On January 4, 1965 Raymond Joseph, the Secretary-General of the Haitian Coalition, sent Frances R. Grant, Secretary-General of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom (IADF), two small booklets that outlined the political and economic aims of the Coalition, one of the leading Haitian exile organizations in New York City. The gesture proved to be an act of legitimation and a way to harness the material and political clout of transnational human right organizations, like Grant’s IADF. A couple of years earlier, Grant had encouraged leading Haitian exiles in the United States to consolidate their political efforts and devise a comprehensive platform for Haitian reform and development that challenged the dictatorial politics of François Duvalier. Grant recalled a press conference at the Overseas Press Club of America in New York City on August 7, 1963 during which influential Haitian exiles left a bad impression on US journalists regarding their vision for a non-authoritarian, post-Duvalier state. Their “defensive mood,” a lack of “positive answers,” and an absence of a “written” positive pledge, according to Grant, did not bode well with the media and would have serious implications on the “necessary moral and material support” needed to liberate Haiti and to “avoid any chaos in the country.” Over the next two years more than 40 Haitian exile leaders assembled to form larger, more organized alliances, including the League of Haitian Patriots, a more leftist organization, and the Haitian Coalition, a non-militaristic political group that sought the economic and social advancement of Haitians. Supported by the philanthropy of
Haitian professionals in the United States, liberal whites and possibly the US State Department, the Haitian Coalition orchestrated weekly radio broadcasts and a newspaper (in French with some English sections) that demonstrated their administrative efficiency and industriousness, and also emphasized the gravity of their political message. The aforementioned booklet entitled the *Programme de la Coalition des Forces Démocratique Révolutionnaires Haïtiennes* sought to push the boundaries of democracy beyond electoral processes and the constitution of civic and state power in order to link principles of democracy—particularly popular control, political equality and relative economic parity—with a human rights discourse.

Historically, these two phenomena—democracy and human rights—have not always been intellectually wedded. According to scholars Susan Marks and Andrew Clapham the idea of democracy as a human right was not always a given; its distinctive literatures, which often emphasize electoral politics, “multipartyism ... political liberalism ... [and] participatory decision making,” and its more recent efforts to envision a “mutual dependence” prove to be “an index ... of their non-unity.”

During the early to mid 1960s Joseph rarely employed the term “human rights,” asserting that the human rights movement lacked significant traction as a cohesive global campaign. Yet, Joseph’s political will and activity articulated in the Coalition’s *Programme*, the pages of the organization’s weekly, *Le Combattant Haïtien*, in addition to its broadcasts on Radio Vonvon, convey an alternative framework that no longer delinked and disavowed the relationship between democracy and human rights. As Joseph and members of the Coalition defended in the *Programme*: “We believe in democracy ... because that word means equal opportunity for all, justice for all, bread for all, respect for all. ... Democracy, far from being an invention of the West nor a device used to throw dust in the eyes, represents for us a fundamental requirement of a socialized human being.”

Within a republic that experienced generations of political violence and severe economic disparity due to a legacy of slavery, foreign intervention and internal power struggles, the Coalition sought to eradicate a tyrannical, “irresponsible and parasitic” system of Duvalierism in the 1960s in order to promote a new society. This new Haiti strived towards a “massive integration of the Haitian people in national life” so that “knowledge, political responsibility and start-up economic development” could be “diffused” to Haitian rural communities and beyond. Thus, it is during this contentious moment of authoritarian rule and underdevelopment in a number of Caribbean and Latin American states, in addition to declining US-Latin American Cold War relations that Joseph’s activism proved to be emblematic of an ongoing protest and rights movement by Caribbean and Latin American exiles. From the late 1930s through the 1960s, many Caribbean and Latin American exiles remained fixed on two particular notions: coupling despotic rule with international legal discourses and transnational organizations committed to, with resolutions centered on, the dignity
of every citizen and subject, while also appending and translating the principles of human rights and democracy to Caribbean and Latin American peoples.

