.
- It didn't take too long for the U.S. to issue an embargo on Haiti, and Haiti was not recognized by the United States as a nation until July of 1862.
- Bravo President Lincoln, right?
- Well, the recognition of Haiti came just two months before the issuing of the Emancipation Proclamation - which, by the way, only freed the enslaved in the rebellious states.
- But hey, better late than never, right?
- Well, at the very same time Lincoln was recognizing Haiti and drafting the Emancipation Proclamation, he was planning for the colonization of free blacks.
- Lincoln was not at all someone who adhered to the equality of the races, so his pet idea was that the U.S. would relocate as many freed blacks as they could to other parts of the world.
- Wouldn't you know it, Haiti would serve as a test case for this.

- On December 31 of 1862, just six months after recognizing Haiti's sovereignty - and less than 24 hours until the Emancipation Proclamation went into effect -
- Abraham Lincoln signed a contract to test the colonization of about 450 freed blacks, which were to be sent to a small island just off the coast of Haiti and under the sovereignty of Haiti.
- The whole colonization thing was a disaster, but the whole case is very illuminating.
- Haiti was recognized at the same time Lincoln and the government knew that they were going to free the vast majority of the enslaved.
- It no longer mattered if Haiti was a good example because with the freeing of the enslaved, there would no longer be any threat.
- But beyond that, Haiti had become a convenient neighbor.
- I mean, they're not right next door, but they're conveniently located.
- If we could recognize their sovereignty and then dump our nation's baggage there so we didn't have to deal with it, why not, right?
- Lincoln, when trying to pitch the idea of colonization to a group of free blacks, said, QUOTE
- your race suffer very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords a reason at least why we should be separated

- END QUOTE
- The easy way out for the United States was to take the labor force which had been kidnapped from their homes and abused for generations - a force which had brought in so much wealth -
- And now remove them from the very land they had helped to work and the nation which they had helped to enrich.
- The United States was now asking the enslaved who had planted to the vine and fig tree not to sit under it.
- And even worse, they were trying to dump this population who had absolutely nothing to their name onto an island nation that was suffering from the lingering effects of empire -
- A nation that the U.S. only conveniently recognized once their services were needed.
- We wanted to give them our tired, and poor, and huddled masses so we didn't have to deal with them ourselves, these victims we ourselves had created.

- Speaking of the lingering effects of empire, let's jump back over to Haiti in 1863 and see what's happening there.
- Well, it was less than a decade after Haitian independence that King Louis the 18 defeated Napoleon and regained the throne.
- And with the throne established, Louis was looking to add the wealth of Haiti back into his empire.

- However, Louis realized that he may be able to accomplish his goal of obtaining wealth an easier way.
- Thus, over the next decade, France continued to work on negotiations with Haiti for a settlement.
- A settlement for what, you might ask.
- A settlement for all the loss of wealth the poor slaveholders and imperialists were robbed of by the Haitians.
- Haiti was struggling as a little island nation who wasn't receiving recognition from the biggest trading players in the game - players which included France and the United States.
- If the Haitians could negotiate a settlement, then they could at least earn the recognition of France.
- But on top of this motivation for negotiating a repayment, the Haitians also wanted to avoid the threat of the reimposition of slavery and a costly war in both lives and money.
- Agreeing to pay France reparations would avoid potential slavery, war, and bankruptcy.
- In 1825, France agreed to pay 150 million Francs to the French -
- An amount ten times what was paid by the United States for the Louisiana Territory.
- The amount the Haitians ended up paying was 5 times France's annual budget.
- The total cost of all the payments which only ended in 1947 -

- was , in 2023 money, approximately 30 billion dollars.
- Try to wrap your mind around this.
- France extorted a small island composed of the people they had kidnapped, enslaved, and tortured, to the tune of 30 billion dollars.
- But that's par for the course.
- It was recently revealed that Great Britain actually made its last slaveholder repayment installment in 2015.
- Many slaveholding nations compensated the slave owners while rarely compensating those once enslaved.
- The United States, however, largely escapes this scandal, because slaveholders were almost universally not compensated for their slaves - with the exception of...
- Can you guess?
- I bet you can.
- Just pause the episode for a second or two and think about it.
- Think back to our discussion of the French Revolution and how the social revolution meant that the people were tired of the aristocrats getting all the kickbacks and not contributing.
- OK, you got it?
- Slaveholders in the District of Columbia were compensated for their slaves!
- So I don't know if that's actually better or worse than compensating everyone.

- On the one hand, it's disgusting that slaveholders were compensated at all, but it seems doubly disgusting that only the political or aristocratic slaveholders were compensated.
 - Both show a disdain for this supposed inhumane act that you just outlawed, because you're compensating those the law now denounces as evil.
 - But only reimbursing the elite does this, PLUS it shows an inequality and disdain for the non-elite.
 - I don't know.
 - I'll have to think about that one.
-
- Either way, the American Civil War is over, and slavery is pretty much outlawed.
 - Haiti is now recognized on the world stage, and it seems like things are looking up for freed blacks.
 - In fact, in 1889, Frederick Douglas himself became the U.S. ambassador to Haiti.
 - A black man as an ambassador, that's pretty cool, right?
 - That's what we call progress.
 - Actually, Douglas was the fourth black ambassador to Haiti.
 - That's quite a feat, right?
 - In a time where racist sentiments still persisted in the country, the U.S. was sending black representatives out into the world as the face of the great United States.
 - I think we all know better than that.

