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Abstract

In 1937, dictator Rafael Trujillo ordered the massacre of Haitians and Dominicans of Haitian descent along the border dividing Dominican Republic and Haiti. This killing of over 20,000 people was informed by an ideology known as anti-Haitianism, which formed under the guise of Trujillo’s “Dominicanization” policy. After Trujillo’s death, his allies created a political dynasty that has helped to shift this anti-Haitian sentiment from a state sponsored ideology to a social norm that has prevailed to the present. This anti-Haitian sentiment is used to control and abuse immigrant Haitian sugar workers. It made thousands of people stateless as of 2013. Yet the massacre has been mostly forgotten. My thesis examines how this forgetting was carried out and used by Dominican elites. It argues that educational policy has been central in the control of the Haitian massacre narrative. By not discussing and understanding the significance of this event and the hate that has emerged from it, Dominicans have followed the anti-Haitian agenda of the people in power. I use a combination of oral histories, newspaper reports, and government documents to demonstrate this repeated manipulation of history. My thesis discusses the importance of education in this racial tension and memory of the genocide, which scholars have not yet discussed. I show how the continual manipulation of the memory of this massacre over time has affected the way that Dominicans more generally think about past and present injustices that Haitians and Dominicans of Haitian descent face in the country.
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Introduction

“A few Haitian farmers crossed the border up North and tried to steal some goats and cattle from our farmers. There was a fight—very regrettable—and several were killed on both sides.”

-Rafael Trujillo’s response to journalist Quentin Reynolds when asked about the Haitian Massacre in 1937.

At 2:30 pm on October 5, 1937, Colonel Andre the assistant Commander of the army of the northern department of Haiti, which is close to the Dominican-Haitian border, sent a telegram. The message was sent to General Calixte in Port-Au-Prince who was the commander of the Haitian army. The message contained the following:

Around 260 Haitians, the majority of whom lived in Dominican Republic for a long time, have entered Haiti yesterday with their belongings, crossing through customs. Many had the identification card that is required to live in the Dominican Republic. Either way it is understood that they were forced to leave after receiving bad treatment. The commander in Juana Mendez (Haitian border city of Ouanaminthe) has receive orders to discreetly open an investigation about this affair.)

This document has been noted as being the first of many officially known written documentations of what became known as the Haitian Massacre of 1937. This is the undeniable proof that something occurred. Although it is a relatively vague statement, we now know that it refereed to a massacre that began when Rafael Trujillo ordered the Dominican army to kill all

1 Albert C Hicks, Blood in the Streets: The Life and Rule of Trujillo (New York, New York: Creative Age Press Inc, 1946), vi.
Haitians along the northern part of the border on Dominican land, in Dajabón province. After the massacre occurred, Trujillo and his followers went to great lengths to hide the events of the massacre and twist the truth about it. Still today a large majority of Dominicans either do not know about the massacre or believe that it was a minor skirmish between Dominican farmers and Haitian thieves or invading Haitians, ideas that were promoted by Trujillo and his followers. It is a calamity that has been hidden for years but is slowly being brought to the surface.

If one were to approach random strangers on the streets of Santo Domingo and ask them about the Haitian Massacre of 1937 many would tell you that they do not know what that is. If you were to then say that it is commonly known as the Parsley Massacre, they would possibly change their answer. They would say that it was an event during Trujillo’s regime in which Trujillo ordered for Haitians to be killed at the border because they were trying to invade. After saying that, some would start rambling about how Haitians are taking over the country today or how Haitians are stealing jobs from Dominicans. A few would say that they were Haitian criminals stealing crops and cattle and Trujillo had them killed. Some would say that it was an unjust killing ordered by Trujillo against Haitians in the border.\(^3\) The significance among all these answers is that there is no clear universal answer to this question. Why is that? Why do Dominicans not agree on one answer about what was the Haitian Massacre of 1937? Can we say that the people in powers’ efforts to hide the truth were successful? If so, what part of society would they have had to manipulate to garner these effects? The answer lies with education.

---

\(^3\) I spoke with multiple people who were born and raised in Dominican Republic. They came from different educational backgrounds and went to school in different time eras. Some completed only secondary school, others did not finish it at all, and some completed a University education. These educational experiences occurred between 1980 to 2020. Some are from urban areas and others are from rural areas. Some live on the western side of the country and others live on the eastern side of the country. All of these interviews occurred virtually in October, 2022.
If you were to ask the same strangers who said that they knew about the massacre where they learned this information from, you would get multiple answers. Many would tell you that they learned about it at their University in a “cultural class” they were required to take. Some will tell you that they learned about it from someone else, whether that is a family member, a friend, or a stranger. A few would tell you that they stumbled upon this information while reading a book or while watching a video or reading an article on the internet. In special cases they would out right tell you that they learned about it in secondary schooling. The main trend in these responses is that learning about the massacre in secondary schooling is not the main answer or even the most popular answer. Not learning about the massacre in secondary school is one of the main issues of why the massacre was forgotten or misrepresented. 

This forgetting has led to a domino effect that still affects the present. Rafael Trujillo used the massacre to create a foundation of anti-Haitianism. His political heir, Joaquin Balaguer, made it perverse in the culture. Leonel Fernandez made sure that these ideas would persist after Balaguer was gone and Danilo Medina put these ideas into a law. It is a cycle of manipulation of the Dominican people where they have been led to believe in anti-Haitian ideas. In hiding or misrepresenting the massacre they erase any chance that people will feel any empathy towards Haitians. It allows for the people in power to spread the idea that Haitians are the enemy. If you can’t sympathize with the supposed “enemy” it easier for them to become the “enemy.”

---

4 I spoke with the same group of people who I asked about the Haitian massacre in the previous interview. They were born and raised in Dominican Republic and came from different educational backgrounds and went to school in different time eras. Some completed only secondary school, others did not finish it at all, and some completed a University education. These educational experiences occurred between 1980 to 2020. Some are from urban areas and others are from rural areas. Some live on the western side of the country and others live on the eastern side of the country. All of these interviews occurred virtually in October, 2022.
There has been tension between the Dominican Republic and Haiti since Independence in the ninetieth century. Dominicans have long resented Haiti for the military occupation and invasions of the 1800s. As time passed, that resentment was a distant memory and they mostly peacefully tolerated and interacted with each other. Especially in the border region, Dominicans traded and lived peacefully side by side with Haitians.\(^5\) The Haitian Massacre rewrote these sentiments and peace.\(^6\) This tragedy caused a reshaping of anti-Haitianism that is still strongly widespread in the country today. The perpetrators of the massacre used misinformation and propaganda to redefine the pre-existing anti-Haitian sentiments for their benefit. It caused the Dominican people to adopt certain behaviors and practices so they wouldn’t be identified as being Haitian. It has caused Dominicans to view anything Haitian with disdain and believe that Haitians are inferior to them. These Anti-Haitian ideas have continued to affect Dominican society to the present.

