

Report on the Impacts of NGO Aid in Camp Perrin



**Partnership Between Northern Illinois University
&
State University of Haiti**

Written by
Elkins VOLTAIRE
Under the direction of Professor Mark SCHULLER ,Ph.D

Port-au-Prince, July 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
Executive Summary	3
I. Introduction	4
II. Commune of Camp Perrin	6
a. Camp Perrin « A Different Place	6
III. Hurricane Matthew on October 4th-5th	8
A. Damage done in the Commune of Camp Perrin	9
IV. Methodology	11
a. Summer 2016	11
b. December 2016	12
V. Presentation of Data	13
VI. Considerations and Principal Findings	28
VII. Recommendations	39
Bibliography	42
About the author	43
Appendices	44

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not have been possible by ourselves. For this reason we are writing this section to thank those who offered their participation in order to make this possible. To start, we would like to say thank you to Professor Mark Schuller who oversaw this research, gave his time, patience and advice and his name and also supervised and edited the work. His contribution is incalculable because without his criticism, scientific discipline and professionalism, this never would have happened.

We are continuing humbly to say thank you to the Department of Ethnology who trained us within the framework of this research, University of Northern Illinois, U.S., that was an important partner in this work, the colleagues on the research team, and in all aspects the community of Camp Perrin: the mayor, the organizations, especially OTEB, farmers, students, professors, motorcycle chauffeurs who drove us everywhere without any danger or accident who were so patient with us and always available when we needed. Friends who guided us, accompanied and helped facilitate the completion of our tasks in the field. Nahim, Jonas and all others – we take off our hats to you. We would also like to thank the owner of the hotel that welcomed us and gave us food that gave us strength to do our work everyday. Fanny Villa and Auberge Mass Nord, you are in our hearts and so satisfied by the welcome and care you gave us.

We cannot forget to thank the members of the population, which is the heart and soul of this work. They received us with open hearts and made themselves available to talk with us, share with us information, without the population we would not have all of this quality information. To every person who agreed to respond to our inquiries, thank you so much.

We would like to thank everyone again, but would not be complete if we did not finish by thanking our family members who provided extraordinary support for us.

Thank you, everyone.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hurricane Mathew is the last catastrophe that hit Haiti, especially in the Northwest, South and Grand Anse Departments on the day of October 4, 2016. In these circumstances, in the same way as before, many local, national and international actors responded. But what was the real impact of this aid on communities? How did people feel about the way actors treated them? In what way did community resources and resilience capacity play a role in the face of a difficult situation after catastrophes? These questions drove a group of students under the supervision of Professor Mark Schuller to launch a big research project in the affected departments.

The data that was recorded and the analysis of this research assisted in understanding many things: 1) Aid that came after Hurricane Matthew started to bring changes in social life, 2) Aid changed human relations in the commune of Camp Perrin, 3) Aid started to develop a behavior of dependency and 4) The response that humanitarian agents provided after the hurricane did not satisfy the population.

When surveyed, and asked to rate the different institutions out of 10, the population gave local authorities an average of 2.46, the State an average of 2.02, and NGOs an average of 3.58 showing us clearly the level of dissatisfaction of people. Regarding NGOs, we can see clearly that after a catastrophe, the communication of humanitarian agents or other actors (like the local authorities, State, NGOs) can become more important than the aid that they bring.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the period of great conquest, where Europeans colonized a number of territories in the name of religion, the world entered a new era¹. This era is characterized by pillaging, genocide and domination all people who were not European. This continued with the establishment slave system. This resulted in the creation of a mode of relations between one which said it was stronger, civilized and all others not like them, they were called savages, and uncivilized, barbaric² peoples. This created unequal relations and brought about the divisions between the colonizer and the colonized, north – south, rich countries – poor countries.

Since that time, despite all of the efforts of dominated countries coming form slavery, other countries that are metropolitan or ancient metropoles continue to block those efforts. They created concepts to eliminate everything, all characteristics/culture they possessed, what Enrique Dussel called "occultation de l'autre." Relations between peoples evolved greatly and took multiple forms, from neighborly relationships to taking on an international dimension.

But with introduction of the concept of development in 1949, inaugurated in a speech by U.S. President Truman, international relations took the shape that holds til today, where the rapport between North and South took on another dimension, one area which was a country that was developed, one that possessed knowledge, economics, technology, health, etc. and countries in need of development had suffering, hunger, the absence of technology, sickness, etc.³ With that definition, the United States gave itself the mission to bring aid and develop these countries as if they were always in that state. It is in this context of American hegemony that a number of institutions were established like the United Nations, World Bank, International Monetary Fund and many NGOs were birthed.

It in this context, as Haiti and many other countries in America and Africa receive international aid either in response to natural disasters called humanitarian aid.

¹ Tzvetan Todorov: la conquete de l'amerique: la question de l'autre ; ed. du seuil ;

² Laennec Hurbon: le barbare imaginaire ; Ed. Henry Deschamps, Port-au-Prince,

³ Gilbert Rist: le developpement, une croyance occidentale ; ed. Presses de la fondation nationael des sciences, Pris, 2007..

it is in the context of a natural disaster that hit Haiti that this study happened. Once again, in the same way it happened frequently in last few years, a serious hurricane passed on the 4th of October. This hurricane hit the areas of the South and Grand Anse harder. It caused a lot of damage, and made the population in those areas more vulnerable than they already were. Like in the past, many local actors, national and international, mobilized to bring aid to those departments hit hardest.

This is the context that served as a pretext to conduct research in the Commune of Camp Perrin in the South Department to better understand:

- 1) During the hurricane, how did solidarity show up in the Commune of Camp Perrin
- 2) For us to see the level of resilience of the people and the resources that they used in the face of the disaster.
- 3) What actions did the people take?
- 4) What new local leaders emerged in the humanitarian context?
- 5) Evaluate how the people viewed the aid that came and how did they assess the work of the different humanitarian actors in the field

This work completed in the commune of Camp Perrin complements the research of, « Exit Strategy: The Long-term Impacts of International NGO aid in Haiti ». It was a collaborative research project between the State University of Haiti and Northern Illinois University. This research was completed in eight areas in the country of Haiti, which are Dabòn and Sayira in the West Department, in the Southeast in Bourdrouin and Marbial, In the South in Camp Perrin and Port Salut, and in the Grand Anse in Pestel and Abricots. This was an opportunity for us to follow-up on earlier research and gather additional information that could aid us in understanding better.

On the NGO question, in Haiti's case, there are a lot of people reflecting on this question in the context of the name the Republic of NGOs. Sauveur Pierre Etienne, a Haitian sociologist, discusses the invention. Haiti stays in a situation of a *restavèk*⁴ economic, where foreigners will provide hand-outs forever. This situation became more

⁴ Restavek comes from a French term *rester avec*. It is a child in Haiti that is sent by his/her parents to work in another household because they lack the resources to support the child.

complicated after the earthquake on January 12, 2010 which took the lives of more than 300,000⁵ people.

It is under the direction of Professor Mark Schuller, an American anthropologist who specializes in the question of NGO anthropology, that this research was completed contributing to a wider study.

This report is divided into five larger sections which are:

1.- The first section will talk about the commune of Camp Perrin, as « a different place », as well as the passage of Hurricane Matthew and the damage that happened especially in the Commune of Camp Perrin.

2.- The second section will present the methods and tools that were used for the research. It will discuss the field visits, observations, surveys and interviews conducted.

3.- The third section will present the data that we collected during the survey from December 2016, while we make a few comparisons with the data collected from the survey of Summer 2016.

4.- In the fourth section, there will be reflections on three hypotheses that we are developing after all of the observations and information that we gathered. It is a partial data analysis.

5.- The last and fifth section will conclude with a few recommendations.

II. COMMUNE OF CAMP PERRIN

This section presents the Commune of Camp Perrin, its history and a brief discussion regarding the motto that people have when they talk about the region, which is “a small isolated location”. We will also discuss the passing of Hurricane Matthew and the damage it did on this Commune.

a. Camp Perrin: « A Place of Its Own ».

“**Camp Perrin: A different place** » (**yon ti kote apa**) is a slogan for this commune that you might hear, and is written when you first enter the commune in the South Department of Haiti. Why is it a different place? What does it mean? Before we try to

⁵ IHSI, recensement par estimation, 2019

respond to these questions, we would like to present the Commune of Camp Perrin before.

Camp Perrin is found in the South Department in the *arrondissement* of Les Cayes. It is found between the city of Les Cayes and Duchity which is in the Grand Anse Department. It is 133.77 km² and the population is 40,962⁶. It is divided into three communal sections. It possesses a number of touristic and historic sites like Saut Mathurin (waterfall), Grotte Kounoubwa, the Davzac canal built during colonial times and its fountain, workshop/training schools, Camp Perrin epi Larivin Disid. It is important for us to note that the commune carries the name of a French officer who created a military camp to protect his plantation. The military base had the name Camp Perrin, which became the name of the town. Many of the neighborhoods carry the names of ancient colonizers like: Lamatinière, Davezac de Castera, Moreau etc.