In this article I examine Raymond Joseph’s political vision of Haiti between 1965 and 1969, particularly through how he appropriates, links and frames a human rights discourse that is dependent upon and constitutive of democratic principles of collectivity, popular control and relative political and economic equality. The period between 1965 and 1969 highlight the inception and demise of the Haitian Coalition’s main media organs, *Le Combattant Haïtien* and Radio Vonvon, which possessed significant influence with Haitians and political sympathizers from the Congo to Mexico City, and to New York and Venezuela. After a constitutional referendum that solidified François Duvalier’s life-long presidency in the summer of 1964, the importance of the politically charged, anti-despotism radio show and newspaper became apparent. Furthermore, it is through these mediums that one can examine and assess how human rights discourse was made, used and circulated outside of a Duvalier dominated Haiti. From 1957 onward this international democratic opposition to Duvalierism, which has received minimal attention in scholarship on François Duvalier or the democracy and rights movements in the Americas, helped produce an international outcry and served as a critical antecedent to the array of forces that deposed Duvalierism in 1986. Employing aspects of scholar Sally Merry's theoretical framework on translation and vernacularization within the human rights field, I argue that Joseph linked democracy and human rights, as well as undertaking a process of translation so as to expand and explicate human rights subjectivity, and also to empower Haitians in the republic and abroad to struggle for a democratic, anti-Duvalierist state. Yet, through the process of linking and translating within this Cold War and transnational American space, the Secretary-General was enshrouded in a world where he was both compliant with and resistant to the ideological and material structures and programs putatively intrinsic to democracy and a rights discourse, such as neoliberal capitalism, individualism, aid, Pan Americanism and anti-communism. This negotiation or navigation of a deeply political and ideological space highlights what Edward Said understands as the dynamism of the exile experience—nomadic and “contrapuntal”—which may provide openings for new conceptions of experiencing humanness and offer new pathways for a potential return home.

Among many Haitian exiles was a shared belief, particularly for Joseph, who underscored internal and foreign economic underdevelopment, that they were engaged in the “social processes of human rights implementation and resistance,” and thus entering into a political and ideological space where human rights subjectivity could broaden and mature. The Secretary-General of the Haitian Coalition outlined a post-Duvalier plan that adopted fundamental principles from seminal US and Western European-centered diplomatic and international events, specifically the ratification of the Atlantic Charter (1941) and the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (1948). As part of Haitian exiles’ vision for a new society, the Coalition stated that the “absolute foundation” of a “new Haiti . . . endorsed the
principles proclaimed naturally” in 1948 at the United Nations General Assembly.¹⁰ Concurrently, exile articulations of a more humane and “good society” also possessed some connections to the ideas of the Haitian peasantry and market women, in addition to having implications for marginalized and impoverished peoples in the Americas and in other spaces of global underdevelopment. Thus, Joseph and, at times, international human rights Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs), who sought to expand and conjoin the idea of democracy and human rights, and therefore broaden human rights subjectivity, worked carefully to negotiate and remonstrate a particularly “Anglo-American vision” of prosperity, order and rights by the US government and the Organization of Americans States (OAS). Joseph and organizations like the IADF labored to replace “vague references to economic justice” with more structured and explicit promotion of democratic principles, diversifying the national economy, and developing Haitian capability and social and economic mobility, with a particular focus on the Haitian masses.” In 1967, Joseph wrote in Le Combattant, in response to both an often ambivalent and inefficient action taken by Washington and the OAS on the issue of Duvalier’s violent and dictatorial acts, “How can people be so callous about killings, illegal jailings, nocturnal disappearances, slave trade, [and] deportation? How can the ‘democrats’ sit idly by while a few miles away human flesh is being cut up, beaten to a pulp? Such callousness makes it hard for democratically minded Haitians to explain Human Rights and Democracy.”¹²