The country has employed Haitians as seasonal workers on sugar cane fields and in other occupations like construction and domestic work because they are considered a cheap and an efficient labor force. A majority of these workers have faced many injustices over the years due to anti-Haitian sentiments. Haitians in Dominican Republic are viewed with disdain and Dominicans of Haitian descent are treated unfairly. Their rights as citizens were taken away in 2013 with the passing of Sentence 168-13, which strips the citizenship of anyone who is a descendant of a Haitian immigrant born between 1929-2010 in Dominican Republic. The

---


Ever the years a small number of people have written about the massacre. Scholars have written about its causes, the historical context behind it, the international reactions of it, its aftermath, and its effects on the present. The most common topic of discussion is about how the massacre was a catalyst for the reshaping of anti-Haitian sentiment, how it has led to the current injustices faced by Dominicans of Haitian descent, and the issue of Haitian immigration into the country. My research adds to the conversation by directly pointing out how the massacre’s anti-Haitian result has directly affected Haitian sugar cane workers and their descendants and how education plays a role in it. I will contribute a new field to the study of the massacre, which is how the memory of the massacre is discussed in education. Among all the writings that scholars have written about the massacre there is no research relating to the teaching of the massacre in schools or their lack of. This paper aims to show how the manipulation of the massacre’s narrative has led to the manipulation of the Dominican people to adopt reconfigured anti-Haitian sentiments and how such manipulation has led to the poor predicament of Haitian sugar cane workers in the country. I hope to contribute to spreading awareness about a human rights violation and the resurfacing of a mass murder.

This paper will focus between the years of 1937 to 2023. A brief history prior to this time period is discussed. The tensions between the two countries began in 1822 and grew after the Dominican Republic gained independence from Haiti in 1844. I discuss how the Haitian Massacre occurred in 1937 and afterwards how Trujillo and his supporters went through great lengths to twist the truth and hide the massacre from history and the people. The other sections of
the paper are then divided into regimes chronologically. Within each regime I discuss how the memory of the massacre is treated and how the massacre has affected anti-Haitianism. I show how anti-Haitianism was restructured, shaped, and cemented over the years from 1937 until 2023. I discuss the history of Haitian sugar cane workers and how their experience has evolved over the years. I analyze the actions taken by the government and institutions to defend or violate worker’s rights as an effect of anti-Haitianism. I conclude by analyzing the role that education has taken in teaching or not about the massacre and its consequent effects on anti-Haitianism.

My main sources include documents surrounding the massacre from both the Dominican and Haitian governments. I analyzed histories written about the massacre during Trujillo’s rule and compare them with the real documents about the massacre. There are newspaper articles and legal documents that I use to explore the connection between anti-Haitianism, the plight of Haitian sugar cane workers, the way that the massacre is taught in school, and the massacre itself. Writings that promote and establish anti-Haitianism written by influential people will also be discussed. I will analyze educational curriculums and student textbooks to interpret how the massacre was taught in schools.

**Tensions between Two Nations**

The Haitian-Dominican conflict begins in the nineteenth century. At the time Haiti was an independent nation after the successful Haitian Revolution of 1791-1804 while the Dominican Republic had gained its independence from Spain in 1821. In 1822, the Haitian president Jean-Pierre Boyer invaded and established an occupation that lasted from 1822-1844. In 1844, while Haiti was dealing with a civil war of its own, the Dominicans declared independence and expelled the Haitians. From that moment forward the Dominican Republic, a nation in Latin America, did not celebrate an independence day from a colonial power in Europe like Spain but
from a neighboring country, which was also a former colony. This is the start of the tension between the two countries.

Anti-Haitianism in the Dominican Republic began in 1844. After independence the “Dominicans lived in constant fear of invasion and occupation by the Haitians.” The Dominicans would seek protection from foreign powers to defend themselves against Haiti. In 1861 the president of Dominican Republic Pedro Santana invited Spain to reclaim its former colony because the country needed an economic patron and for protection against Haiti. In 1865 the Dominicans fought again for independence and succeeded. The Haitian motive for invading was that they feared the Dominican Republic would be used as a base by European powers to reestablish slavery like the French had attempted to do under Napoleon.

It seems to be that the Haitian-Dominican conflict is a sort of misunderstanding from a world perspective. From the Haitian perspective it was necessary to occupy the Dominican to protect their sovereignty. It is a misunderstanding in that it was not a direct attack on Dominicans in a sense. Haiti was an independent state in the western hemisphere surrounded by European superpowers and they sought to invade Dominican Republic to expel European powers that were too close a threat to the new nation. They sought to eliminate a potential location that could serve as a military front to fight against them. The Dominicans are justified for believing that the action is directed against them personally and their continual fear and resentment of a Haiti due to a potential invasion. People from different aspects of society have reshaped this narrative to

---

8 Ibid.
promote their own agenda. They have used it to increase tensions between the two nations, especially after the massacre, and enlarge anti-Haitian sentiments.

**Circumstances of the Massacre**

After Independence, there was no further attempts by Haiti to invade Dominican Republic. The early twentieth century saw minor skirmishes of Haitians into the Dominican Republic, but nothing major that could led to war. Over time there was a demand for seasonal workers for the sugar cane plantations in the Dominican Republic which caused Haitian migration into the country to increase. Political tensions in Haiti also motivated Haitians to migrate to Dominican Republic in search of work. The fear of a Haitian invasion persisted and Dominicans were still weary of Haitians, but remained mostly peaceful. It is this dormant fear that the state decides to manipulate and expand upon.

The region of the Haitian-Dominican border in the early twentieth century was very cooperative and peaceful with Haitians and Dominicans living side by side. Many crossed the border every day and trade with little to no restrictions. It has been established that these people along the border lived autonomously from the government of either country.¹¹ Many times before 1937, Haitian and Dominican politicians tried to control the border and impose restrictions with little success. The United States attempted to impose some sort of control over the border during their occupations of Haiti and Dominican Republic with little success.¹² Haitians and Dominicans settled on either side of the border and intermarried. They accepted and respected each other’s cultures and they became bilingual to better understand each other. This

---


¹² Ibid.
relatively harmonious existence in the border region seemed to not please some people, especially the Dominican elite. The border represented to Dominicans a monument of its independence from Haiti. The relative harmony that existed between these two people at the border region put at risk the Dominican identity and politics of the elite who were trying to control the country.

Rafael Trujillo rose to power in the 1930s with the aim of establishing a clear border between the two countries. He sought to combat the supposed “Haitian problem” that was occurring at the border. The “Haitian problem” was that Haitians were living side by side with Dominicans and forming a sort of mixed culture. He visited the Haitian capital of Port-Au-Prince in 1936 and met with President Stenio Vincent to come to an agreement about border policy and immigration. An agreement was established that formally established a border between the two countries. Peace and good relations seemed to be achieved for the moment but Trujillo was not satisfied because Haitians still closed the border into the country.

Trujillo was not content with the cultural mixing that was occurring in the border region. In 1937, Trujillo did a tour of the cities along the border on the Dominican side and was outraged by what he saw. He saw Haitian immigrant workers, Dominicans of Haitian descent, and Dominicans living side by side as friends and intermarrying. On October 2, 1937 in the Dominican border city of Dajabón he gave a morbid speech about his intentions towards all Haitians people living on the Dominican side of the border. Alfred Hicks investigated Trujillo and wrote a “biography” about him in 1946 which claims that the speech was the following:

---

“‘I came to the border country to see what I could do for my fellow countrymen living here. I found that Haitians had been stealing food and cattle from our farmers here. I found that Dominicans would be happier if we got rid of the Haitians.’ God’s partner, the Savior of the Republic, paused, stamped his foot and raising his hand added slowly, throwing great emphasis on each of his words: ‘I will fix that. Yesterday three hundred Haitians were killed at Banica. This must continue.’”

From October 2 to October 9 1937 Trujillo ordered the Dominican army to kill all peoples who were Haitian or looked black on the Dominican side of the border.