A long time ago, Camp Perrin was a commune that had a special reputation as a region that had a lot of trees and water. Before it became a commune, it was a neighborhood of Les Cayes that was natural site covered with trees, an ecological monument, a place where if one needed to contemplate the marvels of nature, they could go⁷.



These were the answers that residents gave when we asked the question, why is Camp Perrin a different place? For many, the response is based in the history of the town, the beautiful tree coverage, agricultural production, and the touristic sites it possesses. But others go further than those reasons. They put first, the cleanliness of the town, especially Upper Camp, the number of schools in the commune, the number of people

⁶ IHSI, recensement par estimation, 2009.

⁷ <https://fr.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Camp-Perrin>, consulté le jeudi 9 mars 2017 à 11h00

who go to school and the level of education of the people. It is true that is a commune with a lot of schools, that are known by many, that has the best school in the Mass Nord and always has students who perform well on the State exams.

In the case of our research, we observed these things as interesting and very significant in this town. We went a few times to the town, the shortest visits were two days. In the summer of 2016, we passed two months and then in December of 2016 we passed eight days. Before those visits in 2016, there were a few things that were interesting that we observed: we never saw a child barefoot or naked on the streets, I never had someone approach me to ask for money or other items, many young and old folks were intermingled, we saw a lot of youth who would go to the school in the morning and then would be moto taxis in the afternoon or during vacation, and there were others who were working in small business/enterprises, or working restaurants.

We could give an example of Mass Nord where we were, where there are a lot of kids in school, that work during the vacation so that they could have money. We did not see houses made of *Pay* (straw). Almost all of the houses had either corrugated metal sheets or concrete for roofing. Those are indicators for me that the economic level of people is not bad, and people with a lot of independence and pride. Also, there were not a lot of NGOs working in the commune and the State is not that present in terms of actions.

. When we recognize that NGOs like to be in the areas where is more misery, their absence says a lot about the people's socioeconomic status. We found a lot of people who stated that NGOs when they come, they don't stay because there isn't a reason for them to stay, those people are not in need.

Now, how is after Hurricane Matthew passed? Did the situation stay the same? What changed? Before we respond to these questions, we will talk a bit about Hurricane Matthew, the damage it caused and the consequences it had on this commune.

III. HURRICANE MATTHEW ON OCTOBER 4-5

The people of Camp Perrin did not call it a Cyclone (*siklòn*), but more frequently referred to it as "the weather" (*tan an*). I never questioned why they referred to the hurricane (*siklòn*) in that manner, but I can say that ever region in the country of Haiti,

people have a style of speaking and vocabulary that is different to say certain things. Even if the vocabulary is different, they are talking about the same thing like: *tchentchen* or *Mayi moulén* (corn meal or polenta).

Regarding this question, I should say that a lot of areas in the country, like in the Northwest where they use the word *tan* when there is a lot of rain falling and it won't stop « *tan bouche* » and with a lot of wind, or you can hear them say « *gadon tan* », and maybe it is along these lines also, that people in Camp Perrin use the word *TAN* to talk about hurricane Matthew.

Matthew, was a category 4 hurricane, that hit the country of Haiti, especially in the South and Grand Anse department on the 4th of October at around 7 am. The winds reach 230km/h, and the heavy rains cause flooding, landslides (more than 600 mm in less than a day) and the storm tore trees from the roots, and tore the roofs off houses, leaving them naked. The areas by the ocean, like the city of Les Cayes, Port salut, Cown Island, the Grand Anse, etc, the ocean rose an estimated two to three meters.

More than 800⁸ people (according to Frans TVin or 877⁹ according to Radio Canada) died in the country, and other sources in the West of France who said more than 1000¹⁰ people; but according to all, 80% of the gardens/farmlands were damaged or destroyed in the South Department.

a. Damage done to the area

We did find official numbers regarding the damage that the hurricane caused in the Commune of Camp Perrin. We contacted the Municipal office but they did not have a detailed report regarding the damage while we were conducting the study, but we were in contact again after and there was never a report that was prepared. We are going to attempt to describe what we saw after Matthew. When you pass *4 chemen* (a well-known intersection just outside of Les Cayes) going in the direction of Camp Perrin, passing the airport, after a few kilometers on the asphalt road, you can see the nearby gardens and trees in the nearby plains. Before Matthew, when you passed the

⁸ Mobil.francetvinfo.fr/meteo/cyclone-ouragan/ouragan-matthew/ouragan-matthew-haiti-la-grande-urgence_1862263.html, consulté le jeudi 9 mars 2017 à 12h03

⁹ Ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelle/807464/Haiti-bilan-ouragan-mathhew-aide-humanitaire-croix-rouge

¹⁰ www.ouest-france.fr/catastrophe/ouragan/ouragn-matthew-haiti-le-bilan-atteint-les-1-000-morts-4549488/amp

intersection to enter Matinyè on the road the leads to Hotel Le Recul, there are two paths, one to pass Matinyè that would enter the center of Camp Perrin or you could pass a mountain where there is a pond below on a road called Route Nèf.

In those two cases, either if you pass Rout Nèf, when you are higher, it is difficult to know that Camp Perrin was close to you because there were a lot of trees that covered all of the surfaces and even houses that were close by you could not see. When you entered the commune, there were areas that if you did not go, you would never know there were people living there because the trees blocked the view of the houses. Camp Perrin before Matthew was like a beautiful negrès (black woman) dressed in her finest with a beautiful straw hat with her hair flowing down her back. But after Matthew, it had a different face, and it was with great shock when we were entering. We saw the commune was naked, it was undressed, the trees that represented her clothes were practically not standing, and those that were had not leaves, like a fire had passed. All the areas that you could not see before, you now could see without binoculars or even glasses. The village was like a woman undressed, all her hair ripped off.

It was with much distress, that we saw it was hard to find a tree to protect from the sun if it wasn't under a house still standing. The face of the town was distressed. On my way, there were only a few concrete houses that were still standing, but there was practically not a single corrugated metal roof that remained on a house, and others made in wood that fell. A lot of people reported that they lost their gardens, animals, and other things they had. Almost no gardens were still standing.

I was struck by sadness, when I entered Mass Nord. The yard which once was a small paradise because of the number of trees and the diverse types of fruits, it became nothing with almost all of the trees downed, the roof of the school gone, the yard unrecognizable. It was with a lot of emotion that I lived this experience. When I continued, the roof of the church was gone, a lot of other schools had also lost their roofs. When i visited Saut Mathurin (waterfall), there were practically no trees at the top of the waterfall, you barely needed to arrive to know what had occurred below.

Regarding infrastructure, the small electrical grid was damaged still in December when we were there. People reported that there was no power after the hurricane even thought they did not there were some technicians working on the poles or the grid.

Where there were other routes, you needed to do a lot of gymnastics to arrive. The roads were really damaged and a large crack in the canal Davzak, an irrigation canal that was there from colonial times.

But we must emphasize, that life continues. We noticed that some of the local organization were cleaning the debris in areas such as Piko and Kpol. So we can describe the board's cloudy this that Matthew left the commune Kanperen. It is this manner, that we can describe this somber image that Matthew left in the Commune of Camp Perrin.

IV. METHODOLOGY

This study is a long study that started before summer of 2016. It includes a number of steps like a number of field visits, registering GPS points, observations and surveys including one that lasted eight weeks during the summer of 2016 and another in December 2016 after Hurricane Matthew. To complete this study, we combined a number of methodologies. We combined qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Before we discuss all of the techniques and tools we used to gather information for this study, we are going to touch on two important phases in the case this study.

a. Summer 2016

From June until August, the team was deployed to the field. I was in Camp Perrin with an American colleague. It is important for us to note that we had already made a number of visits to the field to make the first contact, and then a second visit to register GPS points after we received a training on observation methodologies on the physical aspects of the area, economic and cultural activities, habits, etc. Then, a third time we went to test our tools to see if they were well adapted, so we conducted a presurvey on January 10-15 of 2016, and a fourth time for us to coordinate logistics, which prepared us to go for eight weeks into the field, which prepared us to go for eight weeks into the field from June 17 – August 8.

During those two months, we administered 100 questionnaires and five interviews. We became integrated in the lives of the community which helped us to understand the social structure, kinship structures, habits and observed many social functions and

phenomena. Also, along those lines, we noted the NGOs that were present and the activities in which they were engaged since we were looking for answers to the question of aid impact and NGOs.

We also worked in the first and second communal sections of Camp Perrin including: Matinyè, Masan, Levi, Anwo kan, Anba kan, Bananye, Bwèt, Mawo, So matirin, Maslin, Nan Jon, Piko, Kpol, etc.