Legal scholars, historians and anthropologists of human rights have provided important analytical and temporal frameworks to address central issues within the field, including tensions between the protection of individual rights and state sovereignty, foreign strategies versus indigenous approaches to state oppression, and the effectiveness of human rights law as an “emancipatory tool.” Merry forces us to think about the adaptation or vernacularization of individual rights to “local meanings and institutions.” Translators, or the “people in the middle,” like Joseph or Frances R. Grant, interpret the moral arguments, “discourses and practices” from transnational institutions and international law to fit particular conditions of trauma, displacement or breach of transnational agreements.¹³ These “knowledge brokers” operate within a structure of contractarianism, where the architecture of the contract possesses moral, epistemological and political elements that historically have privileged the knowledge systems and peoples of the global North and West.¹⁴ Although these translators exercise a central role in the development, exchange and implementation of individual rights and ideas, how do these actors disrupt, negotiate or ignore the normative structures within the contractarianism of human rights? As Joseph and others utilize the language of rights in the United States and seek the guidance, monetary funding, and political and military influence of the US State Department, the UN, the OAS and human rights NGOs they must also accept to some degree the realistic terms of democratic governance, anti-communism, capitalism, and Pan Americanist ideology. Thus, how do these actors challenge or negotiate the
inequalities embedded in these systems, such as foreign intrusion (whether through monetary aid or military intervention) and class stratification?

Translators function within an influential and “vulnerable” space. Their translations operate within a world of asymmetrical relations influenced by a myriad of factors including class, religious faith, race, gender, or “social commitments . . . and established discursive fields that constrain the repertoire of ideas and practices available to them.” François Duvalier’s repressive politics maintained grave implications for those who opposed him within and beyond the boundaries of the nation. This imbalance of power limited democratic reforms in free speech, and stifled rural and urban employment and women’s rights. Throughout Duvalier’s dictatorship Raymond Joseph stood at the forefront of anti-Duvalierist opposition. Additionally, Joseph was a critical figure in the translation of a human rights discourse for Haitians in the United States, in Haiti and other sites throughout the Haitian diaspora, including the Bahamas, Canada and Cuba. Currently, Joseph is well known as former Haitian Ambassador to the US (2004-2010) and the uncle of popular hip hop musician, producer and songwriter, Wyclef Jean. At the same time, it is important to examine Joseph’s life and work for democratic change in Haiti, which spans more than four decades.

**Duvalierism and Raymond Joseph in Chicago and New York City**

In the spring of 1954, a US Baptist Minister from North Carolina visited Haiti and hired Joseph as an interpreter. By the end of his trip in April the minister asked the young Joseph his plans for the future and Joseph answered enthusiastically that he wanted “to study in America.” “Count on me,” the minister confidently replied and by August Joseph was in Chicago enrolled at Moody’s Bible Institute, where he would study biblical languages and ministry. After his collegiate education Joseph returned to Haiti in 1959 and spent two years under Duvalier’s reign and the violent activity of the Volontaires de Sécurité Nationale (VSN) and the tonton makouts, Duvalier’s paramilitary secret police. Within months upon his return Joseph had several disturbing encounters with the VSN. Although he downplayed the incidents years later as “nothing big,” these frequent run-ins proved distressing enough for him to conclude: “If I wanted my life, Haiti wasn’t the place for me.”

Unable to heal this “rift” between him and the ubiquitous suppression of civil liberties exerted by the state, Joseph journeyed back to Chicago in 1961 in a self-imposed exile, and enrolled in a graduate program in Anthropology at the University of Chicago. Hundreds of miles away from New York City, the “center of Haitian political activity” in the US, Joseph started to build a community with the considerably smaller population of Haitians in Chicago, while also immersing himself in his graduate research, an interdisciplinary examination of second-generation Mexican life in Chicago. Ironically, Joseph’s scholarly interests at the University of Chicago forewarned the fate of many political exiles and Haitians who fled their
homeland during the late 1950s through the 1970s believing that “becom[ing] American” was impossible and undesirable. To fight against the notion of the permanency of Duvalier’s authoritarian power and the sobering reality that Haitian exile life was fixed outside of their native land, Raymond Joseph demonstrated a more active and institutional role in anti-Duvalierist politics in the United States.

From 1965 to 1969, the activist journalism of Joseph demonstrated his consistent engagement with notions of human rights and democratic principles. His radio broadcast and his weekly newspaper proved to be critical pieces in challenging Duvalierist power. More specifically, through print media and radio Joseph and other members of the anti-authoritarian Haitian Coalition sought: to challenge the US and inter-American political and aid institutions such as the OAS which, at different times, supported, ignored or insufficiently challenged the Duvalier dictatorship. The Coalition also garnered support for democratic opposition groups within and outside Haiti through direct criticism of the state and indirect cultural programming, in addition to exploring the depths of human rights through an adherence to democratic frameworks and processes that valued open and free dialogue, rigorous documentation and research, and exposing the lineage of underdevelopment. By the middle of the 1960s Joseph paid heed to the message that his father, a Baptist minister, relayed to him regarding the dictatorship: “Don’t learn to use a gun, never use [it]. Your hand and your mouth will always take care of you.”