- The U.S. was sending black representatives to black nations, like Haiti and Liberia, because putting forward black representatives was viewed as the best way to grease the wheels of diplomacy with a nation that had been denied sovereignty for over half a century, until we really needed them so we could ship our baggage off on them.
- Nevertheless, Douglass determined to do his best as an ambassador, regardless of his merely being a political pawn.
- It didn't take Douglass too long, however, to figure out that it would be impossible to do his job with any integrity, and he lasted only 20 months on the job.
- Why?
- Because his job as an ambassador made him Pawn not only for government, but for the big and influential businesses which essentially ran government.
- When Douglas refused to pressure the Haitian government to accept a potentially economically devastating plan by an influential American capitalist, it sealed his fate as the U.S. ambassador to Haiti.
- Douglas became a marked man as other businessmen and government officials recognized that Douglas wouldn't play along.
- This story is worth digging into in more depth, so please check out the links in the show notes.
- But I think the story highlights two important concepts we should be aware of.

- First, it highlights the difficulty that oppressed groups have on both the world stage, as well as the personal stage, represented in both Haiti and Douglas.
- Haiti - a nation still reeling from tremendous debt and political upheaval, was not in a position to decline governmental and capitalistic advances from nations and businesses with extreme power.
- They were extorted by France and in debt to them, and we see in Douglas's story that they ended up paying off businessmen so as not to cross them the wrong way.
- They wanted recognition by the world which would hopefully lead to greater opportunity, but they found that they had only received a facade of recognition.
- There was still injustice and exploitation, but that was now carried out behind the scenes rather than overtly.
- The same applied to Douglas on the individual level.
- It was great, in theory, that the U.S. was finally putting black persons in representative positions.
- Of course Douglas really should have received a more prominent position in government, but hey, if your people have been oppressed and underrepresented, you accept any form of advancement.
- It's a step forward, right?
- Douglas found out that this was not the case.
- He was placed in a position not where he had power to use his voice and his expertise, but rather, in a position where he could be wielded as a tool to exploit those who

were, in many ways, more his own people than the government who sent him as a representative.

- The formerly enslaved, liberated, exploited, and despised Haitians were more similar to Douglas than whites in the U.S.
- The government and big businesses weren't giving Douglas a chance to advance the cause of his people, or people like him.
- He was being asked to throw off his integrity and become a part of the system of oppression.
- He was being asked to betray his people in betraying his own humanity.
- Those in power were using him as a pawn to exploit the very people he was sent to represent, all while giving him the semblance of power and voice.
- While it appeared as though progress was being made by appointing black men as ambassadors to Haiti, this appearance of progress was really just exploitation in another form.
- These covert forms of oppression were beginning to be the operational norm for the U.S., but the empire still hadn't thrown off its old ways of oppressing.
- In less than a decade from the termination of Douglas's appointment as ambassador to Haiti, the violence of empire would rear its ugly head again on the world stage with the start of the Spanish American war in 1898.

- That war would be an interesting rabbit trail to go down in its own right, but we'll do our best to resist that here.
- What's important to note is that the United States used the war to snatch up a number of territories from Spain.
- The U.S. viewed itself as a liberator, yet they were clearly opportunistic colonizers.
- The acquisition of the Philippines probably shows this the clearest, in that when it became clear that the U.S. wasn't going to give the Filipinos independence, and the Filipino's fought back, the U.S. waged a war against the people they came to, quote, liberate, enacting a genocide which killed anywhere from hundreds of thousands into the low million mark.
- Their disdain for human life can be seen clearly in a popular marching song of the time - a song set to the music of tramp, tramp, tramp from the Civil War -
- Or if you grew up in the church, to the tune of "Jesus loves the little children."
- The tune makes the horrendous lyrics all that more grotesque.
- The first verse and chorus say,
- In that land of dopy dreams, happy peaceful Philippines,
- Where the bolo-man is hiking night and day;
- Where Tagalos steal and lie, where Americanos die,
- There you hear the soldiers sing this evening lay :

- cho: Damn, damn, damn the Filipinos, cross-eyed kakiack ladrones,
- Underneath our starry flag, civilize 'em with a Krag,
- And return us to our own beloved homes.
- No, the United States didn't have a concern for liberation.
- We were seeking to extend our empire.
- Our internal conquest of the Native Americans was largely over, with the last battle coming seven years before the Spanish American War -
- The battle of Wounded knee at the very end of 1890.
- Expansion now meant looking outward, and the Spanish American war provided a perfect opportunity to snatch up some prime real estate.
- The Philippines were a nice addition to our conquests, but we had our eyes on more local territory.
- We gained Puerto Rico, which was nice,
- But what we really had our eyes on was Cuba - which was actually where the whole war started in the first place... coincidentally... where a ship just so happened to conveniently blow up in Havannah Harbor, giving the U.S. a pretext to take that very lucrative island from Spain.
- Cuba is actually a place that comes up in U.S. talks a lot when discussing Haiti.
- Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to James Monroe in 1823, said, QUOTE,