The Haitian Massacre of 1937, as it became known, was conducted in a secretive manor so the people involve could change the narrative. He ordered the army to kill with machetes and knives to make it seem like it was the common people who were attacking people rather than the army. No one was spared no matter their age or gender and anyone who looked or was suspected of being Haitian was killed. Many of the victims were Dominicans of Haitian descent. Some were able to escape the massacre by fleeing across the border with whatever they could take with them, mostly just what they were wearing that day. Ironically those who were able to escape did it by crossing the border river called the Massacre River. The Massacre River is named after another massacre that occurred in the area between French and Spanish settlers. The massacre became alternatively known as the Parsley Massacre due to a rumor that came out of it.

Supposedly the soldiers would ask anyone who looked Haitian to say the word parsley and anyone who did not pronounce it like a Spanish speaker was killed, because it was assumed that they were Haitian.

Rafael Trujillo’s Cover up and State Sponsored Ideology

The Haitian massacre of 1937 was a political move to sever any friendly ties that Dominicans had with Haitians. Haitian-Dominican relations along the border were drastically different before the massacre compared to anywhere else in the country. Along the border region, Dominicans and Haitians lived side by side as neighbors, traded peacefully, and intermarried.\textsuperscript{15} This proves that there was no provocation on the part of the Haitians, as Trujillo had people believe. The massacre was an attempt to expel anyone who looked Haitian, whether they were Dominican-born or actually Haitian and anything Haitian related. He was backed by the elites who believed in the idea of “race, culture, and nation being one.”\textsuperscript{16} The elites believed that Dominican nationhood rested on the idea of a mestizo race and culture. They believed that Haitians in the country would have an influence in society that would put this nationhood at risk. The massacre was a radical way of securing the country and eliminating a supposed “pernicious” influence on the nation that Trujillo attributed to Haitians.\textsuperscript{17} The massacre created an atmosphere of fear and silence where “no one would talk about what happened”\textsuperscript{18}, especially in the border region. Talking about the massacre meant sympathizing with Haitians and going against the nation. Trujillo wanted to expel Haitians to create a country that was uniform in its culture so that he could easily control it.

\textsuperscript{17} Ernesto Sagás, Race and Politics in the Dominican Republic. Gainesville: (University Press of Florida, 2000), 46.
After the massacre was revealed to the international community, Trujillo and his supporters went through many efforts to twist the truth about what happened. Balaguer helped to diffuse tensions in the beginning and tried minimize the gravity of the situation. Trujillo’s official narrative was that the “massacre” was just squabble among Haitian and Dominican peasants. Through the efforts of journalists and writers like Quentin Reynolds, the truth of the massacre was known throughout the world. The international community, more specifically the United States, was concerned the repercussions of the massacre and sought a peaceful resolution. Eventually Dominican Republic and Haiti came to a settlement where Trujillo agreed to pay reparations to Haiti for the massacre. This temporarily delayed Trujillo’s plans, but eventually he was able to cover up the massacre and he used his new state sponsored system of anti-Haitianism to do it.

The details of the Massacre were forgotten by the world. After the swift resolution of the massacre where Trujillo and the Dominican Republic agreed to pay Haiti reparations for the killings, Trujillo found an opportunity to clear his name. He used to his advantage the situations created by World War II in Europe, where in a conference that President Franklin Roosevelt created to discuss and reach a resolution about the Jewish refugee crisis, Trujillo volunteered to receive around a thousand Jewish refugees in the Dominican Republic. From that moment forward, Trujillo was praised and commemorated as a humanitarian.

---

21 Ibid., 314.
from being the orchestrator of a massacre to the humanitarian savior in less than 12 months, and thus the massacre was forgotten and buried on the international stage.

Trujillo hid the truth of the massacre from the Dominican people. After the victory of replacing his image from oppressor to humanitarian, he gifted his own biography to libraries in the United States.\textsuperscript{23} His biography was authored by different scholars in 1955 under his instruction and it is a series of approximately 20 books where each book discusses a different topic. One book is titled \textit{La Dominicanization Fronteriza} (The Dominicanization of the Frontier). It has a chapter titled “Incidentes de 1937 y 1942” (incidents of 1937 and 1942) and this is where the massacre is addressed. It states that the amount of crime committed by Haitian people increased until it escalated into the events that occurred in October 1937 and how such actions put at risk the friendly relations between the two countries.\textsuperscript{24} The book even tells of how the Haitian president at the time, Stenio Vincent, agreed that the Dominican Republic was not at fault.\textsuperscript{25} There are no records of the massacre in the Dominican archives so that eliminates the possibility of any one finding out the truth of even questioning if the information in these books are real. The idea that such “facts” are being spread in 1955 demonstrates the success of Trujillo’s actions to hide the truth of the massacre from the people.

The Dominicanization policy that was introduced to justify the massacre was used to help spread Dominican culture. Dominicanization was the name given to Trujillo’s efforts of completely controlling the border region after the massacre.\textsuperscript{26} Dominicanization was the process of creating a human shield to prevent Haitian immigration and regain government influence over

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 212-214.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 57-58.
the region. The massacre was used as the starting point of Dominicanization to secure, develop, and transform the borderlands into a cultural shield of Dominican nationalism against Haitian influences. The elites saw Dominicanization as a way to unite the people under a common goal and keep them dominated. The Catholic Church played a part in promoting Dominicanization and subsequently spreading anti-Haitianism. The Jesuits spread the Catholic faith along the border by establishing a mission in Dajabón in 1936 with the blessing and support of Trujillo. Dominicanization was used to eliminate any Haitian influences on the border region to better control it.

People working for Trujillo helped to hide the truth. Father Felipe Gallego of the San Ignacio de Loyola Mission had been operating in Dajabón since 1936. He witnessed the massacre and the effects that it had on his mission, which he wrote about in his diary. In the 1957 biography that was written about the mission the accounts about the massacre from Gallego were excluded. It was written by Father Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna and it is not known whether this was the result of Trujillo’s repression policies or just a personal choice of supporting Trujillo’s actions, or even if Santa Anna did not have access to Gallego’s diary but when it comes to the Catholic Church it is difficult to know their stance when it comes to Trujillo and the massacre. The Archbishop of Santo Domingo at the time, Ricardo Pittini, was a full supporter of Trujillo. This is supported by the words that Pittini said at the opening of the new church in 1937.

28 Ibid., 46.
in Dajabón which were that “Haitians needed to give thanks to president Trujillo for giving them permission to continue to live on Dominican land, where they get bread and sun.”

Whether it was a situation of “the lesser of two evils” or forced support or just outright malicious intention is unknown. Helping Trujillo to cover up the massacre helped in spreading anti-Haitianism.

Through these actions, the foundation was set for Trujillo to manipulate the people into an anti-Haitian narrative.

The Haitian Massacre of 1937 led to the creation of the current state of anti-Haitianism. Ernesto Sagas defines anti-Haitianism as a “manifestation of the long-term evolution of racial prejudice, the selective interpretation of historical facts, and the creation of a nationalist Dominican false consciousness.” Anti-Haitianism has always been present in the country, it just took another form under Trujillo. Trujillo and his allies took the preexisting and unorganized ideas of anti-Haitianism and converted it into a state-sponsored ideology. After the massacre, anti-Haitianism became a nationalist movement to unite the people that caused the evolution of pre-existing passive ideas of racism against Haitians and painted Haitians into the aggressors that the people in power needed to subjugate and defend the people against. With the backing of the government, the people were influenced to follow this new radicalized anti-Haitian mindset.