Thus, through writing, editing and broadcasting Haitian political and cultural news as opposed to the more radical or rather militaristic and invasive means pursued by other exile groups, especially Jeune Haiti, Joseph intended on “win[ning] the minds of Haitians” by providing “enough information” on the Duvalierist state. Joseph admitted that his media approach would take “longer,” but eventually it would be able “to draw the people away from Duvalier.”

With a successful $50,000 fundraising campaign, Radio Vonvon, a short wave radio program, broadcasted news to Haiti. Initially, the station was run from Chicago, but quickly moved to Manhattan, home to a significant Haitian exile population. Located in the Paris Theater on 58th Street and 5th Avenue, Radio Vonvon’s home was WRUL, one of the few international radio stations in New York City. During the first three months of the thirty-minute 6AM broadcast, Radio Vonvon, popularly known as the “6AM Mass,” emphasized the cultural aspects of Haitian life: folkloric songs, stories about Bouki and Ti-Malice and banal stories concerning different regions of the country, all news, according to Joseph, that was apolitical in content in order to entice listeners in Haiti. Although one cannot be certain today of the specific folkloric songs and Bouki and Ti-Malice stories that aired on the show, it would be interesting to consider how trickster tales and traditional songs often rooted in historical power struggles were interpreted by Haitian citizens in the context of Haitians en exil transmitting their show. Nevertheless, within a matter of months Radio Vonvon’s cultural programming shifted to more overtly political commentary that centered on anti-dictatorial Haitian affairs. In surprisingly great detail Radio Vonvon, similar to Le
Combattant Haitien, reported new Duvalier legislation and decrees, the names of persons harassed or killed by the tonton makouts, state graft, US State Department and OAS relations with the Haitian government, and the inner workings of the National Palace. According to an interview with Joseph in The New Yorker, the broadcast provided “names and places and dates... We had our sources in Haiti. We told people what was going on in the Palace, in the ministries [and] in the countryside.” Additionally, as Joseph revealed in a letter to the editor of The New York Times, “during the two years of its existence, the Haitian Coalition has built up a network of informants throughout Haiti. This explains the accuracy of our facts and has caused the mad tyrant to hit at his closest collaborators to detect and destroy our organization[,] which Duvalier himself terms as ‘bugs in the potato garden’ and ‘termites in the house.’” Duvalier’s callous representation of the exile community as insects and, specifically non-human, speaks to the injustices they endured, but also the importance of the process of humanizing themselves and immobile citizens, particularly through writing and broadcast journalism. “We were always two or three steps ahead of them [Duvalier and his supporters],” affirmed Joseph. In fact, many in the Haitian community believed that Joseph and members of the Haitian Coalition, collaborated with the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)—a claim that Joseph disputes to this day. Radio Vonvon bothered Haitian state officials to such a degree that in September 1965, Duvalier’s administration asked the US State Department to “silence” it because it “constitute[d] aggression against [the] government.” The National Palace added that Duvalier’s regime had not “allow[ed] similar anti-United States broadcasts to emanate from Haiti.”

One of the goals of Radio Vonvon was to disseminate information with enough details so as demonstrate that Haitians abroad had a network of spies that could rival the Haitian state and inevitably weaken Duvalier’s authoritarian power with the masses, the latter which manifested itself in state-sponsored festivals and bribes, in addition to Duvalier’s alignment of himself with Vodou ritual beliefs and practices. Moreover, as a way to participate in technologies of power and circulate (and possibly receive) information, the Haitian Coalition distributed a number of transistor radios to Haitians in Haiti. Depending upon who owned a transistor radio and the person’s relationship to the exile or diasporic community, the possession of the radio could be perceived as a seditious act by the administration. In an effort to co-opt the media influence and presence of Haitians abroad Duvalier, according to Joseph, asserted that “From now on,” apparently through otherworldly powers, that he would also speak “from abroad.” In other words, Duvalier attempted to convince Haitians that he also controlled diasporic news reports.

