

RAFAEL L. TRUJILLO

THE BASIC  
POLICIES OF  
A REGIME

EDITORIA DEL CARIBE, C. POR A.,

CIUDAD TRUJILLO, D. N.

1960



BIBLIOTECA PERSONAL  
GERMAN EMILIO ORNES  
DONADA POR EL BANCO DE RESERVAS DE LA  
REPUBLICA DOMINICANA A LA BIBLIOTECA  
NACIONAL PÉREZ HENRIQUEZ UREÑA

27707

THE BASIC  
POLICIES OF  
A REGIME

## CHAPTER I

### THE MOTHERLAND, THE NATION AND THE STATE

Analysis of the convulsive histories of nearly all Latin American countries supports the conclusion that these difficulties stem from one major source: that in their founding and later development these countries attempted to adjust themselves to pre-determined theories rather than to their own realities.

Latin American nations were born almost simultaneously. The majority of them were unable to establish a stable organization which would intelligently exploit natural resources and lay the foundations of solid political administration.

Their first and most ardent desire was, I believe, to found free nations and destroy the forces that held the diverse colonies in servitude. Even while the people joined in common effort to achieve independence there appeared political theorists to propose prefabricated social and political formulas —theories supposedly definitive and perfected because they had been applied with apparent success in countries of long historical backgrounds. In general the seductiveness of these formulas dwelled in the fact that they

offered the new nations abstract doctrine which, if implemented, would create conditions at opposite poles from conditions which had characterized the colony.

No one, however, took the trouble to examine elemental realities —density of population, consumer demand, transportation, geographic distribution of population centers, and so on. No study was made to determine whether these factors would permit the newly-freed countries— lacking, for example, even an effective economic structure— to actually apply the principles of economic liberalism as conceived for regions highly industrialized and densely populated.

The history of these countries has thus shown, in my opinion, the incongruence of political theories with the hard realities of their situations. Dominican history, particularly, drifts like a ship without a course. The country was initially constituted on the bases of concepts that had no possible application. And almost immediately thereafter our country was subjected to the arbitrary rule of petty war lords and caudillos. Some of them sought inspiration in turgid ideology; others imposed their rule by frank use of force and violence.

Not surprisingly, our country found itself not only off the course of its rightful destiny but driven further onto the reefs of problems constantly more intricate and tragic. Solutions to Dominican difficulties were never sought with cold realism but with compromises, windy phrases, and pat formulas whose lack of effectiveness culminated in cruel humiliations. And so it

was that the country found itself in a collective state of what psychologists call an inferiority complex. The people had finally reached the stage of not even trusting themselves and their own capacity to subsist. This feeling, coupled with the blind ambitions of some political leaders, made for mass pessimism and abandonment.

Throughout my life, both public and private, I have always obeyed a strong practical sense which has caused me to face up to reality and study problems objectively. Despite the seduction of impractical theories, beautifully presented utopias and purely ideological considerations without substance nor possibility of being realized—and the pressure exerted to sway me in their behalf—my sense of the practical has always prevailed over the fantastic.

Never have I allowed myself to be stampeded by feverish political illusions. Always I have kept both feet firmly planted on the ground of realism. I face the facts, not attempting to resolve problems essentially material with the syllogism of a theory. My policy has been to act decisively and in a manner adequate to the circumstance.

It was from this trait that stemmed the conviction—born of my first reflections on the subject—that the conduct of policy of governmental action on behalf of the public welfare cannot be based on abstract definitions of elements fundamental to the country, nor to the functioning of any other social organism. Since a governmental program has to be carried out with concrete materials, the concepts of Nation, State, So-

ciety, Authority, Public Power and similar facets must be defined in accordance with the specific circumstances of the country concerned or with the pertinent political movement. They do not and never have had absolute value; a mere theoretical transplanting in no way assures their efficacy.

