1. Introduction

The right to development is a fundamental human right which entitles people to participate in and contribute to the full realization of their economic, social, and cultural development.\(^1\) In the global context, the right to development obligates States and, by most interpretations, non-state actors (NSAs)\(^2\) to cooperate in overcoming obstacles to the realization of human rights.

Haiti’s long history of entrenched foreign debt, manufactured aid dependence, and interference provides a salient example of how failures to cooperate by NSAs, and particularly international financial institutions (IFIs), may frustrate people’s enjoyment of rights. Meaningful fulfillment of the duty to cooperate may prevent further such rights infringements and positively affect the realization of local communities’ right to development.

Haiti’s past as a former slave colony and the enormous debt imposed on it as a price for its independence set the stage for its continuing dependence on foreign assistance. This dependence engendered a power imbalance with foreign lenders that prevents Haiti to this day from meaningfully participating in loan agreements with IFIs. This dynamic, which has been reinforced by one-sided IFI lending processes that do not allow for genuine negotiation of terms, has eroded Haiti’s ability to preside over its own development and consequently the population’s right, via their right to political participation, to freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. Indeed, structural adjustment policies that IFIs have been able to impose on Haiti through loan agreements throughout the last forty years have weakened the country’s ability to invest in key areas affecting people’s enjoyment of human rights, particularly those most marginalized.

Improved coordination between IFIs and the state, in a manner consistent with the duty to cooperate and its demand for a long-term approach to development, would benefit the realization of the right to development of local communities. In particular, IFIs should prioritize engagement with the state with a view toward eliminating the existing power imbalance and ensuring that their processes are equitable.

2. Legal Framework: The Duty to Cooperate in the Context of the Right to Development

The right to development is recognized in several UN General Assembly resolutions,\(^3\) most notably the Declaration on the Right to Development (“Declaration”),\(^4\) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).\(^5\) The Declaration provides that the right to development is “an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development.”\(^6\) It further clarifies that the right to development “also implies the full realization of the right of people to self-determination.”\(^7\) The ICESCR, the only binding instrument that codifies the right to development, also frames the right as one of self-determination, by virtue of which all peoples “freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.”\(^8\)

The duty to cooperate is subsumed within the right to development, and requires that states—and, by most interpretations, NSAs—act globally in a manner compatible with a long-
term approach to development. The Declaration provides a framework for the duties of States to cooperate within the context of the right to development, recognizing the need for “sustained action” and “effective international co-operation” in order to promote comprehensive development. The Declaration also specifically references obligations of cooperation relating to international aid and lending, requiring that aid and lending be “adequate, effective and transparent, administered through participatory and accountable processes, and targeted towards the most vulnerable.”

The duty to cooperate as recognized in the Declaration extends to States when acting “as members of international organizations [such as IFIs like the International Monetary Fund (IMF)] and as actors in global trade, investment, and finance.” Despite the fact that the IMF does not see the advancement of human rights as part of its mandate and lacks any meaningful accountability to international human rights bodies, including the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), it has also been found to have certain direct obligations vis-à-vis the duty to cooperate. This interpretation is supported by the UN Charter, which emphasizes the duty of both Member States and IFIs to cooperate with the UN in the context of economic and social rights. It is further supported by observations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, finding that the IMF as a UN specialized agency has human rights obligations under international law. Support for IFIs’ duty to cooperate may also be drawn from the Maastricht Principles, which clarify states’ ETOs and extend responsibility to “provide international assistance to contribute to the fulfillment of economic, social and cultural rights in other States” to NSAs.

3. NSAs in Haiti: Historically Entrenched Power Imbalances

Haiti is subject to persistent structural injustices, stemming from colonialism, cyclical foreign debt, and consequent reliance on foreign aid. These injustices create a persistent power imbalance between the state and foreign lenders that drives the latter’s involvement in Haiti’s economy and industry and enables the implementation of policies that adversely affect Haitians’ enjoyment of human rights.

For almost its entire history Haiti has owed a trade debt to other nations, beginning in 1825 with France’s racially discriminatory “independence debt”—compensation for lost revenues from slavery and the price for Haiti’s independence, agreed to under threat of France’s reinstatement of slavery. In order to repay the debt, which took approximately 122 years, Haiti was forced to borrow money from other countries, including France and the US, which sent it into deeper debt. Haiti also had to forego the industrialization that other countries experienced in the 19th century and limit expenditures on infrastructure, education, and social development, instead prioritizing the production of export agriculture that earned the hard currency needed to pay off the debt. Compounding the deleterious effects on its economy was Haiti’s lack of recognition by many states, which negatively impacted its ability to participate in international commerce, depriving it of much-needed revenue and to freely dispose of its natural resources.

These events pushed the country into a cycle of debt and aid dependence that persists to this day. Indeed, by the 1980s, Haiti was forced to seek assistance from IFIs, specifically the IMF, the World Bank (WB), and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), institutions under heavy influence by powerful states who imposed and then entrenched debt in Haiti from the beginning. These institutions then employ inequitable lending processes that severely limit Haiti’s ability to participate in negotiating—or even reject—loan terms.

The centuries of foreign indebtedness and interference and cyclical reliance on foreign assistance entrenched pre-existing power structures and inequalities that are still visible today.
in Haiti’s relationship with IFIs. In particular, the inherent power imbalance between the IMF and the Haitian government due to Haiti’s imposed aid dependence, compounded by the aforementioned lack of equitable lending processes, has limited the government’s ability to negotiate favorable loan agreements.