This survey allowed us to gather good information and data regarding how the commune was before and after Hurricane Matthew.

b. December 2016

This is what I am calling the second phase. We went, for the first time, to the field for an exploratory visit that lasted two days from October 29-30, 2016. During this visit, we made observations regarding the damage that was done by Hurricane Matthew, on the changes in the environment and a few interviews with some of the local authorities like the mayor or important leaders in the commune of Camp Perrin. It was an interesting visit because it allowed for us to see, and listen to the opinions of people regarding aid, how they lived through this event, how they felt, how they viewed tomorrow, etc. This visit allowed us to shape a clearer idea of how to shape the tools to prepare for the survey after Matthew. It was after that, we returned to the field for five days. The work was to administer the questionnaires, conduct interview, and make observations. In this context, we administered 25 questionnaires during those five days and held two focus groups.

We worked with a questionnaire that contained 50 questions. Amongst those questions, the first 31 were closed questions, and the other 19 were open-ended. For those questions, we recorded the answers. After we finished gathering the information in the field, we entered the responses into excel.

This allowed us to pick a mosaic of data within the framework of this investigation where we used direct observations, participant observation, questionnaires with both open and close-ended questions, as well as interviews with open-ended questions with some community leaders. This process began before 2016, but systematic investigation was launched last summer 2016 through December 2016.

VI. DATA PRESENTATION

1. DATA PRESENTATION

Now we are going to present some of the data we collected during the summer of 2016 and in December 2016. We are going to present the data from the summer before in order to show how the situation was before hurricane Matthew and then December's data after in a way that will allow us to see what changed.

1.1. Data from Summer 2016

This first Table speaks to collaboration within the commune. With this we can see 67 out of 100 people said « yes » that people in the area do collaborate/work together, 12 people said « no » the people in the area do not collaborate, and 16 stated « it depends », this would indicate that there are situations when they work together, while other situations where they do not. Also, there were two people that said « sometimes », and three who did not respond to this question.

TABLE 1: DO PEOPLE COLLABORATE IN THE COMMUNE?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	67
No	12
Depends	16
Sometimes	2
No response	3
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

When we asked people in a more general sense, do Haitians work together, 66 said “yes” Haitians to collaborate, 29 said “no” Haitians do not collaborate.

TABLE 2: DO HAITIANS COLLABORATE?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	66
No	29
No response	5
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

Table 3 speaks about the relationship between people in the area. This shows us that 81 people said « yes » people in the area get along with each other, and only four said « no », 10 said « it depends », and two said « sometimes », and three did not respond or said they did not know.

TABLE 3: DO PEOPLE IN THE AREA GET ALONG?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	81
No	4
It depends	10
Sometimes	2
No response	3
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

Table 4 focuses on the confidence people have in each other. It allows us to see that 65 people said that they have confidence in their neighbor(s), there were 20 that said that they did not have any confidence in their neighbor(s), 11 said “it depends”, and four that did not respond to the question.

TABLE 4: DO YOU HAVE CONFIDENCE IN YOUR

NEIGHBOR(S)?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	65
No	20
It depends	11
No Response	4
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

In the area of collective activities in the area, almost everyone stated there are collective activities in the area. (Table 5)

TABLE 5 "DO YOU SEE COLLECTIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA?"	
Response	Quantity
Yes	93
No	4
No Response	2
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

The people in the population identified some needs/concerns in the middle of many others that were more urgent to the area. In Table 6, we see in the needs that are more urgent for people is "work" with 19 people citing it first, after, it is the road with 14 people citing it, and health has four people, after three people cited power, water, and food. We can say that a large number did not respond or said they did not know.

<p>TABLE 6: WHAT NEEDS/CONCERNS APPEAR TO BE MORE URGENT IN THE AREA?</p>

Response	Quantity
Work	19
Road	14
Health	6
Power/Electricity	3
Training/Farming support	3
Food	1
Water	1
Flooding	1
Other	9
No response	43
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

More than three-quarters, or 85 people amongst them believed that those problems can be resolved, and only seven who believed they could not be. This is detailed in Table 7.

TABLE 7 DO YOU THINK THOSE PROBLEMS CAN BE RESOLVED?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	85
No	7
No response	8
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

When asked if local authorities could resolve those problems, Table 8 shows us that less than a half, or 42, amongst the people believe local authorities can resolve

those problems. More than half or 52 amongst them believe that the local authorities cannot resolve those problems and are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8: CAN LOCAL AUTHORITIES OR THE STATE RESOLVE THOSE PROBLEMS?			
Response	Local Authorities	State	NGOs
Yes	42	56	65
No	52	37	23
No response	6	7	12
Total	100	100	100

Summer Survey 2016

When we asked if the State could resolve those problems, we see that 56 or more than 50% believed the State can resolve those problems. When asked about NGOs, 65 people state that they believe that NGOs can resolve those problems more than the local authorities or the State.

TABLE 9: DO YOU SEE NGOS WORKING IN THE AREA?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	39
No	57
No response	4
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

In the short conversations we had with people about NGOs, we found that 39 people only said that they see NGOs working in the area, more than 50% said they do not see NGOs that are working in the area. Table 11 gives a better idea of this.

TABLE 10: HAVE YOU RECEIVED SUPPORT FROM NGOS?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	12
No	23
No response	65
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

Amongst the people that responded to this question, we see 12 who said that they received support from NGOs that work in the area, but more people, 23, stated they had not received any support at all from NGOs in the area. (Table 10)

TABLE 11: DO NGOS BRING SOLUTIONS FOR THE AREA?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	26
No	56
No response	18
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

In Table 11, more than 50% amongst the people, or 56, state that NGOs do not bring any solutions for the area, and only 26 said “yes”, NGOs bring solutions for the area.

TABLE 12: SHOULD NGOS STAY IN THE AREA	
Response	Quantity
Yes	64
No	11
No response	25
Total	100

Summer Survey 2016

There were 64 people, as indicated in Table 11, who believed NGOs should stay in the area, and only a small number who believed they should leave.

TABLE 13: DO YOU HAVE CONFIDENCE IN LOCAL AUTHORITIES, THE STATE OR NGOS?			
Response	Local Authorities	State	NGOs
No	69	19	50
Yes	22	75	35
No response	9	6	15
Total	100	100	50

Summer Survey 2016

In Table 13, regarding the question of confidence in local authorities, the State and NGOs, we can see that there were more people at 69, who have confidence in local authorities, which is greater than the confidence in the State or NGOs. We also see, that it is the State that received the least confidence with only 19 people with NGOs in the middle of where people allocate their confidence.

1.2. Data from December 2016

After we finish presenting the research done in the summer 2016, we are presenting the results from the research in December 2016.

TABLE 14: SPIRIT OF SHARING AFTER THE HURRICANE		
Response	Share with Neighbor(s)	Neighbor(s) Shares with You
Yes	24	20
No	1	5
Total	25	25

Survey December 2016

Regarding welfare amongst the people in the community after the hurricane, we can see that 80%, or 20 people said « yes » that they found people share with them and 96% or 24 who said « yes » they share with others too. We see more people who said they share with others because others share with them.

Table 15 presents the needs of people in the commune of Camp Perrin who participated in this research. In this list, we put a focus on needs that people said are their priorities.

TABLE 15: LIST OF NEEDS PEOPLE HAVE IN THE COMMUNITY	
Need	Number of times cited
Road	17
Power/ Electricity	14
Food	14
Potable Water	13
Work	11
House/House Repair	7
Training/Farming Support	7
Health/Hospital	7
Corrugate Metal Sheets (roofing)	5
Professional Schools/Schools	4
Cleaning	3

People who represent them well/ good leadership	2
Library/Space for Intellectual Debate	2
Reforestation	2
Conscience	2
Security	1
Money	1

Survey December 2016

To be more accurate, we are listing every need that was cited by the 25 people who participated in this research, and the needs were cited multiple times. Therefore it is not possible to show a total. When you look closely, it is the road with 17 people that is cited the most amongst the participants, after it is power/electricity and food who both were cited 14 times, after it is potable water with 13, 11 who stated work and training/farming support, health/hospital, and house/house repairs, all three were cited by seven people. All the others were less cited.

When we ask people to state the needs that are more of a priority for them in the commune of Camp Perrin, the Table below allows us to see that health/hospital is at the top with 14 voices, after it is corrugate metals sheets and food that both were cited 10 times each, and work and professional school after with 8 people. In other words, in the moment of Matthew, these are the needs that became priorities. When we compare the list in Table 16 with that of Table 6, that are from the two surveys from the summer and December, we see that people's priorities changed.

In the summer, it was the road that was cited by 19 people, with work being cited by 14, and power/electricity with six voices, while in December it is health/hospital, corrugated metal sheets, and food that became the top three priority needs. Although the needs from the two research surveys remain similar, it is clear that the priorities changed.

TABLE 16: AMONGST NEEDS WHICH ONE HAS BECOME A PRIORITY?	
Priority After Matthew	Number of times cited
Health	14

Food	10
Corrugated Metal Sheets	10
Work	8
Professional School	8
Training/Farming Support	8
Road	7
Library	5
Space	3
Water	2
Power/Electricity	2
Good representatives	2
Cleaning	2
Conscience	2
Securit	1

Survey December 2016

We are detailing every need that was cited by the 25 participants, and therefore it is impossible to total the numbers.