It is also vital to bear in mind the tendencies, sensitivities and political interests of the theorists who have enunciated and defined such concepts. Some are strictly materialistic; others are the products of an evolutionary process or the culmination of a system of philosophy; some are simple elements twisted into the shape of an ideology. Circumstances —environmental, moral, geographical, climatic, agricultural, geological, creative potential —have been factors only in that they have given a local, unilateral tone to such concepts. They have served but to endow them with a specific character— thus tending to nullify the possibility of universal application.

My government policies have therefore never been based on forced-fed acceptance of pre-fabricated principles. They have been independent unto themselves in both doctrine and performance.

I was convinced of this relativity of concepts even prior to assuming the Presidency. Instead of obeying the precepts of a series of immaterial abstractions, I sought my inspiration from reality. Not, however, from a reality adorned with party labels nor impractical idealism: a stark, palpable reality whose elements were the land, the human being, geography,

productivity, historic experience, moral sense, social composition, and others.

In appraising this naked reality it is evident that only certain immutable elements exert influence. These include: man's social and cooperative nature, his instinct for association, and man's tendency to regulate his actions by an ethical law guaranteeing him a certain measure of moral and material security. But above all there dominated a subjective, personal factor: my Christian faith.

I have the deep certainty that human brotherhood, illuminated by the love and understanding that were preached at Galilee, is the true goal of progress and civilization. I believe that Christianity contains the ethical law that all of us desire and that it has been the sole force capable of implanting confidence and brotherhood among men.

Because of my devotion and idealism regarding our national reconstruction there was danger that my ambitions would be dissipated by appeals for peace and brotherhood —with the resulting lack of accomplishment that has befallen many an altruistic patriot. Such men and their noble phrases are well applauded but their ideals remain never realized. But, blending idealism with the hard realism of a man of action, it has always been natural for me to sidestep verbosity and proceed directly to the heart of the matter.

Consequently, at no time did I allow myself to succumb to the prejudices of preconceived political and social concepts. Nor did I formulate mere verbal theory; even less did I lose myself in an eclecticism



whereby the opinions and postulates of the principal schools remain static. The principles which guided me and took form in my mind were independent of the classic molds and doctrinal statutes. They were developed by my own perception.

The political theories which gave meaning to my government stemmed from one essential, indestructible foundation: my intense devotion to my country. This moved me to one supreme ambition: the aggrandizement of my country in all spheres: economic, social, cultural, moral. This highest ambition was beyond and apart from elements of doctrine.

Experience in government and the result of my works have engraved on my mind what were my basic interpretations of political theorems and their application to Dominican reality. Their record over the years has endowed these interpretations with meanings more concrete and exact than in the beginning and I feel I can now express them with greater precision. Thus, regarding the Nation in both concept and being, I believed and believe —that our homeland, our country, can only develop and function within the framework of the Nation. Consequently, to carry out my program of restoring our country it was necessary for me to establish the Nation first and foremost as the principle and fundament of all subsequent action. Even more now than then I define the term Nation in all its ramifications, not merely in a grammatical sense —nor even in the definitions consecrated by the supreme authorities of language. I have long since realized that the Nation is in itself a sublimation. It

is not a mere consortium of persons ruled by a government: it is a multiple entity, complex and essentially unified. This conviction has been more than confirmed.

A Nation is a clearly delineated territory united by a series of cohesive elements: inhabitants, production, traditions, culture, historic vicissitudes, customs, resources for the future, government, autonomy. In other words, it is composed of material and moral elements which give solidity, form, and permanence to the ensemble. And all are essentially equal in importance. If one of them is lacking the Nation dwindles in primacy and is reduced to a fragile, inert entity. The lack of one essential, in effect, nullifies the Nation.