Trujillo used the massacre to cultivate the seeds of his new anti-Haitian policy. He created a justification of the massacre by stating it was essential for national security against the

---

32 Ibid., 21.
Haitian danger.\textsuperscript{35} Since the truths of the massacre were hidden, the people were forced to accept this and any explanations that Trujillo decided to provide for this massacre. Since this was a dictatorship any questioning of the “official narrative” could have caused trouble for someone. No documentation with reference to the massacre has been found in Dominican archives so anyone who wanted to know more about it would have to rely on what people in power would say.\textsuperscript{36} Dominicans were forced to rely on whatever version of the truth Trujillo decided to tell them which meant that it either did not happen or it was done because of Haitian aggression and in the name of national security.\textsuperscript{37} It is similar to the manipulation of the memory of the Wounded Knee massacre. The Wounded Knee massacre was renamed and spread across the United States as the “Battle of Wounded Knee.” The idea behind this name was that Native Americans were the aggressors and the United States army were defending themselves in this “battle.” In both events the victims are painted as the aggressors and the perpetrators as the defenders who did everything in their power to protect national security and sovereignty. Trujillo used this “defense” explanation of the massacre to convince the people that there should be active aggression towards Haitians because they are the “initial aggressors.” This idea helped to fund his new anti-Haitian policy.

Trujillo then emphasized on the essential part of anti-Haitianism, which is what defines a Dominican and a Haitian. Dominicans were Catholic of Spanish and Taino Indian descent while Haitians were inferior who believed in voodoo and are descendants of Africans who were

illiterate, malnourished, and disease-ridden.  

38 This caused the people to eliminate anything that would cause them to be associated as Haitian from their culture. Haiti was promoted as the enemy whose aim was to take over the eastern part of the island using immigration.  

39 Anti-Haitianism created a social-racial model where only light-skinned elites really fit and everyone else had to lighten themselves or be alienated.  

40 It was difficult for Dominicans to resist this anti-Haitian influence because it expanded into every aspect of society even entertainment.  

41 To accept or be influenced by anything Haitian was to go against Dominican culture and the nation. To spread these anti-Haitian ideas Trujillo relied on intellectuals, news reporters, and political leaders, who created an anti-Haitian campaign like nothing that has ever been seen since the end of the wars against Haiti in 1856.  

42 Trujillo used a tactic that is supposed to be used during times of war to spread hate towards a group of people during times of peace. The Dominican people fell victim to this influence of believing that Haitians were inferior to them, that they were a threat to the country, and they should avoid being associated with being Haitian.  

Well known intellectuals helped Trujillo to cement this state-sponsored anti-Haitian ideology with their writings. Trujillo entrusted Manuel Arturo Peña Batlle and Joaquin Balaguer, who were notable intellectuals, to create the ideological background and justification to Trujillo’s anti-Haitian and nationalist ideologies.  

43 Batlle was a known prestigious intellectual and nationalist during Trujillo’s era and was a follower and admirer of Trujillo’s regime who

---


40 Ibid., 66.

41 Ibid., 67-68.


believed in a more conservative approach to Dominican nationalism. He claimed Trujillo paved the way towards a more pure and conservative nationalism that aligned with the past. This “conservative nationalism” involved portraying Haitians as the aggressor and a threat to Dominican culture. Batlle argued that Dominican History is shaped by the defense of its culture and territory from Haitian aggression, where Haitians are viewed as hostile foreigners who are culturally and racially inferior to Dominicans. Batlle expressed these anti-Haitian ideas and more in his 1946 book called *Historia de la Cuestión Fronteriza Domínico-Haitiana*. Balaguer was another prominent collaborator of Trujillo who held roles including Minister of Education, Minister of External Affairs, and even puppet President during the regime. Balaguer’s line of thinking was similar to Batlle’s. In his book *La Realidad Dominicana*, Balaguer justifies Trujillo’s anti-Haitian policy as a natural inalienable right of the Dominican people to defend their culture and way of life against Haitians. He writes about Trujillo as being the savior of Dominican Republic by establishing a fixed border and eliminating Haitian presence in the border. The writings of these intellectuals helped to convince the people that Trujillo’s anti-Haitian ideas were justified and true and that going against such ideas is going against the nation.

The main cause for the rise in Haitian immigration to the Dominican Republic was the demand for sugar cane workers during the United States occupation of Dominican Republic. In the early twentieth century, most of the sugar industry was owned by foreigners and they saw Haitians as the cheapest labor force. These foreign business owners encouraged legal and illegal immigration of Haitians into the country and opposed Dominican laws which restricted
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immigration of black laborers.\textsuperscript{49} Overtime Haitians came into the country and worked in areas outside of sugar cane production and soon the majority of Haitians in the country were concentrated in the Dominican border region rather than the eastern part of the island where the sugar cane industry was located. The increased immigration of Haitians was seen as a challenge to intellectuals, government officials, and the elite who were trying to whiten the country in years prior. In 1925, the country’s Nationalist Party requested that all black laborers be prohibited from coming to the country with little success.\textsuperscript{50} Many prominent officials and nationalists like Manuel Arturo Pena Batlle signed this declaration. Trujillo’s rise to power in 1930 would be the catalyst that would help these “nationalist” make their ideas a reality. Trujillo created the massacre to eliminate these Haitian immigrants from the border region to satisfy the ideals of nationalists and the elite.

Haitian sugar cane workers seem to have been spared from the massacre. The country rejected Haitians but they need them as a labor force for the sugar cane industry.\textsuperscript{51} After failed attempts at dominicanizing the sugar cane industry, Trujillo learned that he could not eliminate Haitian migrants in the sugar cane industry without creating conflict with the foreign businesses and the United States.\textsuperscript{52} So Trujillo only massacred Haitian immigrants on the border region who were not working on sugar cane plantations, because the sugar cane plantations were mostly on the eastern side of the island. The number of Haitian immigrants into the country did not diminish and Trujillo did not try to diminish it. Trujillo instead tried to contain Haitian sugar

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 22.
cane workers into the bateyes. The bateyes are settlements next to a sugar cane plantation where the workers live. Trujillo warned that the bateyes would be the only safe space for Haitian workers. Trujillo used anti-Haitianism to isolate Haitian immigrants to the sugar cane plantations and restructured society so that the norm was that Haitians only belonged in the sugar cane fields. Instead of using force to enforce this, the government gave power to local government officials so this new norm could be carried out. By associating Haitians with sugar cane work and blocking them out from communities and other jobs, it reorganized Haitians role in the country and damaged any Haitian-Dominican relations that were already established. By insisting that Haitians belonged in sugar cane fields and nowhere else, Trujillo created this idea that Haitians and Dominicans were fundamentally different. It established that Haitians were only good enough to work in the lowly job of sugar cane labor and thus they are inferiors. Trujillo appointed more mayors and gave them more power and in exchange they carried out his anti-Haitian agenda so that the common people would follow his anti-Haitian politics. If the people were anti-Haitian, they would support the notion that Haitians belong on the bateyes only, and turn a blind eye to any violation of rights that Haitians could face.
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Trujillo used education to promote his anti-Haitian agenda. In schools, children were taught anti-Haitian propaganda rather than historical facts.\(^{59}\) Since anti-Haitianism was a state sponsored ideology, it was ideal that it was enforced in schools. A school curriculum from 1951 requests that teachers should read Antonio Sanchez Valverde’s *Idea del valor de la Isla Espanola* and Manuel Arturo Peña Batlle’s *Historia de la cuestión fronteriza domínico-haitiana* in order to teach Dominican history.\(^{60}\) The former is the first “anti-Haitian” source ever written since colonial times that establishes that Dominicans are made of only two races, European and Indigenous, and leaves out anything concerning African ancestry while the latter establishes why Haitians are inferior to Dominicans and talks about how to distinguish Dominicans from Haitians. Teaching these ideals to students would cause them to believe and adopt Trujillo’s anti-Haitian culture or at least it would have helped to cement already pre-existing prejudices. With this manipulation in beliefs, there would be no chance for students to learn about the massacre. Trujillo would not permit students to learn the actual truth of the massacre because it would contradict his anti-Haitian agenda. He could not risk portraying Haitians as victims when he was trying to portray them as the aggressor. So to prevent the real truth of the massacre of becoming public knowledge, Trujillo hid or manipulated the truth about it.