TABLE 17: CAN THOSE PROBLEMS BE RESOLVED?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	23
No	2
Total	25

Survey December 2016

It is only two people, representing eight percent that believe those problems identified in Table 15 and 16 cannot be resolved, with a larger number of people at 23 or 92% who believe those problems can be resolved.

TABLE 18: ARE LOCAL AUTHORITIES, THE STATE, NGOS, OR OTHERS CAPABLE OF RESOLVING THOSE PROBLEMS?					
Response	Myself or Neighbor	Local Organization	Local Authorities	State	NGOs
Yes	18	15	18	11	15
No	7	10	6	12	10

No response	-	-	1	2	-
Total	25	25	25	25	25

Survey December 2016

There were 18 or 72% who responded “yes” that they themselves and their neighbors could resolve those problems with seven who said “no” they could not. There were 15 (60%) that believe that local organizations could resolve those problems with 10 (40%) who believed they could not. Then, there were 18 (72%) people who believed local authorities could resolve those problems, and at a smaller percentage of 44 or 11 people who said that the State could resolve those problems. A larger number of people, or 12 (48%) said that the State could not resolve those problems with two or eight percent who did not say anything. Lastly, 15 people or 60% believed NGOs could resolve those problems.

People consistently added, when they were responding to those questions, whether if it was regarding collaboration/working together or endorsing local authorities or the State, many amongst the participants believe that collaboration/working together can accomplish a lot and change the community where they are living.

TABLE 19: LIST OF ACTIONS THAT PEOPLE TOOK AFTER THE HURRICANE	
Actions	Number of times cited
Cleaning (road, canals)	10
Cut trees, unblock the road, cleaned people’s yards	9
Turned their homes into temporary shelters	8
Saved people in danger	6
Shared (food, clothing)	5
Paid a solidarity visit	4
Surveyed	3

Survey December 2016

It is important for us to appreciate how people in the area did not remain dumbfounded in a difficult situation they and their neighbors were living in the moment of Hurricane Matthew. They took many actions (Table 19) that showed important solidarity like welcoming people whose homes were damaged into their homes, sharing food and clothing, supporting each other, and rescuing those in dangers or that are handicapped or elderly. These gestures are strong and show the solidarity that exists in the

community. I remember a simple gesture that a friend told me, a group of youth and mixed with adults decide to make tea for shock (sezisman¹¹) and walked around distributing to people in their area that were in shock. This appears to be a simple gesture but it is extremely significant that people using traditional knowledge were helping others in a difficult moment, paying solidarity visits, that is a new element in those situations. In other words, the community is very dynamic in crisis moments, which also explains why people do not like to just sit and wait like they are kids without the will or capacity.

TABLE 20: ACTIONS TAKEN BY LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS	
Organizations	Action(s)
G30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gave metal sheets - Cleaning - Cassaverie
A few youth groups created for the occasion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cutting trees - Saving people in difficult situations during the hurricane - Made efforts to find aid -
Local Red Cross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gave potable water
Scouts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Saved people who had water in their homes
OTEB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cleaning - Gave metal sheets - Gave seeds
Project St. Anne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Metal sheets - Wood and other construction materials - Participated in school repairs

Survey December 2016

Local organizations acted in their own way and in the ways their capacity allowed them. They participated in cleaning, moving people, and finding other houses for those

¹¹ It's considered an illness in Haiti, when someone finds out about bad news or lives in a traumatizing situation, and this makes someone disoriented and expresses itself in psychosomatic illness where the person feels sick

who had lost their homes. There were also some who were able to give sheets of tin, seeds, wood and participated in the reconstruction of the school. Table 20 allows us to see which actions they took and which local organizations took the action. We would like to continue to say, it is possible that due to limited resources they do not have the capacity to do anything on a large-scale and others may not give these actions importance or even know about them. The question of reinforcing the capacity of local organizations is an important one. If they are reinforced or given the means to take actions it would allow in the moment of a crisis or natural catastrophe that there are more possibilities for a quicker response, more efficient and closer to their areas.

TABLE 21: ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES	
Authority	Action(s)
Municipal/Mayor's office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They passed and talked - Conducted an assessment - Did a few distributions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gave water - Cleaned
Senator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provided a tractor to clean the road and canals - Gave food
Candidates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brought food - Cleaned - Gave health kits and metal sheets - Gave the resources to clean

Survey December 2016

More than half, 14 out of 25 people said they did not see anything the local authorities did, except to either take incoming aid and put it in their houses, or that they were not sure there were local authorities in Camp Perrin, or they are very passive and waiting the same as the population.

But some cited some actions of local authorities like passing and talking to people, conducting assessments, some water, food, metal sheet distributions, and cleaning. But it is important for us to point out that these actions were not done in collaboration, it was a series of interventions done in isolation. (Table 20)

TABLE 22: ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE STATE	
Action	Number of times cited
Gave metal sheets	2

Water	2
Food	2
Evaluation visit	1

Survey December 2016

The question regarding what people saw or knew of in terms of actions by the State after Matthew, we found only one person who said that the State paid a visit to evaluate the level of damage, two people who cited the State gave metal sheets, water, and food and the rest of the people said either they did not see the State, or the State didn't take any actions, or they did not respond at all. (Table 21)

It is important for us to consider the actions that the population said that NGOs took after Matthew. This is detailed in Table 22 and 23, the actions NGOs took and which NGOs. This does not reflect the entire experience of the population but of those who participated in the survey.

TABLE 23: ACTIONS TAKEN BY NGOS IN THE FIELD	
NGOs	Action(s)
Save the Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food and sanitation kids - Gave tarps - Work - Conducted assessment - Distributions - Gave food kits - Gave aquatabs and oral serum - Helped the school with roofing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gave houses - Assisted kids - Gave buckets - Cosmetic products
PROTOS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Food - Sanitation kits - Tarps - Work
Haiti future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gave food kids - Helped the school with roofing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gave houses

Survey December 2016

There were 11 people or 44% who provided those responses. There were 14 or 56% who did not respond to this question because they did not see what NGOs were doing. The population cited the name of three NGOs that they saw, remember or knew that took action and the sector in which they worked. Those three NGOs are PROTOS, Save the Children, and Haiti Future. Table 23 allows us to see better what concerns NGOs that were already in the community before Matthew.

TABLE 24: ACTIONS TAKEN BY NGOS AFTER MATTHEW	
NGO	Action(s)
-	Food, Health kits
CECI	- Gave food - Gave money - Repaired houses
-	- Passed and marked houses - Took names
-	- Gave rice aid - Metal sheets - Gave food cards
OXFAM	- Gave food - Gave money - Hygenic kits
UNICEF	- Bay manje - Bay Kòb
Spanish and Dominican Red Cross	- Gave food - Gave disinfectant - Installed a water bladder for treated water - Gave hygenic kits
Samaritan's Purse	- Gave rice and oil
CSI	-

Survey December 2016

There were 13 out of 25 that represented 52% that said NGOs either came by to take names, mark houses for them to repair, made promises and then they were never seen again, or what NGOs were doing they could not see, or others didn't respond at all. There are some spots in the table where there are no names because the actions were remembered but the name of the NGO was not. But the population stated these actors came after Matthew.

TABLE 25: WERE THE ACTIONS TAKE EFFECTIVE?

Response	Population	Local Organizations	Local Authorities	State	NGOs
Yes	24	14	5	3	7
No	-	5	15	13	13
No response	1	6	5	9	5
Total	25	25	25	25	25

Survey December 2016

In the survey, 96% or 24 said that the actions they themselves took were effective, in other words useful. Another 14 believed that the actions of local organizations were effective, less than half, and five people believed the actions of local authorities to have been effective and with more than half stating that they were not. Only 12% or three people said the actions of the State were efficient, and more than half at 52% or 13 said that they were not effective or did not exist at all. Also, seven people believed the actions of NGOs were effective while 13 thought the contrary.

TABLE 26: DID YOU RECEIVE SUPPORT FROM NGOS?	
Response	Quantity
Yes	3
No	20
No response	2
Total	25

Survey December 2016

There was 80% or 20 amongst the people questioned who said they did not receive or have not yet received anything from NGOs: from those present before Matthew, nor from those who came after Matthew. Only 12% representing 3 people said that they received some aid (kichòy, highlighting food aid. See Table 26). Citing these numbers, we can say that most people did not benefit from aid that arrived in the commune.

TABLE 27: DID EVERYONE IN THE AREA RECEIEVE?		
Response	NGO BEFORE MATTHEW	NGO AFTER MATTHEW
Yes	1	0
No	21	23
No Response	3	2
Total	25	25

Survey December 2016

In addition 84% said that not everyone in the area received aid from NGOs present before Matthew. An even greater number noted that not everyone received aid from NGOs present after Matthew. No one said that everyone received aid, and 23 people, 92%, said not everyone did with two people not responding.