The existence and functioning of all the components of a nation are manifested largely by its sovereignty —what I have always considered the most vital of a country's attributes. Sovereignty resides in the ability of a Nation to decide for itself —without being swayed by outside pressure or influence— not only the nature of its internal regime but also its destiny. Natural consequences of that include administration of resources, defense of own interests, establishment of own facilities, and unity under one set of publicly accepted laws and institutions. These police powers must work to the public's benefit and not be subject to the brute imposition of foreign force or threat of force; they must be guided by the interests of securing the harmony and well-being of the constitutive elements. My early criterion —later verified

by experience and facts— was that no Nation can be juridically perfect or complete unless it enjoys this amplitude of unrestricted operations; any limitation or restricting of these attributes affects sovereignty which in turn lessens and weakens the Homeland.

I was and am convinced, in other words, that no attempt to build a better Nation is possible if such construction has to be erected on a flawed foundation. There must be absolute sovereignty.

Such sovereignty did not exist in the Dominican Republic when I entered public life and began the first phases of my program. The errors of political offices and national institutions nullified their potentialities; the sway of base passions and petty ambitions, the difficult circumstances in which the Republic was trying to acquire a juridical personality—all these and other inherent or acquired conditions had converged to create such a state of national humiliation that sovereignty was destroyed.

This humiliation, variously manifested, had origins and histories which there is no need to dwell on here. These include circumstances which have been studied and discussed at length: the existence of a huge debt contracted under usurious terms, wasted by ineptitude and constituting a crushing burden; the 1907 Convention, ratified in 1924, surrendered the administration of public finances to a foreign power; the decisive and inexorable influence of the foreign sugar companies who not only controlled the most productive lands but also enjoyed such excessive privilege that the government was reduced to a mere

colonial authority; the vagueness of the frontier with Haiti constituted a permanent threat and left hanging the question of the range of national jurisdiction; the constant and growing budget deficit that forced governments to sacrifice even decorum to gain resources of desperate urgency; the dominance of national life by groups and factions motivated solely by insatiable voracity; and the enduring moral and psychological effects of the recent foreign military occupation.

No, in 1930 there did not here exist a Nation enjoying its just attributes. Instead, there was a group of humanity—a group tormented by unrest, insecurity, compromises, injustice, and servitude. The national community's residue of autonomy was constantly threatened. There was no exact objective nor even the most elemental method in the struggle for subsistence.

The components of nationality itself were a dreary confusion: sterile historic experience, the dubious moral base of the hero cult and the love of the maximum symbols of the homeland, the *Patria*; a confused desire for fulfillment, for seemingly unattainable liberation and sovereignty; a diverse, diluted human potentiality, many petty and uncomplementary trades and activities. Such was the material with which I would have to work.

When I took office I reaffirmed my purpose and defined it with greater exactitude. Above all it was necessary to build a Nation by which the *Patria* could take form. It was to be freed of its tribulations, short-

comings and betrayals. It was to regain its essence and integrity. Our country was to recover, firmly and totally, its autonomy; the sources of danger and menace were to be eliminated.

To that end it would be necessary to pay off the Nation's debts, liberate the economy, expel the odious financial power embedded like a tumor in the country's heart, trace with indisputable precision the frontier with Haiti, extend and enforce national sovereignty to those indelible boundaries, eliminate the unjust privilege which had transformed a group of foreign capitalists into lords and masters, impose maximum austerity regarding expenditures, draw up and enforce measures to hold down the deficits, direct the energies of the citizenry into productive channels. And only when all this had been accomplished could the Dominican Republic be a complete nation in practice, in theory and juridically.

Mere intent to undertake such a colossal task in the face of such powerful opposition might well have appeared absurd. That I was determined to go through with it was due to two unconquerable forces: conviction and faith. It would not be a matter of a day nor a month nor even many years: it was to be a long laborious struggle that perhaps would consume my entire existence. But if at the end there arose a Nation in all its splendor and a Patria worthy of the sacrifice then indeed that existence would be well spent.