**Joaquin Balaguer’s Anti-Haitian Campaign against Sugar Cane Workers**

Joaquin Balaguer helped Trujillo to hide the truth of the massacre or at least convince people of Trujillo’s “official” version. Balaguer’s was Trujillo’s “right hand” during his regime.
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He served as secretary of foreign affairs during the massacre and was one of the main people interacting with the United States and Haiti to try to diffuse this incident. He helped to broker the deal that caused Trujillo to pay reparations for the massacre to Haiti, which ultimately caused the matter of the massacre to be “settled.” After the Trujillo assassination in 1961, the country went through a period of political turmoil and civil war until Balaguer emerged as president in 1966.

Balaguer continued to promote anti-Haitianism but instead of it being a state sponsored ideology, he converted it to a societal norm by continuing Trujillo’s practices of isolating Haitians to the sugar cane fields. Anti-Haitianism was no longer the state’s official ideology or backed by the state like Trujillo’s regime. But nonetheless he “assumed the ideas of other intellectuals, declared himself Trujillo’s heir, and consolidated a policy of racism and xenophobia.” He helped to continue the idea that the country had a “Haitian problem.” He wrote one of his many famous works, *La Isla al Revés*, in 1983, which reiterates his anti-Haitian ideas from his 1947 book *La Realidad Dominicana*. In *La Isla Al Reves*, Balaguer takes anti-Haitianism a step further and provides “biological” explanation to support his idea of the inferiority of Haitians to Dominicans. He was president for seven nonconsecutive terms between 1966 and 1996 and during that time his book become a national best seller. We can deduct from this that his anti-Haitian ideas spread wide and far and gained the interest of the public. The children that grew up under Trujillo’s regime learning anti-Haitian principles in school are now reading a book that the President wrote about anti-Haitianism and teaching it to
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their children. So years later after the death of Trujillo, his ideas are still circulating and very much alive. Balaguer’s anti-Haitianism served beyond manipulating the people; it helped to secure a work force for the sugar cane industry.

Just like Trujillo, Balaguer hoped to use anti-Haitianism to isolated Haitian immigrants on sugar cane plantations. The 60s, 70s, and 80s were a time where the sugar cane industry was at its peak in the country. Balaguer is known for using force to segregate Haitians to sugar cane plantations. He continued Trujillo’s idea that the only place that Haitians belonged in Dominican society was in the sugar cane fields. In the 90s, the sugar cane industry declined and with it Haitian immigrants sought employment outside of the sugar cane fields. It became difficult to confine them to the plantations. So Balaguer changed tactics and decided to seek to pass legislation that would strip descendants of these workers and the workers themselves of citizenship and rights in the country but had little success. Balaguer hoped to deny Haitians their legal rights by attempting to manipulate the interpretation of the constitution.

During Balaguer’s regime is when the truth of the massacre was revealed to the public. This occurred in the 1970s. The new release of the book El Massacre se Pasa a Pie (You can Cross the Massacre on Foot) in 1973 helped to reintroduce discussion of the massacre and the truth of it to the Dominican people. A new edition of the history of the mission of San Ignacio de Loyola was released in the 1980s and Gallego’s full eyewitness account of the massacre was included. These literary efforts to reveal the truth of the massacre, however, did not have a large

drastic impact. For one thing, only intellectuals and scholars of higher education would have been interested in reading about it. Most people were under the anti-Haitian spell so they wouldn’t bother to read or know something about the “enemy”. Many would have been too busy dealing with Balaguer’s policies of subversion, diversion, and repression against left-wing supporters.68 A majority of people would have viewed this event as a tragedy of the past created by Trujillo that should just be left in the past. Due to anti-Haitian influences they would not view it as something to sympathize with Haitians about. Even though the truth of the massacre was revealed to the public, it was not something that was taught in schools.

A curriculum from 1996 whose purpose was to describe what sort of information should be included in school textbooks says that Trujillo’s regime should be taught but there is no mention of the massacre.69 The page discusses that the social, economic, cultural, and political developments should be taught but there is no specific mention of the massacre.70 It could be argued that the massacre could have been brought up under the category of political development, but in the context of this country that may not be the case. Since Balaguer was one of the people involved in the covering up of the massacre, it would be fair to conclude that he would not encourage for it to be taught in schools. Since he was trying to control Haitians in the country using anti-Haitianism, it would not be ideal to teach about something that would make them into a victim rather than the oppressor. He needed the people to view Haitians as inferiors and oppressors whose place belongs in the sugar plantations. A 1984 curriculum for the subject
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of teaching literature, suggested that the book *Mi Compadre, el General Sol* (General Sun, My Brother) should be taught in school as a short story. The writer of this book, Jacques Alexis, is known in Latin America as an exceptional writer and that may be the reason for including his book, but out of all his writings the creators of the curriculum decided to use this book specifically. The book contains the fictional story of two characters’ journey from Haiti to the Dominican sugar cane fields and their ultimate return to Haiti with all of this occurs within the setting of the massacre. Teaching this book to a group of students who do not know about the massacre could have resulted in misinformation. They could have assumed that since the story is fiction, the massacre is also fiction, and with the prominent anti-Haitian sentiment that existed during that time it may have been the case. This proves to show how easily ignorance can be manipulated.

**Leonel Fernandez’s and Danilo Medina’s Sugar Cane Troubles and Educational Reforms**

After Balaguer “retired” from politics in 1996, a new party called the PLD was elected and new political figures dominated politics from 1996 to 2020. Their names were Leonel Fernandez and Danilo Medina. Fernandez, Medina, and the new political party practiced the same anti-Haitian rhetoric that Balaguer developed, and it became one of the party’s distinguishing features. By the early 2000s, anti-Haitianism was widespread throughout the country and had become a norm to follow. Anti-Haitianism had taken root in the country that other aspects of society were affected. It evolved into a “structural racism that is present in the day by day of people, in the media, in justice institutions, in schools, and in interpersonal
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Anti-Haitianism evolved from “an ideology and then converted into a culture where this racist culture was naturalized through repetition of the same practical speeches.”

The people that were repeating these ideas were the politicians and the media. They allowed for Trujillo’s ideas to remain alive and circulating.

Fernandez and Medina followed in Balaguer’s footsteps in trying to control the Haitian population using legislation. Medina was more successful than Fernandez and Balaguer. Under his administration in 2013 a law was passed called Sentencia 168-13 which altered the constitution concerning who received Dominican citizenship. This law established that all people born between 1929 and 2010 to foreigners in “transit” in Dominican Republic are not Dominican citizens. This law specifically targets descendants of Haitian sugar cane workers and other Haitian migrant workers who came into the country and are labeled as foreigners “in transit” because their work was supposed to be seasonal and they were supposed to return to Haiti. This law is meant to prevent Haitians and Dominicans of Haitian descent from getting documentation which in turn lets the people in power control these people much easier. It has been proven that this law has no historical basis and it is rather just a decision based on anti-Haitianism. This law still prevails today and has made hundreds of thousands of people stateless. This is the result of the accumulation of all those years that hate and racism. This law was created to specifically target Haitians and it was done under the same anti-Haitianism that began with Trujillo and the massacre.