The average note that the population gave the entity providing response after Matthew in Camp Perrin.

TABLE 28: THE AVERAGE NOTE THAT THE POPULATION GAVE THE ENTITY PROVIDING RESPONSE AFTER MATTHEW IN CAMP PERRIN			
Actor	NGOs	The State	Local Authorities
Average score from 1 to 10	3.58	2.02	2.46

Survey December 2016

In our study we asked people to give each entity a rating from 0-10 according to how they judged the work done. Each person gave a score as we had asked. We took these scores and calculated an average on Excel. So we can observe that the State had lowest average score, the worst grade, followed by local authorities.

2. CONSIDERATIONS AND PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

In this section we emphasize the study findings that we found most striking. First we discuss some considerations about some of the tables from December 2016. Then we will report three main findings among many others, which involve several aspects of the data that we have collected, supported by the people's own analyses in the recorded interviews.

2.1. Considerations about several tables

Table 16 presents people's needs and priorities after Hurricane Matthew. We found that the priorities changes. In the summer, the priorities were:

- 1) Work
- 2) Roads
- 3) Health

We can say that the tendency was reversed after Matthew:

- 1) Health
- 2) Tin for roofs / food
- 3) Professional schools and support for farming

It's clear that the priorities changed. We know that during natural disasters like hurricanes, large segments of infrastructure are damaged and the health situation of people becomes more complicated, all the planters lost their crops, livestock and other goods. People are in other words decapitalized. So it's understandable that priorities change, and that's precisely what happened in Camp-Perrin after Matthew. We also found several new needs such as housing, roof materials, and cleaning up that weren't present in the summer but they have become concrete and immediate needs as a direct result of the weather event. We can see that primary needs in the context of a disaster become more important than other, long-term needs. Therefore, the social and economic contexts changed, and priorities changed as well.

Matthew's passage didn't change people's sharing practices (Table 14). In summer 2016 93 out of 100 reported sharing and 92 out of 100 reported others sharing with them. Following Matthew, things didn't change: 24 out of 25 (96%) people reported

sharing with others, an even higher statistic than before, and 20 out of 25 reported others sharing with them. Respondents also reported that people in the community regularly are united and Haitians also get together to resolve problems (Tables 1 and 2). We see that in this difficult time during Matthew, this solidarity still existed, and it was even reinforced during the time of the disaster. In a community where people can count on one another, this is an important resource that can play a big role in how they face a series of challenges and solve problems. When the community is closely knit, this reinforces resilience and helps people feel more secure, more a part of society. Following Hurricane Matthew, this mutual aid with people sharing with one another represented a major strength, with people able to better face the weather event and more quickly get back on their feet. This is good, during times of crisis people in the community band together; this is an important resource.

Concerning humanitarian actors, we think that the way that actors intervene in moments of crisis, natural disasters and others, needs to change, like many other people such as Mark Schuller¹² and Michel Julien¹³ argue that humanitarianism needs to revise its strategies. It's clear that the ways it is executed don't bring about good results. This research supports what has already been said. The responses about the effectiveness of the actions of humanitarian actors, and whether they received aid or not, is some proof that shows that aid doesn't work or succeed.

This data helps us reflect about how NGOs act in the field. It is difficult to understand, that NGOs come to help people, whereas many of them say they didn't receive anything or don't even see anything. This is difficult to comprehend. Where did the aid go? Who did it pass through if the people concerned didn't receive it? How was the distribution managed? Many other questions can be asked. We don't take people's interviews to be the Bible, and as researchers our job is not to judge, but 14 people out of 25 people said that, each from a different area.

² Mark Schuller, *Humanitarian Aftershocks in Haiti*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2016.

¹³ Michel Julien, *Impacts des interventions des ONG en Haïti: nécessité d'un nouveau cadre de partenariat*, Haiti perspectives, volume 1. N02. Été 2012.

This statistic likely stems from a lack of information circulating about the work each actor is doing in the field, certainly NGOs, or possibly from the lack of training of field staff or their lack of professionalism. It can also be true that a census is not distribution. During censuses humanitarian actors are there to collect information, which does not mean that a distribution will happen. In this case if there's not a good explanation, it is understandable that people can interpret it that way: if they count my house there will be a distribution. It's also possible that people are truly waiting for aid or truly believe that NGOs = aid, they don't want to give information. It's also possible that a lack of trust or ill will leads some to give out false information to force people to take. All of these scenarios are problems that require careful thought. If any of these are true this can lead to frustration and even render them resistant to anyone coming to the field. I personally have experienced this (ref Table, 24, 25, 26).

Many people reporting that NGO actions weren't effective gave these reasons among several others:

- Aid is badly distributed
- They don't give with the population really needs, and they don't try and find out the population's real necessities
- What they gave wasn't enough
- Those in greatest need weren't the ones who received aid: the truly vulnerable, and the individuals who lost a lot of their resources were not the main beneficiaries. It is as if the aid distribution was done unjustly.

Other people also believed that:

- There wasn't enough
- Distribution was badly done
- Distribution was done according to people's personal connections
- Local authorities absconded with the aid or gave them to their friends
- There weren't many NGOs in the field;

The community didn't just sit on their hands. They acted in the ways they could. When a community has the capacity to use internal resources to confront a situation it's a big

thing. When people spoke of the actions they took, you see and feel a certain pride. I find this very positive. I remember a respondent who recalled how she saved a person with disability, and it is as if she was a 'hero.'

This feeling of satisfaction, and the feeling that they have done something useful for others, is an important aspect regarding how people can manage a traumatic situation like the hurricane can mobilize to act. It represents an energy source that can help them climb the hill and better address all their difficulties. Therefore this reinforces people's resilience.

For people who believe that local authorities can solve these problems, they say that they don't want to, they don't have the will. This is not the first time we have heard this language, but it demands reflection. We can say that in a sense it can be a lack of will in the sense of when authorities have the means, how do they use it? What do they aim to pose as actions with what little they have in their hands? Because you might not have a lot, it's better to try and do something, so that people can see that you did something, rather than not do anything at all if you don't have enough. People will continue to say, there's a bunch of people who only see their own pockets; if they saw collective interests there was a lot of things they could do. But people who don't believe say that it's a bunch of idiots who are leading, who can't see past the nose on their face. And even if some had good intentions they don't have enough means to resolve the problems by themselves. This is a finding because many people reported several cases where authorities took the Matthew aid to their houses, or shared it with their family and friends, and because of this, in people's minds, this is true of all authorities. In other words, the problem of corruption is not only in the head of the state but all over. But in reality, not all are corrupt. To conclude we can say that it's also true that local authorities can't resolve these problems by themselves.

2.2. Aid that arrived developed a behavior of dependency in the middle of the population

There are not very many NGOs that work in this commune and the State is not very present in terms of actions. Regarding this question, in the survey that was conducted in the summer of 2016, we found these numbers that included 45% of the population that believed local authorities could resolve the problems of the th 60% believed that the State could resolve problems, 74% believed that NGOs could resolve problems.

When you isolate those numbers, it appears that people are not very self-reliant, but when you ask them if people from the area can resolve their problems 92% said yes. It indicates that people have the will to contribute to the development of their community, but they may not have the means. It may be the reason they feel frustrated when they are just receiving without being included in actions. It is not in every area of the country that people want to get things for free, without breaking a sweat, I believe that this commune is an example in the middle of many others wants to stay autonomous. We need to underline that it is not that don't have needs or need the support of others or foreigners but they do not want to remain passive. They believe in collaboration, in their own strength and own work. But after Hurricane Matthew ravaged the community, this autonomy looked like it was wanting to disappear.

For the same question in the survey in December of 2016, we found that 72% of the people believed that they and their neighbors if they collaborated could resolve those problems, also 72% believed that local authorities could resolve them, 44% believed that the State could resolve them which is less than from the summer indicating faith in the state had diminished. In addition, 60% believed that NGOs could resolve them, which is lower than the summer also indicating less faith in NGOs capacity.

What would explain the decreased faith in the State and in NGOS and the increase in confidence in local authorities? This would require digging deeper. Change that was happening in the social fabric could be one of the elements that explains those variations. In the moment of a catastrophe, it is possible for people to attempt to balance some ideas that they had before because the context changed. Psychologically, a catastrophe can create trauma and this can awaken a whole series of other ideas that were asleep. Automatically this can happen, people and their

perceptions regarding some things are changing, in addition to one's relationship with oneself, while the environment and institutions are changing as well.

A lot of people that we questioned stated:

«People that came did not want to look for work, they preferred to leave their activities so that could follow where distributions were happening»

We find that once a person who is not from the area appears with a purse or folder in hand, then you have a lot of people that pass asking:

«Are you taking names?»

or

«Don't forget to add my name.¹⁴».