It was then, in the exercise of power and pondering the immensity of the task before me that I gave precise definition to the meaning of the State as I had



done with Nation: The State cannot be considered simply as the Homeland or Country, nor as the Nation even when they are used synonymously. I concluded that the State is the Nation in motion, in function; it simultaneously coordinates the multiple, complex groups that make up the Nation and directs them into constructive patterns. The functioning State is revealed by its methodical classification of the Nation's potentialities and the activation of those potentialities. The State is the prime mover, the driving force. The Nation is revealed by the mere fact of its existence although such existence be precarious or diffuse.

I may now spell out these factors with greater precision than was possible then; yet, the thoughts which guided me have remained fundamentally unchanged. The Nation is like a physical demarcation, a sometimes theoretical pattern, an ensemble of material, moral and spiritual elements—but lacking the intrinsic force of dynamism. The Nation is propelled and given direction by the State. To give a practical example of this differentiation the case of the Jewish Nation might be cited: scattered over the globe for twenty centuries and, although united by psychology, language, traditions, and religion, it was unable to function as an organic unit. Only when at last there was returned part of the territory seized from them by Vespasian at the beginning of the Diaspora, did the State emerge. Again functioning it provided the Nation with the powerful vital impulse required.

Thus is the State the key instrument which animates the spirit of the Nation and a confirmation

of sovereignty. Granted that the Nation can be consolidated only by galvanizing its elements, and that only the State is capable of providing this necessary impulse, it is then logical that the State be effectively represented by a Government. It is equally logical that this Government not be weak, frail, and at the whim of events; instead, it must be firm, vigorous, ambitious and inspired by a broad, carefully weighed program.

The State cannot, however, even thus conceived, execute its duties if the Government that directs it is reduced to the domination of a strongman or personal dictatorship impelled solely by lust for power. Dominican history, like that of other American countries, has been that of a series of names of those who exercised despotic power in the name of the State. And it was precisely the owners of these names who reduced our national fortunes to the point that I found them in 1930.

The basic elements thus classified, I realized that a dynamic State could accomplish nothing by exercise of power for power's sake or for the personal satisfaction and predominance of an individual or faction. I know that the State would have to secure maximum community effort by the harmonious activation of all the inert forces of the Nation.

If I had succumbed to the many pressures and influences brought to bear following the elections of May 1930 my dream of building a magnificent new nation would have degenerated into mere rhetoric. If I had been dominated by a mere lust for power,

or by the greed which possessed so many previous government leaders, the accomplishments of my government would have been as sterile as theirs. If I had surrendered to those who held their country cheaply, and to political leaders who prostituted their powers and the national interest, the result would have been the same. I would have descended to the level of the verbose phrase-makers with their hypocritical revolutionary proclamations, platforms and so forth who sought only to dupe the people and sink the country's pride deeper into the mire.

I did not assume the Presidency of the Republic because I sought the satisfaction of occupying the Republic's highest office. Nor was I interested in exploiting it in my own behalf. I arrived deeply aware of the responsibilities I accepted and conscious of being a legitimate instrument of the State.

Unlike many of my predecessors, I was not motivated by ambition, pride or vanity. I was possessed solely by devotion to my country, my homeland. By the scale of political values which I had devised to guide my policies it was the State, represented by the Government and personified by the President of the Republic, which is responsible for establishing the practical and juridical supremacy of the Nation.

It is also the duty of the State to ensure the absolute sovereignty of the Nation and its exercise is all just moral and physical dimensions. And the State must ensure that thereby there lives and functions a country ennobled by hallowed practice of probity and honor. Most important, the President of





the Republic must be possessed of the highest sense of his responsibilities as the working instrument of the State. This conception eliminates the possibility that leadership should degenerate into being its own reward, be an opportunity for personal gains, or a stewardship for the satisfaction of favor-seekers and petty politicians.

This philosophy was to completely change the office of the President of the Republic, giving it the dignity and stature it had never previously enjoyed and for precisely the reason that its functional concept had never been clearly enunciated.