- But we have first to ask ourselves a question. do we wish to acquire to our own Confederacy any one or more of the Spanish provinces? I candidly confess that I have ever looked on Cuba as the most interesting addition which could ever be made to our system of states. the controul which, with Florida point this island would give us over the Gulph of Mexico, and the countries and the Isthmus bordering on it, as well as all those whose waters flow into it, would fill up the measure of our political well-being. yet, as I am sensible that this can never be obtained, even with her own consent, but by war; and as her independance, which is our second interest, and especially her independance of England, can be secured without it, I have no hesitation in abandoning my first wish to future chances, and accepting it's independance with peace, and the friendship of England, rather than it's association, at the expence of war, and her enmity.
- END QUOTE
- Can we seriously even make a more solid case for U.S. motive on the world stage?
- Whereas the U.S. didn't want to recognize Haitian independence until we needed them as a colony to transport freed slaves we didn't want to have to look at, as Lincoln basically said,
- We had relations with Cuba from essentially the day it opened up its doors.
- It's one thing to recognize the freedom of former slaves who fought for their independence, and another to

recognize a slave colony that's still under the subjection of masters.

- And that, Cuba certainly was.
- Cuba was actually the second to last country - right before Brazil - to emancipate its slaves, doing so at the end of 1886, only two and a half years before the war with the U.S.
- So - this country that had become a very lucrative sugar producing nation -
- A country which still had a populous used to being under subjection -
- It was ripe for the picking, and beautifully located to complement the growing U.S. empire.
- But hey, the U.S. were liberators, right?
- They fought for independence and knew what it was like to seek freedom.
- The U.S. wouldn't colonize, right?
- After liberating Cuba, it didn't take too long for the Cubans to not feel too liberated.
- They eventually asked the American army to leave, but the U.S. wasn't wild about that idea.
- So, a brilliant plan was devised which would allow the U.S. to appear as though they were liberators who walked away from the new pearl of the antilles, while actually maintaining significant control over it.
- They developed the Platt Amendment - the conditions upon which they'd leave Cuba - and leave Cuba a free Cuba to do as they wished.

- Well, do as they wished with a few caveats.
- Listen to some of the provisions of the Platt amendment:
 1. Cuba can't let ANYONE ELSE have military access to the country. They basically couldn't make treaties with other nations.
 2. Can't go into debt
 3. That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty
 4. Ratified and validated all acts done while under U.S. military occupancy
 5. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.
 6. That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.
- If you are like me and wondered where in the world Guantanamo Bay came from, this is it.
- How does the U.S. have territory in a nation that we've had an active embargo against for over half a century?

- Because we swiped it from them, essentially by force, back when we made them independent -
- Or as the U.S. defines independence - we made them dependent upon us.
- Again, I'll put links in the show notes, because the history of Puerto Rico is also worth going into here, especially in regard to sugar.
- But Cuba will hopefully at least give you a glimpse of how things played out.

- With an understanding of what was going on around Haiti, let's zoom back into Haiti in 1915 - 25 years after Frederick Douglas left his post as ambassador, and 15 years after the Spanish American War.
- In 1915, the United States invaded Haiti.
- Why?
- That's a good question.
- Of course there is a standard U.S. answer, which is that we ran to the assistance of our beloved island neighbor out of the abundance and overflow of love we had for them.
- Our benevolence compelled us to help.
- We just so happened to have a bunch of warships and thousands of troops in the vicinity ready to invade
- Perhaps that had something to do with the fact that only several months prior, the U.S. literally landed troops in Haiti, walked into its national bank, and stole all the gold - something like 14 million dollars worth - on the pretext

that they thought Haiti MIGHT default on the loans they had faithfully been paying on up to this point.

- They did this at the behest of National City Bank - the bank which today is Citigroup - and the bank which held part of the debt Haiti was paying on to France until 1947.
- But fear not, this was all benevolence on the part of the U.S.
- How do I know that?
- Because the state department's website tells me so.
- The site for the office of the Historian writes, QUOTE
- In 1914, the Wilson administration sent U.S. Marines into Haiti. They removed \$500,000 from the Haitian National Bank in December of 1914 for safe-keeping in New York, thus giving the United States control of the bank. END QUOTE
- Safe-keeping
- Whew! I was worried there for a second.
- Only three months after the United States began to keep Haiti's gold safe in New York, they just so happened to be in the neighborhood when they thought their buddy, Haiti, could use a little more help with elections.
- You know, because the people had just successfully risen up against a dictator who had just executed a bunch of people.
- So the U.S. army sets up shop in Haiti, generously writes them a new constitution -
- A constitution Similar to the Platt amendment we saw in Cuba