If we remember during and right after the weather events, I am referring to the way people referred to the Hurricane in the zone, we could say that there were a lot of actions which were taken to save people and to unblock the road, but the week after, things changed. When you asked people what actions local associations were taking, almost everyone responded in this manner:

« No actions. They are waiting to see what is going to be brought for them to distribute »

After the hurricane, those elements show that there was a type of social mutation that began where people were developing a dependency on humanitarian aid and even had a person state that Camp Perrin is no longer a different place².

I can not say if this talk is a different after the hurricane, but I believe that the image people had regarding their commune began to change with a lot of changes that were happening on multiple levels especially at the level of their environments. This dwindled perspective came more after hurricane Matthew, and you could see on people's faces despair, embarrassment, lacking esteem, and nostalgia when they were talking about how the commune was in the present and how it had been before. Also, people's pride dwindled, political issues in the commune, and dissatisfaction regarding the leaders they have and hurricane Matthew contributed to this decreased pride. So,

¹⁴ This is a reference to the practice of taking names and adding to a list of people who can benefit from aid.

the slogan a different place did not really resemble how things evolved beginning before Matthew and was reinforced after Matthew.

5.2. The population was not satisfied with how agents managed distribution

It is clear that those numbers indicate that people were not satisfied at all regarding the response after Matthew. Therefore they were not satisfied with the interventions of the State, nor the local authorities, nor the NGOs. The small difference that was present in the numbers, were some were worse than others, and we see that it is the NGOs that are less bad. What this seems to indicate is that the population was a bit more satisfied with the work of NGOs over others. Those numbers were similar to what people said whether it was the State, local authorities or NGOs and reinforced each other. In point 5.2 in the report, you will find more details on this question of dissatisfaction

It is true that many questions were raised about this aid called humanitarian aid treated people, and how they brought aid and what they brought. In Haiti, especially, people are always saying that in all things you must have a sponsor. In other words, you must have your people. In the commune of Camp Perrin, after the hurricane, a lot of mouths were shut and heads bound regarding how the aid was organized and how it was distributed. We are going to attempt to give a few numbers that can help us to understand the dissatisfaction of people. When you ask people, what score you would give local authorities, the State or NGOs regarding how they managed the aid they brought after Matthew, the scores they received were: NGOs scored 3.58/10, local authorities scored less than NGOs receiving a score of 2.46/10, and the State even lower receiving 2.02/10. We can state that not one of them passed or came close to the score of 10. Also, NGOs were scored higher than local authorities and the State. In all of this, it is the NGOs that were the least bad and the State that was the worst amongst them.

The conversations with people can help us better understand what the numbers are saying. When we asked people how they would evaluate the response that came after Matthew here are some of the responses we found:

«I could see that it was good in one area because people who did not have received. In another area it was not good because it was people who were not in need that received. There were people who received and created a business, selling the aid.»

«I evaluate it at zero, because there should be some instructions¹⁵. When they say they are coming to help people it is always partial. If you are giving you are supposed to do that for everyone without looking at their faces.»

«Don't have a response because neither the State, NGOS, nor our local authorities brought anything that we saw.»

These responses give an idea regarding how people understand the aid that was brought for them and also the level of their satisfaction. It is true that there are some that believe the contrary like those who stated:

«I could see that it was good in one area because people who did not have received. In another area it was not good because it was people who were not in need that received. There were people who received and created a business, selling the aid. »

People provided a lot of cases that they saw, which led them to their analyses. They saw a series of people that had nothing from before the hurricane and that became more vulnerable after and even in these conditions aid does not reach them. It seems to be the tendency that people who had the means to live and were not that affected by the hurricane were the ones receiving aid. They are not talking only about themselves but everything that they see in their direct environment.

People mostly said that it was based on appearances (that you 'looked like a victim') and to their people that distribution was done, like these people among the following who continued in the same sense, that said:

«Even if they brought aid, we did not receive it. Peasants that lived in the mountains did not receive it, even those in the middle of the town, we did not

¹⁵ In other words, making resources available to them so they can produce themselves and evolve themselves.

receive any. When the hurricane was coming they did not send cards but for you to find something it is sponsors (marenn ak parenn). In addition, it's not good if you had to get up because of being hit by a stick.»

Neither the State, nor local authorities are included in this category. Besides the people believe that is them that are the head of the chaos and a few other people who are responsible for the NGO distributions. The statements made regarding the State and local authorities are significant along those lines. Remember local authorities scored 2.46/10”

***« They fought more and did not take care of anything.»
« until today we have still to see someone ask us what we brought »***

For those who were commenting about the State here are a few statements:

***«The State did not do anything at all.»
« it was the same thing for the State. There really isn't a State authority that took anything into their charge. You could see that it was the Grand Anse that benefitted more. Here, no one from the state looked at us. »***

For NGOs that scored 3.58/10:

« NGOs did not circulate into all of the corners, because they do not have agents. When a commune is destroyed that is when they put agents into the different corners, on all of the mountain tops to see how the population is living, and how peasants are functioning. Because peasants are under trees, under small places when the rain falls. We did not see NGOs, their interventions were not efficient.»

There you have a series of declarations that translate the frustrations and dissatisfaction of people. People added that it was by looking at people's faces they selected the people who would receive aid. When an NGO agent passes, they look at you and according to what they see they decide if you merit aid or if you do not merit aid. One victim said the following:

«When they came, they did not give anything because they just looked and they told those people that they were not in need and I believe that they did the same in a lot of places. It is something that is not good.»

So in other words, for you to receive aid, you must have the face of a victim. When they look at a person's face it must be one marked with misery, to 'look like a victim', dressed shabbily for them to decide to give you so more of the people resembled people who looked like they were in need, a face that is marked with "I am in need" has more possibility of receiving aid or fulfilling the conditions to find aid. This is something that is very serious. It is as if they are encouraging people to make no effort to help themselves, instead you should wait for an extended hand to provide. It is as if they are indirectly encouraging parasitic behavior, slavery in their homes.

To end, to remind of what people said that aid did not circulate in all areas. There were a lot of places that people have still not received anything at all. Only people came by and took their name, made promises and they never saw anyone return to tell them anything.

This helped us to understand that the physical presence of people and talking was making people feel like they existed, making them feel like people, and that they were not thrown away or forgotten completely. This gave the possibility for them to express what they were feeling and what they wanted. Therefore the physical presence of actors establishing contact with the population and talking to them directly is an important aspect in humanitarian interventions or in urgent situations. We can also say, that this communication can become more important than the actual aid given. Because when you give people attention and recognition, it is amongst the needs to feel that they exist and that they are important. Because when you give someone something but they feel as if they are not treated as a person, what you bring becomes of little significance because one of humans' first needs is to be recognized and treated as important.

5.3. Everything after a catastrophe, humanitarian agent communication can become more important than aid

Frequently when there is a natural catastrophe, humanitarian actors and the State give priority to distribution of aid materials like food and other things. Many times, they

do not take the time to understand the real needs, what are necessities for people. Instead it is according to what they think is a priority to give them, but it is not according to what people would say they need as a priority. This happens often, where what is thought and what is really needed is vastly different. Every area has particular strengths as well as needs, and they don't take the time to create a good relationship with people and establish a good line of communication. The statements of a lot of people Camp Perrin enabled us to understand that good communication amongst actors that are intervening with the population can make a big difference even if you don't have anything to give. Many and almost all stated that:

« They would pass and see us at least, and we felt as if we existed »

«If they only passed to see us, even if they did not bring anything, we would say to God thank you ».

Presence and communication that can create a sense of this type of security and this type of existence. When we speak about communication, we want to say that it is to use every means possible and that is available to inform the population: radio, loudspeaker, sound truck, neighborhood meetings, banners, etc. and establish a good direct or indirect line in a way that allows for them to express their needs, their priorities, their frustrations, their ideas, the way they understand things, their propositions in community meetings, survey, focus groups, door to door visits, neighborhood committees, meetings with organizations, with leaders, going by church, where there are cock fighting rings, Vodou ceremonies, etc. It is these things that I am calling **HUMANITARIAN COMMUNICATION.**

Also this translates into people's desire to not remain in a child-like position and for them to be brought things without being able to express what they want or what they need. People believe, that even if they are being aided, they should have input. Besides in Haitian culture, when a person is receiving and are only receiving, this creates a feeling of embarrassment, he/she feels bothered¹⁶; even if it is an elderly person he/she still wants to take care of his/her affairs without other people knowing. So to sit and wait for things to come makes the population uncomfortable, and creates a lot of frustration, it is their rights that are violated and they take it as an injury to their

¹⁶ Marcel Mauss (2011): Essai sur le don, HEC, Paris.

dimension as a human, and as if they are demeaned as humans. What is harder in all of this, is that what is brought for them is not only in bad conditions, it is also not what is priority or a true need.