---
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Anti-Haitianism has become deeply rooted to the extent that it influences circumstances outside the country. Back in 2016, close to the United States presidential election, rumors were being spread by Dominican immigrants in the United States. A conversation occurred between two people, who are both Dominican immigrants and one was a PLD member, about the upcoming US presidential election. The PLD member told the other person that there was a rumor about a secret meeting that occurred during the summer of 2016 between Dominican President Danilo Medina and then U.S. Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, and some unnamed members from the European Union in Punta Cana. They were trying to craft a deal about giving every Dominican citizenship in countries around the world so they would leave the island. They would then give the rest of the island to Haiti so that the issues in Haiti can be resolved.\textsuperscript{75} If we exclude the politics surrounding this false rumor, we see how anti-Haitian sentiments are weaponized to change the opinions of Dominicans. The fear of Haitians taking over the island and the narrative of Haitians as the oppressor is used to manipulate Dominican public opinion.

The media has served a major role in the survival of anti-Haitianism and the ultimate manipulation of the massacre. A famous news reporter by the name of Consuelo Despradel is infamous for promoting anti-Haitian sentiments in her broadcasts. In her recent news broadcasts she tackles the debate of Haitian immigration in the country. She exclaims that “the only thing that Haitians can agree on is that Dominican Republic has to be the solution to their problems and that this [land] is theirs.”\textsuperscript{76} Instead of looking at Haitian immigration from the perspective of

\textsuperscript{75} I was told of this rumor by the person who was the recipient of this information. The conversation between the person sharing details about the rumor and the recipient occurred in early 2016. I was told about this conversation years later in July 2021.

\textsuperscript{76}ZOLFM. Consuelo Despradel: Los Haitianos Están de Acuerdo Que RD Es La Solución a Sus Problemas, 2022. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ltx_iAF-hr0.
a Haitian who is immigrating to get a better life away from an unstable war torn country, Despradel chooses to relay on outdated ideas of why Haitians want to come to the country. She discusses that the problem with Haiti is that “its citizens have no official documents because Haitians do not like to have their picture taken because it sucks their souls.” Despradel calls upon rumored voodoo beliefs to justify why many Haitians lack government identification instead of attributing it to the country’s instability and lack of government organization in rural areas. Despradel then discusses a book written by a Haitian activist with collaboration with Hillary Clinton and Michelle Obama and points out how “how Hillary Clinton and Michelle Obama and the Democrats are the ones who pressure the most, and the Republicans too, but mostly the Democrats that the solution to Haiti is Dominican Republic.” This claim relates to the previous claimed Clinton-Medina rumor of 2016. Despradel pushes along the idea that foreign nations believe that Dominican Republic should be the solution to Haiti’s problems, and thus spreads the idea to defend Dominican sovereignty against a Haitian takeover. This News reporter is one of the most famous in the country and even had her own show. She currently appears in one of the most popular news channels in the country and her popularity and ideas have a drastic influence on the opinions of people and the attitudes they develop.

Advocating for the rights of Haitians and Haitian descendants in Dominican Republic and going against the anti-Haitian norm comes with repercussions. A professor at the Autonomous University of Santo Domingo by the name of Carlos Agramonte released a novel in 2009 which tells the story of Father Hartley’s missionary efforts in helping abused Haitians in the Dominican sugar cane plantations from 1994 to 2006 in the background of a fictional romance story. The
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novel criticizes the system of modern slavery that exists among sugar cane workers in the country. Agramonte received threats because of the book and a friend of his who is a high official in the army recommended for him to leave the country.79 Agramonte seems to have fled the country because he currently resides in Delaware. Speaking out against anti-Haitianism or even in favor of the rights of Haitians seems to be a fault worthy of exile. This demonstrates the grasp that anti-Haitianism has on the people to believe that it is right to threaten someone just for speaking out about injustices towards other human beings.

Schools during Fernandez’s time did not teach about the massacre. An adult education textbook from 2005 talks about Trujillo’s crimes like violations against democracy and the assassination of female activists, but there still is no mention of the massacre.80 It seems that Fernandez’s administration continued Balaguer’s and Trujillo’s policy of hiding the truth of the massacre. Knowing the truth of the massacre would work against the prevailing anti-Haitian narrative. With the political instability in Haiti, there had been an influx of Haitian immigration into the country. Anti-Haitianism was key to control and deport such immigration.

Even though the sugar industry in the country is not as dominating as it was in the twentieth century, companies and bateyes, along with human rights violations, are still occurring. In 2007 a documentary was released called the Price of Sugar and it told the story of a British-Spanish priest called Christopher Hartley who ran a mission in Dominican Republic from 1994 to 2006. Father Hartley went into the bateyes of San Jose de los Llanos, even though he was told

not to, and helped to advocate for the rights of these sugar cane workers. The documentary provides evidence that modern slavery does still exist in the sugar cane industry in Dominican Republic. It was narrated for an English audience, meaning it was meant for an international audience. It seems that the film was meant for foreign governments or institutions to take action against these injustices suffered in the bateyes, because the Dominican government won’t do anything against it. We learn that these workers are hired and brought to Dominican Republic illegally, basically human trafficking. This sugar cane employment is a trap. They are lured with false promises of prosperity compared to the hardened lives they currently lived in Haiti. Their IDs and documents are confiscated, which makes them stateless in both countries. Workers and their families are not allowed to leave the bateyes and there are armed guards to ensure that they do not. They live in poor housing, lack basic health, and have little access to drinkable water. They are rarely paid and if they are its less than what they were promised. They have very little food and their nutrition mostly depends on sugar cane. Hawaiians are then trapped in these bateyes to work on these plantations and they can’t leave or demand basic rights because they are considered stateless due to having no papers. They are forced to endure whatever the people in power chose for them to endure and they receive no help from the Dominican people because they are blinded by ideas that Hawaiians belong on the sugar plantations and are the “enemy.”

Father Hartley advocated on behalf of these people. He taught the workers that they have rights and that they were the most important unit of a company. He encouraged them to strike for their rights. For a time their conditions improved: they could leave the bateyes and they were paid. The documentary reveals a morbid message that was supposedly sent from owners of the company to the people of the bateyes. They said “that as long as the priest is here to protect you,
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your conditions will improve.” These means that the people of the bateyes are only safe under the protection a priest. They can’t even rely on the empathy of Dominicans or the government to help them or at least let them see that their treatment is wrong. Anti-Haitianism prevents this empathy and lets these “owners” mistreat these people.

Father Hartley was severely persecuted for his kindness. Father Hartley’s kind-hearted actions were meet with backlash from the Dominican people. The people of San Jose de los Llanos demanded that Father Hartley be kicked out of the country because he was “haitianifying” the country. They claimed he was bringing Haitians into the country and said that he was destroying their nation by aiding Haitians. He received death threats and made national news. The people demanded the Catholic Church and the government to take action and kick him out of the country. The bishop of San Pedro de Macorís, Francisco Osorio Acosta, sided and defended Hartley and said that his actions were noble in encouraging the workers to demand their human rights. This all accumulated into a protest in 2005 where people went into the streets demanding for Hartley to leave because he was discrediting the country in the international community by favoring illegal Haitians. If the documentary is to be believed, the Vicini family, who are the owners of the sugar cane industry that owns the bateyes where Hartley is operating, paid the people to protest against Hartley. Even the famed news reporter Consuelo Despradel showed up one of the protests to demand that Hartley leave.