- Including things like giving the U.S. total power over Haiti's financial system,
- authorizing the U.S. to create a new Haitian military,
- and prohibiting Haiti from selling or renting territory to another foreign power.
- Man, isn't this like the exact type of behavior we saw from abusers?
- You initiate violence and blame it on the victim, then you isolate them from the outside world by taking their resources and preventing them from having outside relationships.
- You make them dependent.
- This is a tactic that the U.S. and the West has gotten very good at.
- There's a really interesting book you should check out in regard to how this works today.
- The book is entitled, "Confessions of an Economic Hitman."
- Now, I don't know if the author is relaying events that actually happened, or if it's based on real events.
- It purports to be real, but I'm not sure.
- Regardless, the book does a great job of showing you how economic dependence works today and how we are able to put a stranglehold on nations now without actually invading them on flimsy pretexts.
- It used to be ok to do that kind of thing even if everyone knew what you were doing, but it's harder to get away with invasions than it used to be.

- A hundred years ago, invasions only required that there be a tiny conflict where you needed to go and keep the peace.
- Today they require that you find - or at least hypothesize - weapons of mass destruction.

- The U.S. would remain in Haiti for 19 years, running the show and training the military
- This latter role will come back to haunt Haiti over the next century, as the U.S. trains soldiers to be cunning and ruthless - two things that wreak havoc on populations when dictators come to power.
- Perhaps nothing shows the ruthlessness of U.S. fighters more than the execution of one of the rebels who fought against the U.S. invasion, Charlemagne Paralte.
- Charlamagne - I'll use his first name, since I don't really know how to pronounce his last -
- Plus, it's just a cool name -
- Charlamagne was a resistance fighter who rallied the people and continued to annoy the U.S. troops
- After a few years of this, the U.S. were able to find someone who helped them sneak into Charlamagne's camp and execute him.
- They hauled his body away and took a picture of his dead body propped up against a door, in hopes that this proof that the Haitian rebel was dead would deter others from following him.

- The picture actually had the opposite effect, causing the Haitian rebels to fortify their commitment against the U.S. thieves and invaders.
- This famous picture of Charlamagne, which you can easily find with a quick search, has come to be known as the crucifixion of Charlamagne -
- A man who, like Jesus, inspired revolutionaries by his death for an ideal.
- Charlamagne was eventually honored with a place on Haitian currency in 1994 - which, coincidentally or purposefully coincided with the return of a president, Jean Baptiste Aristide - who the U.S. helped to foment a coup against.
- So Charlamagne definitely still has a place in the heart of many Haitians who recognize their oppressed role on the world stage.
- But we'll get to Aristide later.
- Right now we're still in the nineteen Teens

- Around the same time Charlamagne is waging his fight against the U.S. invaders, other Haitians are trying to put up a fight in the government, through the legal system.
- The U.S. had drafted up a terrible constitution for Haiti in 1915 that began to suck the economic resources out of Haiti in favor of the U.S. government and big business.
- But in 1917, the Haitian government got enough momentum that they attempted to nullify and rewrite this constitution that was forced upon them.

- However, Smedley Butler and the marines barged into the Senate and forced them, at gunpoint, to dissolve.
- This was one of the many experiences which moved Butler to write the famous book, "War is a Racket," towards the end of his life -
- A book in which he says, QUOTE
- I was a racketeer - a gangster for capitalism. END QUOTE
- That he was.
- He just didn't realize it yet.
- Just as when Frederick Douglas was ambassador to Haiti, the U.S. continued to seek their own wealth and advancement on the world stage, even at the expense of a weak, vulnerable island nation of former slaves and exploited peoples.

- Maybe it's not really despite Haiti's vulnerability that the empire struck Haiti.
- It's actually because of the vulnerability.
- Sure, there were some conflicts between European powers, but the long-term exploitation tended to exist in the most vulnerable places.
- At the same time Haiti was being invaded and exploited, the U.S. also invaded Veracruz, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua, pulling similar exploits in several of those places.
- The United States was setting itself up for the most lucrative century of its short existence.

- With implied violence being communicated to all of South and Central America -
- Made clear by the actual violence the U.S. was clearly willing to commit -
- U.S. influence began to grow.
- This influence was extended after World War 2 as the U.S. was directly involved quite a number of regime changes via coup - and a number of clear, as well as assumed assassinations of leaders facilitated by the U.S.
- The U.S., under Reagan, also showed its willingness to engage in huge, extended campaigns of terror and human rights violations,
- As the United States government looked the other way for drug dealers selling crack in the inner cities so that those dealers could fund a violent terrorist group in Nicaragua - the Contras -
- Who Reagan was not legally allowed to divert money to.
- This is part of the same scandal which precipitated the Iran - contra affair, in which Reagan sold weapons to a supposed enemy of the U.S. - Iran -
- In order that he could divert this untracked money where he wanted it - to the Contras reign of terror.
- The reasons for all our murders, torture, fomented coups, invasions, and exploitations were diverse.
- I mean, primarily we want power and control, so it really boils down to that - whether that means money, political advantage, military advantage, or whatever.