The IMF lending process was created as inherently uncooperative. Loan terms are set by the IMF and borrowing states have only three options: accept, reject, or amend. States may not propose their own terms, which significantly reduces their ability to participate in the process. This is particularly relevant in situations where loan conditions reflect practices or models based on Western economies that may not work in other countries, such as the IMF’s imposition of tax reforms in Haiti that do not take into consideration the country’s large informal working sector. Furthermore, IMF loans are subject to final approval from its managing director and executive board, which incentivizes the borrowing state to accept the IMF’s loan terms (including loan conditions) in order to secure the sorely-needed loan.

The IMF Articles of Agreement, which govern lending agreements between states and the IMF, lack any meaningful provision for cooperation. Article IV requires “regular (usually annual) comprehensive consultations” with Member States, wherein IMF staff visit a country to review its economic and financial policies and assess its development. In doing so, IMF staff meet with local government and central bank representatives, and often “representatives of business, labor unions, and civil society.” The primary purpose of Article IV, however, is not to protect the development interests of the country but to allow the IMF to “[monitor] the economic and financial policies of its 189 member countries.” Practically, the IMF’s recommendations based on the Article IV consultation process are almost always accepted without negotiation, further evidence of the coercive nature of the IMF lending process.

Accordingly, the Article IV process, while requiring engagement of the relevant Member State, does not necessitate genuine and equal cooperation between the two parties that respects the right to development, and is insufficient to fulfil the IMF’s duty to cooperate. Furthermore, the IMF has not made adequate efforts to remedy the existing power imbalance, which would allow for cooperation in a way that meaningfully considers Haiti’s right to development. Despite publicly acknowledging the need for more investment in social programs, IFIs continue to impose loan conditions based on an understanding of Haiti’s economy that does not consider its socio-economic realities. Cooperation with the state to better understand those realities and determine how to incorporate them into lending agreements with a view toward long-term realization of the right to development may encourage a rights-based approach to assistance.

4. The Failure to Realize the Right to Development

These structural injustices create a continually reinforced power imbalance that allows NSAs to impose policies on Haiti that, while beneficial for lenders, negatively impact the realization of human rights in Haiti. The IMF began imposing structural adjustment policies in Haiti in the 1980s and, despite its acknowledgement of Haiti’s perpetual high risk of debt distress and its more recent recognition of the negative impacts of its policies, continues to provide millions of dollars of loans to the country that include structural reforms and elements of austerity conditionality. The unequal balance of power between Haiti and the IMF does not allow the Haitian government to reject these conditions, which have the effect of broadly limiting Haiti’s ability to invest in social services and infrastructure.

For example, the IMF imposed tax reform requirements on its $40 million USD Emergency Economic Recovery Credit in 1994, which was itself imposed on Haiti as a condition of US support for the return of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, who was ousted in a coup in 1991,
These reforms, due to the large size of the country’s informal working sector, resulted in revenue declines and weakened the state’s ability to invest in basic social services. In a more recent example, the IMF agreed to lend Haiti $111.6 million USD and $299 million USD in March 2019 and April 2020, respectively, both of which included conditions on arrears clearance, forcing Haiti to prioritize deficit reduction instead of spending on critical services for COVID-19 relief.

Policies that limit social spending hinder socio-economic development and adversely affect local communities; Haiti’s social and economic landscape is in serious decline, with Haitians lacking access to healthcare, food, water, and education. Constructive engagement between NSAs and the Haitian government that give Haiti a seat at the table would help to ensure local communities’ meaningful participation in their development.

5. The Need for Constructive Engagement between IFIs and the Government of Haiti

By genuinely cooperating with Haiti and approaching foreign assistance in a way that ensures it is compatible with the advancement of people’s right to development, the IMF—and other IFIs—could improve participation of local communities in development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting therefrom. In line with this idea, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has encouraged the preparation of “a human rights impact statement... in connection with all major development cooperation activities.” This view is supported by Philip Alston, the UN Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, who emphasized in a 2018 report that adequate consideration of the potential human rights impact of financial assistance is critical. The Committee has also directed that, before deciding to impose debt adjustment programs and economic sanctions, foreign lenders should take full account of the need for protecting economic, social and cultural rights, especially in context of vulnerable groups.

Instead of continuing with further loans and attached conditions, IFIs should take a rights-based approach to assistance that centers the Haitian state and protects its autonomy, while prioritizing open dialogue and public participation. Doing so will allow the Haitian government and its constituents to participate in key decisions affecting development in Haiti promote the people’s right to freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

6. Conclusion

NSAs have a duty to cooperate with states when taking actions that affect the right of local communities to participate in and contribute to the full realization of their economic, social, and cultural development. In Haiti, entrenched foreign debt, aid dependence, and interference have created a power imbalance that has stripped the government of its ability to meaningfully participate in assistance negotiations with IFIs. The IMF in particular has made constructive engagement even more difficult by utilizing a one-sided lending system and a consultation process that serves to protect the financial interests and policy objectives of leading IMF Member States rather than the development interests of the borrowing state. This lack of genuine cooperation has resulted in the imposition of loan conditions that have and continue to severely limit Haiti’s ability to spend on social programs, and that consequently frustrate the people’s right to actively, freely, and meaningfully participate in development.
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Drugs and public health: An uneasy relationship

Several factors contribute to this epidemic. For example, a lack of access to care in the form of clean water and sanitation can lead to increased transmission rates. In addition, the 2010 earthquake in Haiti caused widespread destruction and disrupted access to clean water and sanitation facilities. As a result, many people are forced to rely on contaminated water sources, increasing the risk of disease.

Furthermore, HIV/AIDS prevention efforts have been hampered by political instability and corruption in Haiti. The government has failed to invest adequately in HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs, and corruption has led to misuse of funds meant for these programs. As a result, the country continues to struggle with high HIV/AIDS rates.

Despite these challenges, there is hope for the future. With increased international support and a focus on sustainable solutions, it may be possible to make progress in the fight against HIV/AIDS in Haiti.
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