In Haitian Vodou, practitioners believe that the initiates are able to communicate with the lwa, or spirits; however, it seems that many Haitians, according to Joseph, believed that other animals not part of the sacred pantheon of spirits could also be employed by Vodou initiates to communicate or spy. In the early 1960s Joseph claimed that while in conversation with another Haitian professional
educated in Spain, a black dog walked closely to them and was believed to be a “spy” sent by the head of state. Interestingly, in the late 1960s Joseph is quoted as saying that a majority of Haitians, those who believe in Vodou, “believe the dogs, the cats, even the tarantulas work for Duvalier.” Utilizing his studies in anthropology and cultural relativism Joseph believed that he could not “convince Haitians that dogs don’t spy.” “If I tell them that,” Joseph stated, “they would think I am naïve and I don’t know [Haitian] culture. [Yet,] I can convince them that the dogs have switched allegiance.”

Therein lies the vulnerability of the translator. As Merry asserts, “[the translator’s] vulnerability is her ability to persuade people with grievances to accept her definition of the problem. . . . She may confront violence and other forms of resistance. She is constrained by her resources and institutional location. The translator must walk a fine line between too much replication, in which case the new ideas will lose their appeal to local communities, and too much hybridity, in which case the reform will lose the support of the global community including its funding and publicity.” Despite the potential for death threats, Joseph and the supporters and organizers of Le Combattant and Radio Vonvon needed to convince Haitians to challenge an authoritarian system in Haiti that continuously denied Haitians the experience of being human. To do this, many Haitians exiles privileged the values and systems of the Haitian folk or peasantry in political discourse, which often was generated by a dreamlike state or an exilic state of “essential sadness” or “terminal loss . . . at not being with others in the communal habitation.”

The trauma of exile, particularly for many Haitian former ambassadors, government officials, intellectuals, labor leaders, artists, business professionals and factory workers, who exchanged pleasurments and discussed politics in Upper West Side Manhattan hotels or apartments and street corners and Brooklyn dwellings, generated an illusion or sense of reflection in which many displaced persons enclosed and fixed themselves in an imaginary of a “triumphant ideology[,] a restored people” or in an “exaggerated sense of group solidarity.” Their exilic condition produced a tremendous sense of loss, but also a need to reclaim and reconstruct severed lives. Several writers, scholars and even acclaimed filmmakers invoked this notion of the dream, the longing for a return to Haiti in the context of exile. Rubbing shoulders with other noted Haitian exile elites, a Haitian art critic, as reported by The New Yorker, argued that Haitian artists in New York “do not suffer more from being in exile [because] . . . their imaginations are in Haiti.” As he explained, “They are working out of their Haitian background, and under the influence of voodoo, and they could continue working in New York for the next century just as if they were still in Haiti. . . . While they are in New York, their work is the extension of a dream.”

Furthermore, in acclaimed director Raoul Peck’s film The Haitian Corner, there is a critical scene in a Manhattan bar where the protagonist Joseph and his friend Brunel empathize with a patron, listlessly staring out the window. Brunel testified that “everyday he gets up, gets dressed, he packs his things to go back to Haiti. [He] goes
to the travel agency, asks for the cost of the flight then stays [at the bar window] all day long—that’s how Haitians live here.”

During the early Duvalier years exile politicians and leaders in New York sought to locate their politics and their vision for a new Haiti in relation to the peasantry. Exiled Haitian Presidential candidate Louis Dejoie fervently claimed his political and ideological bond to the black peasantry in relation to Clement Jumelle, one of Duvalier’s main presidential rivals: “I, a mulatto, am far nearer to the black masses than Jumelle and all those who speak of class, of black class. I have lived nearer to the Haitian peasants than Jumelle. I know more intimately their needs[,] and I speak their creole better than Jumelle. . . . In the countryside, on my plantations, I sleep in their thatch house, I eat with them. Jumelle has never had any rapport with a Haitian peasant.”