But even while clarifying the role and responsibilities I assumed as President there increased the obstacles in my path. Difficulties arose which would have to be overcome if my program —of such magnitude that it could have seemed utopian— was to get underway. At first glance, perhaps, they appeared clear and simple. But how many roadblocks, how many special interests, how many evils and prejudices would have to be breached before there could be attained a goal that seemed so simple, logical and natural!

It would have to be done slowly, eliminating the factors of political disorder, financial oppression, jurisdictional imprecision, and economic serfdom; replacing the public's pessimism and feelings of incapacity by self-confidence and creative willpower to carry out a fundamental transformation. Only the first step was the redefinition of the basic elements in order that this program not spring merely from

desire but from the firm foundations of a philosophy and doctrine.

Present realities testify to how, without impatience nor by fits and starts, but guided by definite conceptional interpretations, I one by one eliminated the negative factors and gave our country a splendor that towers above the sterile fury of stubborn adversaries.



## CHAPTER II

### ELEMENTS OF THE STATE

My personal interpretation of functions of the State is, as I have said, that the State must vitalize and set in motion the elements which make up the Nation. In order to fully consolidate these elements it is first necessary to begin by recognizing the existence of factors that limit and determinate the action of the State.

Even with a government wholly determined to carry out the total redemption of all that is innately Dominican —above all, attaining of total sovereignty —the Dominican State could not work toward this goal without adjusting to the human, geographic, economic, historic, and other realities characterizing the Nation. To do otherwise would be to create situations of sterile violence.

With this declaration I reaffirmed my former pledge that no theory, however classic, could be of absolute value in the administration and organization of a Society or a Nation. Any approach must be elastic flexible, able to adapt itself to reality. I also recognize that the State is limited by the same circumstances.

To explain the concept of State that inspired and stimulated my governmental policies from their inception and to indicate their intimate relationship with national reality, I must first define some personal convictions. Above all, I believe that the State should not be confused with any of its component parts, whether they be abstract concepts or hard facts. These form the theory or reality of the political structure or social and economic organization of the country. They include Government, Society, People, the moral standard, mass psychology, public wealth, military force and others. Each has its objective and an action that is independent but coordinated as in all complex organisms.

The lack of precise delineation between the components of the State, or the confused condition of those components results in the predominance of one of the factors and thus an unbalanced State structure. This condition may arise as the result of proponents of a determined ideology who juggle these elements in order that they resemble previously conceived definitions.

Those who regard force and all its manifestations as a lofty expression of superiority —as the only real device to measure a scale of values— can only conceive of a highly militarized State subject to rigid military discipline and dedicated to forcing communal effort to achieve even greater power.

The liberals of the last century, considering the supreme purpose of government and consolidation of wealth, sought a weak state —a state subject to the

free play of economic factors— which to them represented the highest goal.

A religious cult or doctrine holds sway in a theocratic state with a corresponding clerical hierarchy. The oligarchy is founded on the hegemony of certain social or family groups. The absolutist seeks to manipulate facts of national life in accord with an infallible political doctrine or philosophy; he imagines that a mere decision will work fundamental changes in the functioning of the Nation.

In this century there has surged forth the most monstrous of all concepts of the State: the Marxist state. In theory and for propaganda purposes it is presented as the dictatorship of the proletariat; in reality it consists of the abolition of all individual rights, the annulment of all personal values, interests, affections and so forth in order to transform them into communal service: the supreme criterion. No one has any right to individual expression, demand, pleasure or property because the state absorbs the totality of human potentialities. Man loses his personality, is de-humanized and reduced to the minimal condition of cog in a machine, stripped of all essence.

Any theory of state based on the supremacy of one of its constitutive elements can only produce a weak and precarious organism suffering from an imbalance that saps its strength. In some cases such a state is either unable to function or is forced to undergo a series of calamities; even the most inexpert observer is able to see how senseless it is to suppose that a mere drastic act of state can bend the laws of

economics, improvise an industrial system, create sudden wealth, modify customs or beliefs and undertake other transformations. This is true even when it refers solely to human activity, in appearance relatively malleable.