So it would be important that institutions bringing aid for people in the moment of natural disasters are provoked to establish good contact amongst people, learn to listen so that they can identify the real needs and make people feel as if they are really concerned. This is valuable for local authorities, the State and for NGOS too. After all of the data I collected, after all of the voices of the population, I believe that this makes a big difference.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to formulate these recommendations, I am taking the words people gave as responses when we asked them what should be done. According to them, here are some of the recommendations they made:

4.1. Regarding the question of dependence, actors who come to help are supposed to:

- 4.1.1. Don't be content with just giving to people only, this can create or reinforce the dependency. After the urgent period plan ahead for well-structured projects in sanitation, environment, etc. where the population can participate or even as volunteers or to work in order to contribute to changes and find anything for them to function.
- 4.1.2. Try to reflect with local organizations, neighborhood committees, the ideas and the ideas concerning projects can help in their areas. This can diminish the dissatisfaction that was present and come closer to expectations

4.2. Regarding the question of dissatisfaction

- 4.2.1. Go to all of the mountains to know how the population is living and the needs that are more urgent for them. Conduct a comprehensive assessment on the damage and the priority needs of people in every area. This is valuable for not only the State, and local authorities, but also NGOs.

4.2.2. Provide what is being given with a sense of order and in respect and dignity. Distributions can be organized in a way that a kit is prepared for a family, rather than have people come and get it, to pass by their homes and give the kits. When you do this you are able to mark every house that has received a kit already and identify every family that has already received. People reported that Red Cross did this with water and it was done well. They came by with a water truck, and in front of every house they stopped, they had people bring something to hold the water and they would fill it for them. This provided more transparency and made people feel like they were people. Also, even if everyone did not receive it caused less frustration because they saw that some people received aid. This we talked about in point 4.2 regarding frustration that people gave a clear idea this point and table 11 shows the level of people's dissatisfaction too. If they do not have enough to give everyone, do not include everyone - if there is 10 people that you are able to give and people see that you are doing something for 10 people. Because when people are left waiting and they don't see anything, a situation of dependency grows, as well as frustration.

4.3. Communication

4.3.1. NGOs should find honest people, people that the population are confident in, that has a good name in the area to manage aid on the group and to keep authorities informed even if they have their flaws. It is people in the area who can tell you who they trust either in a neighborhood assembly or in a survey. It is an exercise of this sort that we did in our survey because it was they who knew the people and every area has a notable/elder. This is what makes communication with the population or with organized structures vital before interventions because they should not become overwhelming, and needs to take local knowledge into account. This may be difficult directly after an event, but it is possible a few days after.

- 4.3.2. Get out and don't just in the office and function alone. They are supposed to go and see families so they don't feel like they have been forgotten, or neglected because what they feel, their ideas, and their presence are important.
- 4.3.3. Try to find the people who are more in need and ensure that they are reached first so it cannot be said that aid workers are only looking at the faces of people, to see if you're poor enough to deserve aid. This can be completed with a good field survey, observation, and visits can allow you to find that information.
- 4.3.4. Lastly, it is important to go and see people and to establish good communication that permits people to express how they feel, their needs, their priorities, before decisions are made to bring them things. Even after the urgent period this is important.

So this is the work we did in the field. We present the commune a bit, we talked about hurricane Matthew and the damage that it did. Even if we did not have numbers for Camp Perrin, we presented a lot of information that we found in the field. We picked some of the data to analyze in addition to observations that we made based on what people said, and we proposed some solutions that could be useful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bartolomé de las casas: Très brève relation de destruction des Indes; éd. La découverte, Paris, 1996.
2. Bernard Hours, « Les ONG: outils et contestation de la globalisation », Journal des anthropologues [En ligne], 94-95 | 2003, mis en ligne le 22 février 2009, consulté le 01 avril 2013. URL: <http://jda.revues.org/1941>
3. Enrique Dussel, 1492, l'occultation de l'autre, éd. Des ouvrières, Paris, 1992.
4. Gilbert Rist: Le developpement, Histoire d'une croyance occidentale, éd. Presses de la fondation national des sciences, Paris, 2007.
5. Jean Anil Louis-Juste: ONG: ki gouvènman ou ye, ed. ASID, Port-au-Prince, 2009.
6. Laënnec HURBON, Le barbare imaginaire, éd. Henry Deschamps, Port-au-Prince.
7. Sauveur Pierre Etienne. Haiti: l'invasion des ONGs, Ed. CIDHICA, Port-au-Prince, 1997.
8. Tzvetan Todorov, La conquête de l'amerique: la question de l'autre; éd. Du seuil; 1982.

WEBOGRAPHY

1. IHSI, recensement par estimation, 2009.
2. <https://fr.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Camp-Perrin>, consulté le jeudi 9 mars 2017 à 11h00
3. Mobil.francetvinfo,fr/meteo/cyclone-ouragan/ouragan-matthew/ouragan-matthew-haiti-la-grande-urgence_1862263.html, consulté le jeudi 9 mars 2017 à 12h03
4. Ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelle/807464/Haiti-bilan-ouragan-mathhew-aide-humanitaire-croix-rouge
5. www.ouest-france.fr/catastrophe/ouragan/ouragn-matthew-haiti-le-bilan-atteint-les-1-000-morts-4549488/amp

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Elkins VOLTAIRE was born in the Northwest province of Haiti. He is completing a masters in Development Sciences at the Faculté d'Ethnologie in the Université d'Etat d'Haïti. He completed a BA in psychology. He has several years of humanitarian work experience as a psychologist. He participated in several scholarly research with several institutions such as Sant Egalite, UEH, New York University and Northern Illinois University. He is a member of the Haitian Studies Association (HSA). He is very active in social causes with organizations he leads such as CHRIPPES (Centre Haïtien de Réflexion, d'Interventions Psychosociales et de Promotion à l'Épanouissement de Soi) and ADN (Aktè Dinamik pou Devlopman Nòdwès), or a member such as Asosyasyon Ayisyen Sikoloji elatriye, MENORHA (Mouvement des Étudiants du Nord-Ouest pour la Réhabilitation d'Haïti).

His research foci include children's rights and development, corporal punishment and children's psycho-social development for his BA thesis. He is researching NGOs for his MA thesis; community resilience and social representation.

Appendices

Survey Questions – Summer 2016

Depatman:		Komin:	
Seksyon Kominal/ Katye:			
Dat:	Lè:	Siyati:	Non:
A. Prezantasyon moun kap viv nan zòn nan ak relasyon ki genyen antre yo.			
1. Depi kilè w rete bò isit?		How long have you lived here?	
2. Kijan w wè evolasyon zòn nan?		How do you see the area evolving?	
3. Èske moun nan zòn sa konn fè tèt ansanm?		Do people in this area get together/ unite?	
4. Èske nan zòn bò isit moun byen youn ak lòt?		Are people in this area on good terms with one another?	
5. Èske ou gen konfyans nan vwazen / vwazin w?		Do you trust your neighbors?	
B. Rezo sosyal moun nan			
6. Tanpri ban mwen non 3 moun ki pi pwòch w nan zòn nan?		Please name three people you feel closest to.	
7. Pou premye moun nan, se kijan w rankontre avèk li premye fwa?		For the first person, how did you meet this person?	
8. Chak kilè nou kwaze?		How often do you meet?	
9. Èske ou konn pataje manje avèk li?		Do you share food with him/her?	
10. Chak kilè?		How often?	
11. Èske li konn pataje manje avèk ou?		Does he/she share food with you?	
12. Chak kilè?		How often?	
13. Si w gen pwoblèm, èske w ka konte sou li?		If you have a problem, can you count on him/her?	
14. Pou dezyèm moun nan, se kijan w rankontre avèk li premye fwa?		For the second person, how did you meet this person?	
15. Chak kilè nou kwaze?		How often do you meet?	
16. Èske ou konn pataje manje avèk li?		Do you share food with him/her?	
17. Chak kilè?		How often?	
18. Èske li konn pataje manje avèk ou?		Does he/she share food with you?	
19. Chak kilè?		How often?	
20. Si w gen pwoblèm, èske w ka konte sou li?		If you have a problem, can you count on him/her?	
21. Pou twazyèm moun nan, se kijan w		How did you meet this person?	