- The U.S. didn't want those it couldn't control, so it ensured that those in power would be under the thumb of the U.S.
- If leaders in the Western Hemisphere weren't willing to be put on a leash, then the U.S. would put them down.
- This happened to a number of good, popularly elected leaders, but one with which I'm the most familiar is Salvador Allende of Chile.
- When Allende was murdered, the man who took his place was Augusto Pinochet - a ruthless dictator - but a dictator backed by the U.S.
- He only eventually lost the full backing of the U.S. after he foolishly assassinated a Chilean exile - along with a U.S. citizen - on U.S. soil, by car bomb, in Washington DC.
- There are just some things the U.S. has to distance themselves from, you know.
- Thousands of tortured, raped, and murdered foreign peasants?
- No problem.
- One U.S. citizen on U.S. soil?
- Absolutely Unacceptable.
- This is the good old U.S. of A
- We undermine democracies we don't like.
- We subvert the will of the people if it doesn't suit our interests -
- And we install, train, and support, horrendous dictators so long as they'll be our lackeys.

- Let me give you just one other example of how you see this play out.
- Look at Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines.
- He was a ruthless dictator who was eventually ousted by the people power revolution.
- He sent the army out and a million people literally crowded around the tanks and the soldiers and won them over with love.
- Marcos high tailed it out of Dodge, but where oh where was he to go?
- Fortunately for Marcos, he had some friends in high places.
- One of THE highest places, actually.
- Marcos was friends with none other than Ronald Reagan, and as he sought to flee the Philippines, he did so on a U.S. C-130 bound for Hawaii.
- He brought with him: when he fled to Hawaii by way of Guam,^[279] he also brought with him 22 crates of cash valued at \$717 million, 300 crates of assorted [jewelry](#) with undetermined value, \$4 million worth of unset precious gems contained in Pampers diaper boxes, 65 Seiko and Cartier watches, a 12 by 4 ft box crammed full of real [pearls](#), a 3 ft solid [gold](#) statue covered in [diamonds](#) and other precious stones, \$200,000 in gold bullion and nearly \$1 million in Philippine pesos, and deposit slips to banks in the US, Switzerland, and the Cayman Islands worth \$124 million, which he all amassed during his [dictatorship](#).

- Marcos was a dog who exploited his people, but that didn't matter, because of the master who held his leash.
- His master cleaned him up, tucked him away in a beautiful Hawaiian home, let him take all his stolen money, and issued absolutely no consequences -
- Unless island arrest with access to luxurious living and virtually unlimited resources on Hawaii is considered justice.
- This is U.S. foreign policy.
- We put down any dog - especially the nice ones - if they're stray,
- But we keep the most vicious and rabid ones around, so long as they're attached to our leash.

- A lot of what the U.S. seeks to do on the world stage, then, is to attach leashes.
- For as many invasions and coups as we've been a part of, it really is a costly and inconvenient way to do business.
- It's much easier and less costly to put a dog on a leash than it is to train or replace a dog.
- There are many ways the U.S. puts leashes on its dictators, but one of the most effective has been through economics
- This isn't at all a new thing.
- In fact, one of the Founding Fathers explains how this works quite well.

- Listen to the words of Thomas Jefferson as he explains this strategy of economically leashing another.
- It's quite a lengthy quote, so you might want to change to one speed and buckle up.
- QUOTE:

- our system is to live in perpetual peace with the Indians, to cultivate an affectionate attachment from them, by every thing just & liberal which we can do for them within the bounds of reason, and by giving them effectual protection against wrongs from our own people. the decrease of game rendering their subsistence by hunting insufficient, we wish to draw them to agriculture, to spinning & weaving. the latter branches they take up with great readiness, because they fall to the women, who gain by quitting the labours of the field for those which are exercised within doors. when they withdraw themselves to the culture of a small piece of land, they will perceive how useless to them are their extensive forests, and will be willing to pare them off from time to time in exchange for necessaries for their farms & families. to promote this disposition to exchange lands which they have to spare & we want, for necessaries, which we have to spare & they want, we shall push our trading houses, and be glad to see the good & influential individuals among them run in debt, because we observe that when these debts get beyond what the individuals can pay, they become willing to lop th[em off] by a cession of lands. at our trading houses too we mean to sell so low as merely to repay us cost and charges so as neither to lessen or enlarge our capital. this is what private traders cannot do, for they must gain; they will consequently retire from the competition, & we shall thus get clear of this pest without giving offence or umbrage to the Indians. in this way our settlements will gradually circumscribe & approach the

Indians, & they will in time either incorporate with us as citizens of the US. or remove beyond the Missisipi. the former is certainly the termination of their history most happy for themselves. but in the whole course of this, it is essential to cultivate their love. as to their fear, we presume that our strength & their weakness is now so visible that they must see we have only to shut our hand to crush them, & that all our liberalities to them proceed from motives of pure humanity only. should any tribe be fool-hardy enough to take up the hatchet at any time, the seizing the whole country of that tribe & driving them across the Missisipi, as the only condition of peace, would be an example to others, and a furtherance of our final consolidation. END QUOTE