The State must be strong, majestic, temperate, authoritative, flexible in proportion to its circumstances, its material resources and moral formation. A small, hyper-militarized nation would be a grotesque, purposeless monstrosity. National forces should be in line with population, wealth, culture, geographic location, political sensitivity, psychology, and the condition of all the elements composing the State.

An impoverished State with unused natural resources indicates some imbalance or ineptitude in the administration. A State which seems wealthier than what the realities of its situation would appear to permit—an industrialized state, for example, which must import its raw material or operate largely on credit—is a fiction, an artifice which cannot survive. An oligarchic state is composed of a privileged minority, which possesses all, and an immense majority of hate-filled wretches perennially on the point of exacting reprisals. A military state suppresses freedom and culminates in totalitarianism; on the other hand, however, an exclusively civil state is limited to a government lacking sufficient power to enforce its authority. And so on.

Universally, the supreme harmony is equilibrium. The solidity and durability of the State can only be ensured by the unison of all elements with each in

true proportion. The State, the driving power of the Nation and coordinator of the values that constitute it, can function only if these values are realistically appraised. In other words, the State can acquire stability and fulfill its purpose only if each of its constituent parts performs the exact function corresponding to it; that is as in physiology where each organ of the anatomy has an exact and exclusive reason for being. To put in another way, the State is comparable to the engine of an automobile. The components include the Government, Society, Economy, administrative organization, armed force, etc.

The Government is the functional organ of the State. It is the instrument by which the latter directs the dynamism of the State, interpreting the objective of the State in regard to the Nation.

My concept may thus be summarized: The Nation is the reality, the fact; the State is the vital principle; the Government is the action. In this view, the Government may be described, to reduce it to schematic comparisons, as somewhat comparable to the nervous system of the national organism.

If the population is the statistic or demographic sum of the inhabitants of the Nation, Society is the animated, operative whole of the population when considered in motion or fluid; it is therefore, a feature of national expression. Population is statistical in concept—but considered as Society it is the source of energy vital to the functioning of the Nation. It is up to the Government to harness and channel that energy. It is a force represented not only by work,



productivity, and in the sense of moral values; it is also in the influence exercised over the individual by political parties and other molders of public opinion, religious beliefs, and the factors of custom, tradition and history.

The economy is the result of the productive effort of Society. If this effort is realistically based and is carried out in coordination with the diverse elements of the economy —production, distribution, consumption, prices, etc— it is certain to produce community wealth. But if these factors are left to find their own way there will appear contradiction and friction culminating in poverty and ruin.

Public administration is the form and operation of organizing State action. This regulatory system — which may assume any of several forms: republic, monarchy, federation, etc.— does not in any way affect the supreme goals of the Nation nor the definition of its components. It is, however, decisive in determining operational policy.

Military and police forces in their primary role ensure national sovereignty; keeping the domestic peace is their secondary function. They represent law and order, enforce compliance with the civic code and protect personal and community rights.

And so may be successively listed the component elements of the State, each one of which performs an express, coherent function. In following chapters I will explain the extension, influence and dimensions of these basic components and how I methodically

set them in motion to achieve a rate of progress both harmonious and efficient.

I entered the government with a broad range of knowledge and ideas and a scale of values by which to arrange them. It was an approach that became ever more clear and effective as I became more and more possessed by my responsibilities. I did not assume my duties unknowing their scope and depth. I did not trust to chance. Never was I moved by petty passion or impulse. My deep devotion to my country and my determination to make it free and great were what moved every fiber of my being, illuminated the road of the future and inspired the effectiveness of my evaluations. And so was formed and consolidated a balanced, realistic concept of the State.