An examination of ethnographic literature of the 1950s and 1960s by some of the leading US and Haitian anthropologists highlight some important ideological convergences of thought between rural and poor urban denizens and the well-heeled exile community. These intersections reveal potential cross-class and transnational conceptions of a new and more humane Haiti. Both Sidney Mintz and Alfred Métraux document how the notions of respect, collective organizing and sharing, and interdependency or reciprocity are central aspects of local individual and community relationships. In Métraux’s study of cooperative labor systems in Marbial and Mintz’s study of pratik among Haitian market women, both scholars situate these characteristics within an economic context that helps to “stabilize” and promote value in trade and “distributive” activity, in addition to encouraging relatively positive market relationships. Yet, Métraux and Mintz, as well as several other anthropologists of Haiti (e.g. Katherine Dunham, Harold Courlander, and Melville Herskovits) often fail to demonstrate how peasant social and economic life is connected to state governance, international markets and political relations.

Moreover, their work neglects to illuminate how these multiscalar relations translated into critiques of the state dedicated to the ideological formation of a better Haiti. Current ethnographic scholarship on the Haitian peasantry, specifically, and the Latin American peasantry more generally, tend to emphasize how state and international politics, including globalization’s economic forces impact peasant groups, in addition to how peasants respond to neoliberal forces. One can make the argument that Haitian exiles in the late 1950s and 1960s vocalized and documented peasant political and economic assessments, and also appropriated the core belief systems of respect, collective work, sharing, and interdependency in order to garner support for and to shape an anti-Duvalierist Americas and a new democratic Haiti. For example, in the conclusion of the Haitian Coalition’s Programme, the transformative agricultural, social, economic and political vision for Haiti is described as a “great” konbit. The employment of the term konbit, a collective agricultural system of work predominantly rooted in rural areas, proved significant as a message of interdependency, public decision making, a respect for rights, relative economic equality,
and importantly a sense that a convivial atmosphere is a central part of work and community building.40

While the mission of the Haitian Coalition and other Haitian exiles was founded in ideas similar to those of the Haitian peasantry, the peasantry itself understood interdependency and collective work as a means of survival and sustainability as opposed to the creation of a new society. The key objectives of the Coalition outlined in the *Programme de la Coalition* asserted the importance of “rais[ing] the moral, material, economic, social and cultural development of the Haitian man; chang[ing] the social structure of the nation” so that the nation-state could “reduce differences in living standards and per capita revenues,” and thereby generate a greater chance for social mobility.” “This new society,” the Coalition argued, will produce a government that will be at the “service of any class, or any faction . . . [its] efforts will be directed towards human promotion of the Haitian people as a whole.”41 In this framework emerges a precursor to Amartya Sen’s notion of capability deprivation, largely framed as a lack of “substantive freedoms” an individual “enjoys to lead the kind of life he/she has reason to value.”42 Joseph contended that the goal of development was to counteract capability deprivation by supporting and broadening civil liberties and opportunities, and removing “major sources of unfreedom: poverty as well as tyranny . . . [and] systematic social deprivation.”43 Consequently, in search of respect within US and Bahamian government circles that were either ambivalent towards state violence and graft or supportive of an anti-communist Duvalier, while also in need of a unified and collective effort to oppose Duvalierist politics in order to craft a new Haiti, the leading group of Haitian exiles appropriated values often associated with the Haitian peasantry.
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In fact, the logo and tagline of Le Combattant highlighted the imperative for a collaboration between the intellectual elite (not necessarily an exile elite) and the peasantry. The image depicts two men in the countryside shaking hands. The man on the left portrays a Haitian peasant with barefeet, a short-sleeved shirt, straw hat, and one tattered pant leg, rolled up. The man on the right signifies refinement and edification. He is dressed in a suit and tie, holding several books. The men are moving toward each other so as to demonstrate an equality or an agreement to share knowledge in order to erect a new, more egalitarian nation. However, where is the Haitian woman in this picture? And does her absence reveal her marginalized role in this new vision? At the same time, the picture could also be read as the elite imparting technical and philosophical knowledge upon the unlettered peasantry in order to improve economic and social conditions in agrarian areas, so as to control the intense flow of urban migration of the peasantry to Port-au-Prince. Thus, elite and middle-class dwellers exemplify their fear of a countrified and unsophisticated Haitian metropolitan culture.