The media did not put a favorable light on this positive activism. News reporters like Consuelo Despradel condemned Hartley and requested that he leave the country because he was
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“turning over the country to Haitians.”

Consuelo Despradel entered the church with the intent on disrupting mass and confronting Hartley and she was pushed out of the church by Dominican supporters of Hartley. An article written a few months after the protest, around the time that Hartley left states that this scene played out slightly different and Consuelo was pushed out of the church with shoves and threats with weapons. The documentary shows Consuelo being pushed out of the church but no one in the church had any weapons and no threats with weapons is heard. It could be a dramatization of events to put Hartley and the workers in an unfavorable light but whether it is true or false, Dominicans will chose to believe that the workers were being violent.

In 2006 Hartley was forced to leave the country. Bishop Francisco Ozoria Acosta ordered him to leave. The reason for his departure is unclear although Hartley said he left to take care of his father who was in poor health while others say he left due to pressure from politicians and businesses who did not like his activism. Yet Bishop Acosta’s official statement said “Father Hartley’s departure from the Dominican Republic had nothing to do with the health of his father, who had been ill for some time. Neither was it the result of any pressure whatsoever from the Government of the Dominican Republic, Cardinal López Rodríguez, or the Vicini family [but] for me to make the decision to relieve Father Hartley of his pastoral duties and ask him to leave the San Pedro de Macorís Diocese.” This is quite strange because first Bishop Acosta defends Father Hartley and his activism then he makes him leave the country. This gives indication that

the church could again be aligning with the government. With Hartley’s departure, things must have changed in the bateyes of San Jose de los Llanos. The gruesome message that the Vicinis sent to their employers is still a worry. Another concern are the people from the bateyes that appeared in the documentary and gave interviews and if they were in any way in danger for those actions after Hartley left. One thing is certain and it’s that the people of the bateyes most likely did not receive empathy from Dominicans regarding the bad treatment they faced.

The creator of the documentary received backlash due to the film. The Vicini family own one of the three major sugar cane companies in the country and they are the owners of the plantations and bateyes that are discussed in the film. The Vicini family sued the creator of the documentary for defamation in Massachusetts in the first circuit court of appeals. The court sided with the filmmakers because the Vicinis were not able to prove that the accusations shown in the film were false and that the filmmakers knew about it. This is a major win in providing that what they are doing is wrong and it sets Haitians as the victim. Due to anti-Haitian sentiments Dominicans chose ignore, deny, or erase inconvenient truths like this one.

Dominicans are aware of the conditions and treatments of sugar cane workers in the bateyes. They know that they live in unsuitable housing, that they barely have any drinkable water, and that the workers are taken advantage of by the company. It is interesting to see how a people can be blinded into protesting against a noble cause and how the same people can believe that these people in the bateyes should live the way that they do. These people claim that by helping another human being their nationalism and state sovereignty is being threatened. This all goes back to the anti-Haitian policies that are followed by the people. This anti-Haitianism has caused Dominicans to believe that it is right for these people to be abused and they see

nothing wrong with it. They believe that Haitians should be treated this way and they see Haitians as inferior to them. They believe that Haitians are doing lowly jobs like sugar cane cutters because that is their worth. This is all part of an elaborate scheme by the people in power: if the common people do not sympathize with Haitians, then companies and the government can easily abuse them for profit or for a different kind of advantage. These people turn a blind eye to inconvenient truths like these because the anti-Haitianism that Trujillo structured tells them to.

Forty six years after Trujillo’s death and his anti-Haitian policy that began with the massacre is still active and in full force.

Accountability for the massacre brings unfavorable consequences. A bishop by the name of Diómedes Espinal de León in the border region apologized to Haiti on behalf of the Catholic Church and the Dominican people for the massacre on October 7, 2007. A rebuttal to this occurred on October 9, 2007 when Cardinal Nicolás de Jesús López Rodríguez said that the Dominican people do not need to apologize because Trujillo is the culprit of that crime and he is already dead and buried. Rodriguez’s statement is an example of the prevailing theme of forgetting that anti-Haitianism has been promoting with the subject of the massacre. This statement by Rodriguez helps disconnect the massacre from the present and treats it like a tragedy of the past that is long gone and should be forgotten. The effects of the massacre are still felt in the country today through anti-Haitianism. Rodriguez’s statement only helps to validate anti-Haitian sentiments and prevent the mending of bonds broken by the massacre. To commemorate the 85 anniversary of the massacre, multiple newspapers in the country posted
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articles talking about the massacre and under one article in particular the following comments can be found:

First comment:

“With this invasion of Haitians again, they better take care, for easily what is said here (the article) can happen again, even though they have found corpses from this killing, that Trujillo supposedly did.”

Second Comment:

“All these newspapers are traitors posting the same article. Will you do one about the Degüello de Moca (massacre in 1804) that the Haitians did against Dominicans? Because of articles like these is why they killed the family of Soto Jimenez. For the past few days on twitter, Haitians have been talking about how they will begin to take revenge, when it happens to you all hopefully you will understand that the money that you get for betraying the country is NOTHING. Traitors!”

Around the same times that the articles were posted, a Haitian immigrant killed his boss and two other people in the northern city of Puerto Plata and was on the run. This killing is what the second comment is referring to. As a consequence of that murder, Haitian immigrants who had nothing to do with that killing who lived in the areas of Puerto Plata were forced to leave the city for fear of retribution due to the killings. Community representatives advised them to leave the

---


area. When this individual is found, he most likely won’t have a fair trial, and will be in danger of getting lynched by the people only because he is a Haitian who is suspected of killing Dominicans. These comments under an article remembering the massacre provide no hope for accountability or even for Dominicans to sympathize with Haitians. The comments are an example of how the memory of the massacre has been manipulated to such an extent that it is used to threaten Haitians. This is just another example of the grasp that anti-Haitianism has in the country and another example of Trujillo’s permanence.

Father Hartley is just one of a few examples of people who have advocated for the rights of sugar cane workers. Father Pedro Ruquoy was in Dominican Republic as a missionary advocating for Haitian rights a few years before Hartley arrived. He received the same threats and accusations as Hartley. But he was forced to leave after he received physical harm for his actions. Both Hartley and Ruquoy have been accused by Dominicans of attempting to destroy the sugar industry in the country. The Dominican Chamber of Deputies, which is the equivalence of the US House of Representatives passed a resolution that stated that Hartley, Ruquoy, and the documentary The Price of Sugar were part of a smear campaign against the Dominican Republic and its sugar cane industry. Today Father Hartley and Father Ruquoy are abroad and are still advocating for Haitian worker rights in the Dominican Republic.

Not all of the PLD’s actions can be seen as horrible. The country has been modernized under the PLD’s leadership with many reforms like in public transportation and education. The department of education was reorganized with many sub departments. One of those departments that was created was the department of curriculum. This department was established in 2012 and
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its purpose is to craft a curriculum for schools in the country to follow\textsuperscript{97}. On the department website there are two curriculums that discuss how Trujillo’s history should be taught in school. The first curriculum is from 2016 and it mentions that Trujillo’s regime needs to be taught but there is not mention of the massacre.\textsuperscript{98} The second curriculum from 2017 says to teach about Trujillo’s regime and to teach about the “genocide of 1937.”\textsuperscript{99} Both of these curriculums are labeled as “preliminary and for revision” and there is no documentation to show that they were officially published so it is safe to assume that they were never published. It is not known why one curriculum states the massacre specifically and the other wasn’t, there isn’t any documentation about it. Medina was still president during this time period but it seems that there was a drastic change in personnel in the department of education because many of the people listed in the 2016 curriculum do not appear in the 2017 curriculum. Approximately 78 years after Trujillo and the events of the massacre and it is still not officially part of the educational curriculum. It seems like Trujillo’s idea of hiding the truth of it and converting it into anti-Haitian policies has prevailed.