From this search for equilibrium I came to the conclusion that a government leader merits the name of statesman only when he is able to rally all the citizenry into a coordinated movement, stimulated by the state, whereby each citizen and group contributes proportionately to the common good. And such a rally is possible only when an exact, systematic evaluation has been made by the methodical arrangement of the intrinsic potentialities of these forces. It is not enough to define them; they must be weighed and measured with an analytic criterion. Only thus is it possible to create, first, adequate productivity —the only stable, permanent foundation of physical and moral progress — and, secondly, the balance necessary to prevent the withering and decay of any organ of the State. And I

proposed to be a statesman and not a transitory government leader or eventual political hack.

To better explain this approach and how I applied it, I will cite as an example one of the constitutive elements of the Dominican Nation and one of the basic factors, consequently, of the State. I refer to mass psychology. The vicissitudes to which the Dominican people had been exposed are unique, differing sharply from those of any of the other countries.

Even as a colony another power installed itself on this island and seized a great part of its territory. Later, with the surrender of Basel in 1795, there was imposed over us authority completely alien to every facet of our being. So strong was this revulsion that this authority could only breed resistance. This was followed by our being abandoned and forgotten. Seeing ignored their loyalty to their traditions and ancestors and with resulting uncertainty and unrest, Dominicans then opted for independence. It proved to be short-lived.

For 22 years the country groaned under the yoke of Haitian occupation. But with all its destructive violence the oppressor could not crush the heroism of our race. In 1844 it erupted into action that hurled out the invader. But following the liberation there continued bloody disorders which led the country to choose to return to colonial servitude. Again, however, the people in depths of their being unleashed the instinct for freedom and again the country obtained its independence. But what had been won by great

sacrifice became cheapened by the ineptitude, ambition or insignificance of government leaders.

Greedy hands contributed to the distortion and agitation of the situation and the country lived a history in which predominated the caudillo, civil war, insecurity, financial servitude and other destructive pressures. Against these forces the country constantly struggled to retain its personality.

Always the people were faced by uncertainty, discord, the ruin of their hopes, the crushing of their vital instincts. All this frustration was causing to be forged a special psychology, a typical but unique sensitivity, a way of being unlike that of any of the other peoples of America: it had been differently molded and was of different component elements.

Grasping the true psychology of the Dominican people I realized that any impulse, decision, legislation, or mandate would have to be attuned to this situation: that is, to its possibilities, way of reasoning, and reacting, way of facing life, natural philosophy, hopes, range of its determination and will, its understanding and faith, and all the other circumstances which have produced its character. Any sudden pressure brought to bear to hastily bend these traits would meet invincible resistance. Even though uncoordinated and even involuntary it would be encountered because such effort would clash head-on with the hard realities of the psychological structure.

From the first moment I assumed the Presidency I directed the workings of the State in channels that were above all rational and practical. Neither did I

attempt, even indirectly, to bluntly force any situation nor to achieve any overnight transformations. In regard to public psychology, I began by recognizing the existence of pessimistic tendencies, the lack of confidence, the timidity and anarchy that a history of suffering and disillusionment had imbedded in our being. At the same time I recognized the spirit of combativeness, aggression and indiscipline that was the accompanying consequence of those same events. All of this had had a cumulative effect in the formation of a national mentality.

I understood all this. However, this mentality as an instrument could not figure in plans of the length and scope I had in mind. It was therefore vital to undertake to reform this state of mind and adjust it to new times and new environment. Lack of confidence would be transformed into fervent feelings and actions, numbness must give way to ardor, hopelessness would have to be replaced by optimism, antagonism by dynamic cooperation.

It was apparent that it would be necessary to create specific situations to justify such a change in popular psychology: if I was to realize any success in my dreams of restoring and consolidating our country it was absolutely vital to stimulate all positive factors and to strip away the negative and inert.

First step in achieving this transformation was to be total reform of the general atmosphere in order to allow the appearance of a new awareness of Nation and Country. Above all, there would have to be security, peace and political stability. Then it would

be necessary to stimulate interest in economic matters which would be proportional to the required effort: to restore public morale and the people's confidence in their ability —a confidence which had been rendered dormant if not destroyed by the crushing events of their past. Finally, slowly and more solidly, the cultural level would have to be raised: illiteracy was to be eliminated, civic consciousness would be created, and all the results of basic education would have to be further encouraged —all would mold into the one overall new national character that I sought for our country.