rankontre avèk li premye fwa?	
22. Chak kilè nou kwaze?	How often do you meet?
23. Èske ou konn pataje manje avèk li?	Do you share food with him/her?
24. Chak kilè?	How often?
25. Èske li konn pataje manje avèk ou?	Does he/she share food with you?
26. Chak kilè?	How often?
27. Si w gen pwoblèm, èske w ka konte sou li?	If you have a problem, can you count on him/her?
CH. Lidè zòn nan	
28. Se kijan ou fin konnen nouvèl?	How do you get news?
29. Se kiyès wap tyeke pou konnen sak pase nan zòn nan?	Who do you seek out to find out what's happening in the area?
30. Depi gen yon pwoblèm nan zòn nan, se kiyès ki kapab rezoud li?	When there's a problem in the area, who can resolve it?
31. Dapre ou menm, ki pi gwo bezwen nou nan zòn nan?	What do you think the three most pressing needs in the area?
32. Èske pwoblèm sa yo kapab rezoud?	Can these problems be resolved?
33. Kijan?	How?
34. Èske otorite lokal yo kapab rezoud pwoblèm sa yo?	Can the local authorities resolve these problems?
35. Èske leta kapab rezoud pwoblèm sa yo?	Can the state resolve these problems?
36. Èske ONG kapab rezoud pwoblèm sa yo?	Can NGOs resolve these problems?
D. Relasyon moun nan avèk ONG	
37. Èske w wè ONG kap travay nan zòn sa yo?	Do you see NGOs working in the area?
38. (si wi) Ki ONG?	(if yes) Which NGOs?
39. Èske w te gen chans rankontre yo?	Did you have the opportunity to meet with them?
40. (si wi) Kilè w te kwaze avèk yo pou premye fwa?	(if yes) When was the first time you met with them?
41. Se kilès ki mennen w nan ONG sa a?	Who put you in contact with this NGO?
42. Se kilès ki w te konn wè anndan ONG sa a?	Who did you meet with in this NGO?
43. Èske w te resevwa yon sipò nan men ONG sa a?	Did you receive support from this NGO?
44. Èske tout moun nan zòn nan jwenn?	Did everyone in the area get support?
45. Sak esplike sa a?	What explains this?
46. Ki denye fwa ou te wè yon aksyon	What was the last time you saw a collective

kolektif nan zòn nan?	action in the area?
47. Dapre ou menm, èske aksyon sa yo efikas?	Do you think these actions are effective?
E. Enplikasyon moun nan aksyon sivik	
48. Èske w fè pati yon asosyasyon oubyen yon òganizasyon?	Are you a member of an association or organization?
49. (si wi) Ki asosyasyon?	(if yes) What association?
50. Chak kilè asosyasyon an reyini?	How often does the association meet?
51. Ki aksyon asosyasyon nan poze?	What actions does this association take?
52. Èske asosyasyon an konn fè rasanbleman?	Does this association have general meetings?
53. Èske asosyasyon an konn fè manifestasyon?	Does this association organize demonstrations?
54. Ou menm, èske w patisipe nan yon manifestasyon?	Have you participated in a demonstration?
55. Poukisa (poukisa pa)?	Why (why not)?
F. Pèsepsyon moun nan sou ONG ak lòt aktè	
56. Kijan ou wè ONG yo?	What do you think about NGOs?
57. Ban mwen twa mo ki nan tèt ou lè ou panse sou ONG.	Name three words you associate with NGOs.
58. Dapre ou menm, ki wòl ONG yo dwe jwe?	What do you think NGOs' roles should be?
59. Èske se sa yo fè?	Is this what they do?
60. Èske ONG yo pote solisyon pou zòn nan?	Do NGOs bring about solutions for this area?
61. Èske ONG yo dwe rete nan zòn nan?	Should NGOs stay in the area?
62. Epi pou otorite lokal yo, kijan ou we yo?	What do you think about the local authorities?
63. Ban mwen twa mo ki nan tèt ou lè ou panse sou otorite lokal yo?	Name three words you associate with the local authorities.
64. Dapre ou menm, ki wòl otorite lokal yo dwe jwe?	What do you think the local authorities' roles should be?
65. Èske se sa yo fè?	Is this what they do?
66. Epi pou leta, kijan ou we leta?	What do you think about the state?
67. Ban mwen twa mo ki nan tèt ou lè ou panse sou leta?	Name three words you associate with the state.
68. Dapre ou menm, ki wòl leta dwe jwe?	What do you think the state's roles should be?
69. Èske se sa li fè?	Is this what it does?
70. Èske ayisyen konn fè tèt ansanm?	Do Haitians get together / unite?
71. Èske w gen lespwa sou lavni a?	Do you have hope for the future?

Survey Questions – December 2016

Department:		Commune	
Communal Section/Neighborhood:			
Date:	Time:	Last Name:	First Name:
A. Lidè zòn nan			
1. Se kijan ou fin konnen nouvèl?		How do you get news?	
2. Se kiyès wap tyeke pou konnen sak pase nan zòn nan?		Who do you seek out to find out what's happening in the area?	
3. Depi gen yon pwoblèm nan zòn nan, se kiyès ki kapab rezoud li?		When there's a problem in the area, who can resolve it?	
4. Dapre ou menm, ki pi gwo fòs oubyen kapasite zòn nan genyen?		What do you think the area's biggest strengths or capacities are?	
5. Dapre ou menm, ki pi gwo bezwen nou nan zòn nan?		What do you think the three most pressing needs in the area?	
6. Ki bezwen ki pi priyòrite pou zòn nan dapre w menm?		What do you think the area's biggest priority is?	
7. Èske pwoblèm sa yo kapab rezoud?		Can these problems be resolved?	
8. Èske nou menm menm vwazen nou kapab rezoud pwoblèm sa yo?		Can you and your neighbors solve these problem?	
9. Ki aksyon nou menm konn poze apre Siklòn Matyè?		What actions have you engaged in after Hurricane Matthew?	
10. Dapre ou menm, èske aksyon sa yo efikas?		Do you think these actions are effective?	
11. Èske asosyasyon lokal kapab rezoud pwoblèm sa yo?		Can local associations solve these problems?	
12. Ki asosyasyon lokal yo?		What local associations?	
13. Ki aksyon asosyasyon lokal konn poze apre Siklòn Matyè?		What actions have local associations engaged in after Hurricane Matthew?	
14. Dapre ou menm, èske aksyon sa yo efikas?		Do you think these actions are effective?	
15. Èske otorite lokal yo kapab rezoud pwoblèm sa yo?		Can the local authorities resolve these problems?	
16. Ki aksyon otorite lokal konn poze apre Siklòn Matyè?		What actions have local authorities engaged in after Hurricane Matthew?	
17. Dapre ou menm, èske aksyon sa yo efikas?		Do you think these actions are effective?	
18. Èske leta kapab rezoud pwoblèm sa yo?		Can the state resolve these problems?	

19. Ki aksyon leta konn poze apre Siklòn Matyè?	What actions has the state engaged in after Hurricane Matthew?
20. Dapre ou menm, èske aksyon sa yo efikas?	Do you think these actions are effective?
21. Èske ONG kapab rezoud pwoblèm sa yo?	Can NGOs resolve these problems?
22. Ki aksyon ONG konn poze apre Siklòn Matyè?	What actions have NGOs engaged in after Hurricane Matthew?
23. Dapre ou menm, èske aksyon sa yo efikas?	Do you think these actions are effective?
AN. Relasyon moun nan avèk ONG	
24. Èske w wè ONG ki tap vini apre Siklòn Matyè?	Do you see NGOs that came after Hurricane Matthew?
25. (si wi) Ki ONG?	(if yes) Which NGOs?
26. Ki èd ONG sa a te pote?	What aid did this NGO bring?
27. Èske w te resevwa yon sipò nan men ONG sa a?	Did you receive support from this NGO?
28. Èske tout moun nan zòn nan jwenn?	Did everyone in the area get support?
29. Èske ONG ki te la anvan Matyè toujou la?	Are the NGOs that were here before Matthew still around?
30. (si wi) Ki ONG?	(if yes) Which NGOs?
31. Ki èd ONG sa a te pote?	What aid did this NGO bring?
32. Èske w te resevwa yon sipò nan men ONG sa a?	Did you receive support from this NGO?
33. Èske tout moun nan zòn nan jwenn?	Did everyone in the area get support?
B. Pèsepsyon moun nan sou ONG ak lòt aktè	
34. An gwo, kijan ou ta ka evalye repons apre Siklòn Matyè?	In general, how would you evaluate the response after Hurricane Matthew?
35. Dapre w menm, kisa ki te bon?	What do you think was good?
36. Dapre w menm, kisa ki merite chanje?	What do you think needs to change?
37. Kijan w ta evalye travay ONG apre Siklòn Matyè?	How would you evaluate NGOs' work after hurricane Matthew?
38. Dapre w menm, kisa ONG yo ta sipoze fè?	What do you think NGOs should have done?
39. Èske se sa yo te fè?	Is this what they did?
40. Epi pou otorite lokal yo, kijan ou ta evalye yo apre Siklòn Matyè?	How would you evaluate the local authorities' work after hurricane Matthew?
41. Dapre ou menm, kisa otorite lokal ta sipoze dwe fè?	What do you think the local authorities should have done?
42. Èske se sa yo te fè?	Is this what they did?
43. Epi pou leta, kijan ou ta evalye leta apre	How would you evaluate the local authorities'

Siklòn Matyè?	work after hurricane Matthew?
44. Dapre ou menm, kisa otorite lokal ta sipoze dwe fè?	Dapre ou menm, kisa otorite lokal ta sipoze dwe fè?
45. Èske se sa li te fè?	Is this what it did?
46. Èske ayisyen konn fè tèt ansanm?	Do Haitians get together / unite?
47. Èske w gen lespwa sou lavni a?	Do you have hope for the future?



This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under CAREER Grant # 1455142 and RAPID Grant # 1722749. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Translation by: Jessica Hsu