Luis Abinader’s Regime change and Promises of Progress

In 2019, there were elections in the country that almost led to the PLD winning again. The young people took to the streets in protest in accusation of a fixed election. When the dust settled there was a new president and political party elected. Luis Abinader and the Modern Revolutionary Party (PRM) were elected. The PRM is a modernized version of the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD) who were in power from 1978 to 1982 and again from 2000 to 2004. Abinader is still in power and has replaced almost every position in government with new people, including positions in the department of Education.

Anti-Haitianism is still prevalent in the country today. Sentencia 168-13 is still active today with no hope of it getting repealed anytime soon, even after pleas from activist with Abinader to repeal it. But at least there are actions being taken by foreign institutions against the Dominican sugar cane companies that are still committing human rights violations. In 2022, the United States has decided to block sugar imports from the Company Centro Romana, which is the largest producer of sugar in the Dominican Republic. This is the first step at applying pressure to these companies to stop them from committing human rights violations against workers.

The department of curriculum officially published a new curriculum in 2022. This new 2022 curriculum follows the same structure and words from the 2017 curriculum. Under the section for social sciences you will find the section on Trujillo and a list of topics that must be

discussed. Among these topics you will now find a topic called “violencia military y paramilitary: el genocidio de 1937 (military and paramilitary violence: 1937 genocide). The idea that the Haitian massacre had to be specifically mentioned in both the 2017 curriculum and 2022 curriculum proves that the massacre is not something that was commonly taught in secondary education, which the setting where it should be taught. This has to be the first official government recognition of the massacre. With this new curriculum students in secondary school have to learn about the massacre. The wording used to describe the massacre is genocide. It unconsciously declares that this killing was targeted with an intent to exterminate. This could be the first step of the government admitting fault, even if it’s on behalf of a government that is supposedly long dead. This will create a new generation of people who will be more aware of the dark history surrounding the country and this could lead to people question whether or not Haitians really are the “enemy.” This new awareness will hopefully cultivate people who will lead justly and distribute long overdue justice.

The visible reason for this change can be attributed to a drastic change in government power. With the 2020 election, the PRM had a majority in both houses of congress and has control of the presidency. The PRD has a long history of opposition against Trujillo’s Regime, Balaguer’s government, and the PLD. The idea that the massacre is now being able to be taught in schools after the PRM is in power is self-evident. The PRD and PRM is not known for following a strong anti-Haitian ideology like the PLD. Regarding the issue of Haitian immigrants in the country due to the current political stability, Abinader has said that he wants to help Haiti

but as long as Dominican sovereignty and security is secured and that the human rights of Haitians are preserved.

The teaching of the massacre in schools is the first step in dismantling the anti-Haitian mold that started with Trujillo. With the creation of a new generation of open-minded educated individuals, there is hope that the current anti-Haitian norm will be eliminated in the future, that the Sentencia 168-13 law can be repealed, that the sugar cane trap can stop existing, and that the Dominican government can finally offer a proper formal apology for the massacre. It could also be the result of another political strategy where a regime is trying to distance themselves from past regimes by providing an inch of progress. Whether that is the case it remains to be seen and for the future to tell.

**Conclusion**

Howard Zinn wrote that “there is no flag large enough to cover the shame of killing innocent people for a purpose which is unattainable.”¹⁰⁴ This was said with a different context in mind, but its message is universal. When Balaguer passed the mantle of presidency to Fernandez in 1996, Balaguer told him that he was giving him a “ship that is ready for takeoff.”¹⁰⁵ Balaguer, Fernandez, and Medina have all made positive actions towards the country. But all of these “highways, dams, bridges, roads, schools, hospitals, agricultural settlements, risk channels…”¹⁰⁶ educational reforms, labor reforms, and even healthcare reforms cannot and will not hide the fact that a crime was committed, is still being committed, and is still not being acknowledged. They

---


¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 341.
can boost all they like about their golden legacy of progress, but no golden legacy could ever mask the dirty stain of hate and injustice that they helped to cultivate.

Close to the 100\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the massacre, there are small sparks of progress. The proposal to include the “genocide of 1937” into the curriculum is monumental and the idea of publishing it is colossal. It is the first step towards lessening of tensions and it’s another stepping stone towards accountability. Many people today will not witness the dismantling of these anti-Haitian norms and injustices or any significant justice for the victims and this prevailing negativity is building up to something catastrophic. It is like a balloon expanding with air which will inevitably pop and when this balloon eventually pops, no one on either side will like the consequences.

Dominican Republic and Haiti are insignificant and almost unnoticeable on a map. They are not as world famous or have any significant footing among the powerful. This massacre only affects two countries which means it only affects a small number of people. So why even bother to emphasize this subject of massacres, injustices, and racism? It is our job as members of the human race to know and to do better. As people who share the same planet we owe it to the memory of all victims of any injustice, oppression, or persecution from any place to know, to analyze, to remember, and to do better.

The purpose of this paper is to show how the teaching of the massacre affects anti-Haitianism and how the massacre has directly impacted anti-Haitianism and Haitian sugar cane workers but the sources used to make these claims provide some limitations. The sources were able to provide a good representation of the perspective of the people who are in favor of anti-Haitianism and Trujillo’s actions towards the massacre, but the sources fail to represent the perspective of the people who are opposed to these ideas. This lack of representation creates a
false image that claims that everyone in the country is anti-Haitian when that is not entirely the case. The majority of the people are anti-Haitian but there still is a silent minority who are opposed to anti-Haitianism.

This topic of education and the massacre is an unexplored topic. It would be interesting to find out more information on how it is taught about at the university level. Is it treated as a tragedy and creation of Trujillo that came and went or as the catalyst for the current consequences of the present? It would be interesting to know about who the “elite” are. The Catholic Church’s position and opinions on this matter past and present would be interesting to know as well. In the future it would be interesting to learn what effect the teaching of the massacre in secondary schooling has on society.

In Latin America there is a saying, “entre el cielo y la tierra nada queda ocultó” (between the earth and the sky nothing remains hidden). Whether it will be tomorrow or a hundred years from now, light will shine upon the dark corners and we will be able to see. The Haitian massacre of 1937 is an example of how it was hidden and then unearthed approximately four decades later. I do believe and reaffirm again that Rafael Trujillo is alive. He is alive and sitting in every classroom in Dominican Republic where a history school book does not mention the Haitian Massacre of 1937. He is alive and standing by watching as a Haitians fall into the trap in disguise that hides behind the promises of sugar cane employment. He was alive and sitting at the table where the judiciary committee agreed to make every Dominican of Haitian descent born after 1929 in the country into a stateless inconvenience. He was alive and standing next to the lawyers that were hired by the Vicini family as they sued the filmmakers of the documentary that exposed their crimes against humanity. He is alive and hanging out with every person and group of people who take it upon themselves to harass, mistreat, manipulate, or even murder an
innocent Haitian immigrant in the country or a fellow Dominican whose only fault is having Haitian ancestry. They say that men die and their flesh and bone inevitably turn to dust and that only their actions, ideas, and words remain. No truer words have ever been spoken.
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