- EXPLAIN QUOTE
- If we can get a country dependent on us through imports, foreign aid, debt acquisition, or any other number of routes -
- Then we don't have to worry about control
- There's a great book on this called "Confessions of an economic hit man," and I think the author actually has a TedTalk on this as well.
- He shows how it was his job to go around to vulnerable countries and put an economic leash on them which made them dependent to the U.S.
- You can see this leash being put on Haiti as far back as the beginning, where the U.S. used recognition or the lack thereof as a bargaining tool -

- Or when the U.S. drafted constitutions that put Haiti into its pocket.
- But that sort of thing didn't end when the invasion force left Haiti.
- U.S. economic policy has been impacting Haiti ever since.
- As just one example, take a look at Haiti's rice.
- Haiti used to be self-sufficient in regard to its agricultural production.
- That makes sense, because for an island nation to survive it really needs to produce its own food.
- However, U.S. economic policies ended up driving the cost of imported rice down, meaning that Haitian rice farmers could no longer make a living.
- It was actually cheaper to import rice than it was to grow it on the island.
- How is that possible?
- Because the United States heavily subsidizes rice, meaning that the imported rice - with all the subsidies the government gives - is actually significantly cheaper.
- This is the same sort of thing that has happened with Mexico and the South.
- As a result of organizations like NAFTA, Mexico is restricted from placing tariffs on certain U.S. products.
- Great - free trade, right?
- Well, it's not really free trade because the products don't have prices which actually reflect their cost.

- The U.S. can afford to give its farmers huge subsidies, meaning that U.S. imports to Mexico are cheaper than Mexican products, as Mexico can't afford to subsidize its farmers to the same extent.
- So U.S. practices of subsidizing their products while drawing other countries into trade agreements that do significant harm to them have resulted in terribly unjust consequences.
- For Mexico and South/Central America, that means many are out of jobs and without food.
- You know that immigration crisis they talk about in the U.S. all the time?
- Well, that's in part - if not in large part - because of the way the U.S. has exploited other countries for its own self-interest.
- For Haiti, the results are just as bad, if not worse, since its a bit more limited in the fact that its a small island nation.
- It is not self-sustaining now, and it is the most impoverished nation in the Western Hemisphere by far, with Nicaragua coming in second at about double Haiti's GDP.
- While Haiti's poverty is bad for Haiti, its dependence on U.S. imports and foreign aid is a benefit for the U.S.
- In fact, 26% of Haitian imports came from the U.S. in 2021, with the Dominican Republic - its neighbor which inhabits the same island - coming in at second place with about 22%

- No other country topped 20%.
- Sure, Haiti doesn't make the U.S. wealthy from its importation of 1 billion worth of U.S. goods.
- But we have to remember that a large part of what empires fight for isn't directly economic, but rather idealistic.
- The U.S. recognizes the threat of a good example, and so long as Haiti is on a leash, they can't become a threat because we'll ensure they don't become a good example.

- While the U.S. has fomented coups in many countries to prevent good examples, maybe the most pertinent example for those of us who are U.S. citizens comes in the example of Iran.
- That example is pertinent to us because not only is it very clear and very representative, but because it's had a significant impact on the world.
- Beyond the real world impact, it's also an example which shows us what ideal the U.S. is ultimately fighting against.
- Sure, the U.S. is fighting against communism or socialism in a sense - but that's always put forward as this ideology which is genocidal and forced upon the people -
- Perhaps, say, like Mao's revolution which murdered many and was forced upon a significant portion of the population through violence.

- But in Iran we see that this is a caricature of what the U.S. often ends up fighting.
- Often, the U.S. fights against an ideal that seeks justice.
- That's exactly what, in my opinion, was happening in Iran in the early 1950's.
- STORY OF IRAN
 - BP
 - Democratically elected / nationalization
 - Coup
 - Ruthless dictator installed

- OK.
- That was Iran.
- But what about Haiti.
- Interestingly Haiti came close to being a good example in the early 90's.
- At that time, the country had been run by a ruthless family of dictators for some decades - the Duvalier family.
- The U.S. had been very supportive of the Duvalier regime, even helping to train the military who would return to Haiti and torture the citizens.
- All that was very common knowledge.
- And the Duvalier family would of course siphon funds off for themselves.
- But they were on a leash, so the U.S. was happy to help a few grow rich at the expense of the masses, so long as that meant the leash was kept taught.