Yet, the landscape in the image is significant to and indicative of the Haitian Coalition mission. The mountainous countryside, with a humble single family thatched-roof house, communicates that a bucolic Haiti is emblematic of a collectivism needed by exiles—a peaceful and respectful communalism that challenges the violent and turbulent politics of Duvalierism. The provincial areas hence prove important again; the peasantry and the land that they cultivate is “the backbone of the Haitian economy,” and it could produce a new Haiti—democratic, politically and economically stable and systematically promoting often bourgeois notions of progress for the peasantry. The capital or urban sphere, where power has been traditionally centralized and brutally exercised, is reimagined to share in the fruits of this collective urban/rural partnership, thus, terminating what Sylvia Wynter deemed the “circularity” of indigence, violence and inequality. Le Combattant’s tagline complements its logo and also makes a profound statement: “La main dans la main pour vaincre, la main dans la mains pour reconstruire (Hand in hand to win, hand in hand to rebuild).”

Le Combattant and Radio Vonvon served as vital instruments in the exiles’ vernacularization process, which was critical to the translation of rights and new attempts to conceive of and enact democratic principles and human rights. To pinpoint where Joseph and his media tools fit along the vernacularization “continuum” is difficult. As Merry illuminates, the differences between “replication” and “hybridization” in translation and vernacularization—processes that demonstrate the extent to which ideas have or have not transformed from “[their] transnational prototype” to “local cultural forms”—are “a matter of degree.” Joseph, as well as other exiles and members of the Haitian Coalition, understood the importance of maintaining good relations with the US government, of heralding the benefits of democracy and free market ideology within an intense and politically turbulent anti-Communist global environment. The United States established a
“favorable” position toward the more democratic leaning Haitian Coalition and their means of expression, recalled Joseph, which “allowed an (anti-militaristic) opposition to flourish.” For the most part, Washington officials believed the Coalition promoted a “democratic form of dissent.” And for Joseph and many leading exiles in the US, including Marcel Fulbrum, former Haitian Ambassador and Minister of Commerce, mining the dynamism, humanity, tolerance and “revolutionary contents” of democracy became the mission of a more intellectual, anti-militaristic wing of anti-Duvalierism, which included Radio Vonvon, the Haitian Coalition and Le Combattant Haitien.

However, Joseph often took issue with “democrats,” such as the State Department or more frequently the OAS, which insufficiently addressed human rights violations in Haiti. In a weekly post in July 1967, Joseph discussed the failure of the OAS to act against the “case of genocide being perpetrated by one of its member states.” “In the name of humanity and democracy,” he appealed, “the OAS should take a stand against the criminal and illegal government in their midst. Otherwise its states will be in a very weak position to claim the democratic and humanitarian titles when chaos sets in and an intervention becomes an ugly reality.” For Joseph, the OAS proved to be a “paper tiger” in inter-American affairs because the organization, along with the US government, failed to bring sanctions upon Duvalier’s administration. He also challenged the OAS to pay closer attention to the Dominican Republic when reports emerged that Haitian workers on Dominican territory were being “turned over to Duvalier’s repressive forces by Dominican authorities.” To whom could Joseph and the Haitian Coalition turn in their time of need? On the one hand, Joseph encouraged foreign institutions and governments to act on behalf of Haitian exiles who supported a North American doctrine of democracy, freedom and mutual cooperation (that is, Pan Americanism). Yet, on the other hand, he was also disillusioned and misled by those same governing bodies, who he deemed at times as the “civilized world,” which proclaimed these liberal tenets and policies, but did “nothing.” “When the explosion comes,” Joseph stated acerbically, “[the OAS member states] will want to know why Haitians are so anti-human! Just because they have been treated like animals by their own government and by the other governments where they went for refuge.”