- One day, Jean Bertrand Aristide - a religious leader and liberation theologian - decided that he'd had enough.
- He ran against the Duvalier family and won the presidency by an overwhelming majority vote
- The U.S., however, was no fan of liberation theology - this theology which sought to cut the leash.
- See, when there's one leader who's on a leash, that leader may appear to have a lot of power, but they're manageable.
- If they get out of line you can just assassinate them or get a new guy in office.
- But if someone who truly represents the people comes into office, as we saw with the story of Iran, then when you deal with a leader, you're really dealing with all the people.
- The people finally recognize that they have power and they're no longer easy to manipulate.
- Under Aristide, the people were recognizing their power.
- But the U.S. - the leashholder,
- And the business and military elite - the ones on leashes,
- Didn't like Aristide.
- Before Aristide could even take office, a coup was put into the works and he had to leave the country.
- While the U.S. had seemingly won, there were such mass protests in the U.S., that Clinton was forced to help escort Aristide back to power in a military exercise called, Operation Uphold Democracy!
- Talk about virtue signaling hypocrisy

- The very people who support a coup and hide behind the bushes want to take credit for reinstalling democracy.
- But that's ok.
- If you fail, try again.
- And they did.
- Aristide's policies and his calls for France to pay Haiti back for 21 billion in extortion money the Haitians had paid them to free themselves from slavery -
- Those policies weren't too popular with the white Westerners.
- So another coup was enacted in 2004 when Aristide was forced to resign by U.S. soldiers and escorted out of the country, into exile.

- That brings us up to the present on Haiti
- There are many other stories I've left out in regard to the story of Haiti, and I hope you'll check out the links in the show notes as well as my reading list on goodreads.
- You should especially check out the work of Paul Farmer who served as a doctor in Haiti for decades.
- He has fantastic insight into Haiti's place in the world, and he's also a liberation theologian and carries a beautiful perspective.

- But for now, we have enough material to work with to talk about the implications for our season on propaganda and conspiracies.

- The first question for us might be, does this whole history of U.S. relations with Haiti really count as a conspiracy?
- It's not like Jefferson hatched this plan 200 years in the making.
- The history we unpacked is filled with a number of separate conspiracies - and a number of unjust incidents that weren't really master plans, but rather actions of circumstance and opportunity.
- At the same time, what do you call it when the history of what the U.S. has done to Haiti - and to much of the rest of the world - is so clear,
- Yet nobody knows it?
- We are taught that Haitians are poor and dirty, and it's implied that this is because they're lazy or not as industrious.
- They're not as smart, maybe, or they're sexually promiscuous and unwise, like we saw with the way Haiti was stigmatized during the early days of the AIDS pandemic.
- The United States isolated Haiti in its early days,
- Sought to exploit Haiti to unload its baggage after the Civil War,
- Sought to exploit Haiti for big business under black ambassadors like Frederick Douglas,
- Invaded the country and stole their gold,
- Re-wrote their constitution to allow foreign corporations to buy land and to give us military rights there,

- Forced Haiti to pay extortion money for its freedom from slavery until 1947,
- Undermined their agricultural self-sufficiency through forced economic policies like tariff rates and the subsidization of our farmers,
- Supported ruthless dictators, upheld their regime, and trained their security forces,
- Supported the killing of - or at least looked the other way when people's movements arose under leaders like those who held to liberation theology,
- And fomented or supported two coups against the most popularly elected president in Haiti's history.
- And that's a short list.
- A big list, but a short one of the injustices.
- The fact that we as Americans can look on Haiti with pity rather than guilt -
- That we can seek to give charity to them every once in awhile when there's an earthquake,
- rather than giving reparations for what we owe them, in hopes that we might find some sliver of forgiveness and redemption
- What do you call that other than propaganda and conspiracy?
- A long-running conspiracy isn't any less of a conspiracy, and the intent of the conspirators doesn't nullify what it is.
- For most, it may be a conspiracy of ignorance, but it's a willful conspiracy.
- And when conspiracies reach this level in the Bible -

- When injustice becomes so baked into the system that nobody can see it -
- Or nobody wants to see it -
- That's when God troubles the waters
- When God sets the slaves free,
- When Pharoah gets dethroned.
- When the rich cry out.
- When the oppressive people who think they're God's people get sent into exile.
- Maybe I'm waxing biblical here.
- I mean, the waters haven't been troubled for hundreds of years.
- But I don't think my sentiments are far off.
- In fact, my thoughts here are reminiscent of one of the founding fathers who I've already quoted in this episode.
- Listen to the words of Thomas Jefferson on this idea of justice.
- QUOTE: And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that his justice cannot sleep for ever: that considering numbers, nature and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation is among possible events: that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest... END QUOTE

- Jefferson recognized, as King recognized and as Parker before him recognized -
- That the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.
- Or in negro spiritual terms - God is going to trouble the waters
- The waters off the coast of Haiti have been troubled by the United States ever since the country's inception.
- They've been troubled so that we, the empire, Babylon, could build the wealth and power that would secure our place in the world.
- But injustice cannot go on forever.
- God will eventually trouble the waters, and Babylon the great will fall.
- When she does, there will be many shouts of joy rising up from the blood of the millions we've afflicted from around the globe -
- But especially from the place who has for so long been our neighbor, but to whom we have not been a neighbor to.

Charles Herbert Allen Mayor puerto rico sugar: mono-crop

and importing food making dependency

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BPdV7ShkVic>

The threat which prevents reconciliation is that justice might be brought about.

-

-

NAFTA tariff w/Mexico immigrants

Marcos

Aristide hired women cops

Khian sea waste philadelphia nuclear waste

Author:

<https://paulderienzo.wordpress.com>

Haiti's nightmare: The Cocaine Coup and the C.I.A.
connection - The Village Sun

<https://thevillagesun.com/haitis-nightmare-the-cocaine-coup-the-c-i-a-connection>

How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, slavery and capitalism,
and THE INTERNATIONALISTS

- Story of Carribean really story of Africa
- Exploited from the beginning

Brings up question of what is conspiracy?

- History and conspiracy are one in the same, as nations move towards their own advantage
- Bleak view of human nature, as anyone competent in history should
 - Racism, buck v. bell, unit 731, they thought they were free, milgram

David walker's appeal to the colored citizens of the world

Gvt. Conspiracy/ Propaganda encapsulate all other forms

- Isolation, myth, inception, silence, and benevolence

Black Panther

- Toussaint, imperial exploitation of Wakanda

Haiti encapsulates complexity

ISOLATION: Non-recognition by U.S., embargo, USAID

MYTH: AIDS, pearl of antilles, poverty, cultural ingrained deficiency

INCEPTION: Code Noir

SILENCE: Duvalier abuses and aid on/off

BENEVOLENCE: American "generosity"

Rochambeau in American Revolution:

<https://www.battlefields.org/learn/biographies/rochambeau>

Rochambeau in Haitian revolution and genocide:

<http://islandluminous.fiu.edu/part02-slide13.html>

LaFayette for abolition

Hamilton pro-haiti:

<https://itshamilttime.com/2012/12/07/hamiltons-views-on-race-and-slavery-haiti/#:~:text=Hamilton%20supported%20the%20Haitian%20revolution.of%20a%20free%20black%20republic.>

Jefferson on Haiti:

<https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2010/01/americas-curse-on-haiti/34183/>

Decolonial Haiti - tried to become like empires. Similar to the internationalists and how Japan failed because they tried to be like the empires

Haitian pigs killed

<https://www.theglobalist.com/haiti-and-the-dominican-republic-one-island-two-worlds/>

Wade in the water

God's gonna trouble the waters

Bridge over troubled waters

- <https://www.lyricsondemand.com/u/unknownlyrics/damndamndamnthefilipinoslyrics.html>
- <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/98-01-02-3827>

1889-1891

Frederick Douglass and American Empire in Haiti

<https://reparationscomm.org/reparations-news/editors-choice/frederick-douglass-and-american-empire-in-haiti/>

platt amendment - Google Search Haiti

Jefferson on taking land:

<https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-39-02-0500>

-
- At what point is a conspiracy not a conspiracy, but a modus operandi - general operations?

Charlemagne Péralte

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charlemagne_P%C3%A9ralte

Paul Farmer and Liberation Theology:

<https://religionandpolitics.org/2016/03/01/the-liberation-theology-of-dr-paul-farmer/>

Code Noir in Haiti and forced baptism

Voltaire wrote that “the Black Code only serves to show that the legal scholars consulted by Louis XIV had no ideas regarding human rights.” Robert Giacomet, a French attorney, called the Black Code a crime against humanity in

his book *Le Code Noir, autopsie d'un crime contre l'humanité* ("The Black Code, Autopsy of a Crime against Humanity"). Sala-Molins, who taught political philosophy at the University of Toulouse and at the University of Paris-Sorbonne, referred to it as "the most monstrous legal document of modern times" and only a weak barrier to the master's tyranny.

Slavery was abolished in France on February 4, 1794. The decree stated: "The Convention declares the slavery of the blacks abolished in all the colonies; consequently all men irrespective of color living in the colonies are French citizens and shall enjoy all the rights provided by the Constitution." Unfortunately, none of the implementing measures were taken, and slavery was reinstated by a decree of July 16, 1802, while Napoleon Bonaparte was First Consul. It was definitively abolished by a decree of April 27, 1848, on the initiative of [Victor Schoelcher](#). The Black Code had remained in force for 163 years.

<https://blogs.loc.gov/law/2011/01/slavery-in-the-french-colonies/>

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-francaise-d-etudes-americaines-2015-1-page-6.htm>

<https://www.history.com/news/abraham-lincoln-black-resettlement-haiti>

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/factcheck/2020/06/30/fact-check-u-k-paid-off-debts-slave-owning-families-2015/3283908001/>

Invasion of Grenada: Chomsky's "threat of a good example"

<https://chomsky.info/unclesam01/>

- Haiti couldn't be allowed to be an example
- https://sociology.yale.edu/sites/default/files/invasion_of_grenada_foresight.pdf

Hamilton helped draft Haitian constitution but policies changed under Jefferson

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p2R_FyKisRk

<https://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5018>

- Debt and controlling govts. For next 30 years
- Book: stories of an economic hit man
- Get them in debt, which is what the U.S. used to justify invading Haiti in 1915 - Stossel: trade prevents armies from crossing borders

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/may/13/haitians-self-sufficiency#:~:text=When%20the%20cost%20of%20US,the%20dependence%20on%20food%20aid.>

<https://oec.world/en/profile/country/hti?yearlyTradeFlowSelector=flow1>