Conclusion

By the end of the 1960s, the US government openly supported Caribbean and Latin American despotism, as long as they demonstrated a concerted effort to preserve an anticommunist agenda. For the most part, Duvalier’s administration proved to be pro-US aid and pro-capitalist, despite many attempts by Haitian exiles to show Duvalierism’s connections to communist activity. Consequently, Washington’s foreign policy interests of “not tak[ing] action against dictatorships of the right” limited exile activism on the airwaves. WRUL, the New York City radio station that
broadcasted Radio Vonvon, refused to sell airtime to a financially solvent Haitian Coalition. According to Joseph, after Richard Nixon was elected in 1968 and sent New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller on a state-funded Caribbean and Latin American research tour, WRUL told him that “programming was changing” and the 6AM time slot was “no longer available.” Waving to a crowd from a balcony of the National Palace in Port-au-Prince, Rockefeller’s (in)famous photo with Duvalier in July of 1969 crippled the spirit of Joseph and many others. “The writing was on the wall,” Joseph exclaimed, “It’s going to be very difficult for us to operate” Radio Vonvon and the newspaper. Soon after Rockefeller’s return, his report on Latin America advocated a “pragmatic partnership” with despotic regimes and heralded Caribbean and South and Central American militaries as a “constructive social change.”

Radio Vonvon, including Le Combattant, shut down its operation several months later.

From 1965 to 1969, Radio Vonvon and Le Combattant Haitien proved to be a critical voice for Haitian exiles and their articulation of human rights and democracy. Through the work of Joseph and others, many Haitian exiles expressed a humanism that was largely influenced by their unique position as uprooted citizens of Haiti, who believed their life in the US was temporary. The various forms of life available to Haitians in New York City—whether in its jealous state, tragic state, discontinuous state or solidified state—often privileged the values of the Haitian peasantry in order to produce and take advantage of a more expansive human rights sphere. Additionally, it proved strategic, for some, to appropriate those values to situate their private agenda or more public institutional mission as more authentically Haitian, more politically, socially and economically transformative for the Haitian masses.

An examination of Jennie M. Smith’s powerful ethnography of Haitian peasants and their community organizing in southwestern Haiti during the middle of the 1990s reveals a potential historical continuity (with some conflicts, disruptions and failures) between two complex and diverse groups who sought to create a new Haiti. Both, Haitian exiles of the 1950s and 1960s and Haitians peasants of the 1990s promoted several key components of what makes a good society: relative economic equality; a particular type of social hierarchy; respè (respect); an acknowledgment of a citizen’s full humanity; the availability and access of basic social services; and the ability to obtain “personal and collective security.” The elements of this Arcadian vision emphasized a cooperative sharing in the “labor and the rewards” of the peasantry. It highlighted interdependency; a reinterpretation of progress as a repudiation of the exploitative aspects of class stratification and over-consumption; an institutionalization of subaltern voices in decision-making politics (local, national and international); and also a promotion of dignity. These ideas proved to be in tension with the reality of democratic governance and free-market ideology that concedes and promotes asymmetrical relations, and subsequently bargains with specific aspects of abusive, institutional power instead of eradicating it. Herein lies the dilemma that exiles faced: the promotion, negotiation and challenging of the
ideologies of Pan Americanism, democracy and capitalism integral to the human rights architecture in the Americas and also central to Washington's power. Much like other exiles in New York City, Joseph attempted to create a new way that borrowed and reframed aspects of a Washington-centered foreign policy, but also sought out alternatives. At the center of Joseph’s democracy and understanding of human rights were the notions of protection and the implementation of freedom from state violence and corruption that silenced oppositional thought and practice. The civil, political and economic rights essential to the architecture of human rights hinges upon the people’s reinforcement of “democratic principles [in which] public decision-making is the business of all citizens equally.”\textsuperscript{58} Moreover, Joseph’s democracy proved to be an engagement with human rights that emphasized the obstacles of Haitian economic underdevelopment, the limitations of capitalist and communist systems, and the contradictions of US-centered inter-American affairs.

In an attempt to navigate the political terrain of Haitian despotism in exile, Secretary-General Joseph sought to “oppose the extremes” of US- and Haitian-state exploitation, the alignment of international organizations’, like the OAS with United States foreign policy, and communist state nationalization and repression—particularly in the case of Cuba—with a belief in the “sanctity of life.”\textsuperscript{59} Joseph argued that he did not want to “align ourselves [the Haitian Coalition] with the dictatorship of the right [Duvalier]” or institutions [the OAS] and individuals that had “totally aligned [themselves] with the US.” We decided to take a “third course.” And that process over the years of the Cold War proved to be latent with compromise and debate.
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