I had scarcely begun to undertake this staggering program when —16 days after my inauguration— a tremendous cataclysm destroyed the nation's capital.

The San Zenon Hurricane, as it came to be known, left thousands of victims, a wrecked city, and a grisly panorama of death and desolation. The tragedy had the effect of precipitating my plans. It created sadly propitious circumstances for their implementation. I could exercise my capacity for organization and leadership which had been developed during my military career. I was able with this demonstration to restore some degree of the confidence which was the foundation of the moral reconstruction I proposed.

The efficiency with which I met the terrible consequences of the storm and the readiness with which I took charge of the situation —without having had time to organize the government that was to attempt to lead a country already struggling against growing and implacable menaces and which was so

financially subjugated that it lacked even minimum autonomy —enabled me to restore confidence, stimulate effort, overcome pessimism (further exacerbated by the catastrophe) and rehabilitate our noble hopes and ambitions, prove the power of unity and cooperation, and awaken some of the qualities dormant in the national character. In other words, there was a demonstration of what a people is capable of doing by acting with faith, decision and method under competent, vigorous leadership.

The surging forth of this mass confidence visibly overwhelmed the resignation existing before the catastrophe and a spirit of struggle was born in repairing its ravages. Despite tragedy and death life went inexorably on and the future could be dimly perceived as if by mariners peering through darkness at a fog-bound coast. There was the promised land and we had only to go to it. We would go.

But this confidence could not bear constructive fruit unless it was accompanied by certainty that honest effort would be definitely worthwhile. One of the causes of the pessimism and lack of enthusiasm for private initiative was the uncertainty stemming from the civil wars and political instability. It was far from infrequent that sudden disorder, rural or urban, whether a revolution, a barracks coup, or a sudden outburst of maddened passions would ruin everything. The persecution, massacres and confiscation which the victors of the moment so avidly applied not only spread ruin but —even worse— tore the very hope from men's hearts.

The prior analysis which preceded my every action indicated the need to assure the stability of my government as well as the domestic peace of the country. This was to be part of a program to set in motion the positive force of the national psychology.

First step was to be restoration of the human will power that had been such a powerful factor in the wars for independence —but later was so submerged in the revolutions. A new, stimulating faith was needed. The united action of the two positive factors would indicate a fundamental transformation of the public mentality. From this would be born selfless desire for rescue of the Homeland from the forces which had so truncated its sovereignty. It would be realized, moreover, that this goal could only be gained through joint effort. Thus there began to materialize a mass readiness to acknowledge the energy and organization that I was giving the government.

My purpose was to harmonize the common efforts and multiply the results methodically attained. My accomplishments in the face of the cataclysmic hurricane had demonstrated my abilities as a leader and organizer. Public confidence in me, so firmly expressed in the enthusiasm of my sweeping electoral victory, had been amply confirmed. The psychological transformation which was being achieved was to provide me with resources vital to the unfolding of the phased program which I had in mind.

It was, as I have said, vital that there be some guarantee of security that, from then on, all constructive effort be rewarded and protected —and that this



security be genuine and energetic in the face of the inevitable uprising against the Government when the usual hardened revolutionaries should again begin their agitation, stealing men from their homes and jobs—following, in short, what had become converted into custom and tradition. To stay such violence, I mobilized all mediums of public opinion. These included personal friendship, patriotic idealism, the possibility of solving present problems by coordinated community efforts.

But in vain did I appeal to their hearts and minds although I did everything possible to swerve the rebellious energies into more constructive channels. Appeasement failed in the face of stubborn determination to rupture the normal processes of administration. However, swift victory over the conspirators quickly restored law and order.

Simultaneous with my securing of the domestic peace was my first attempt to raise the cultural level of the people.

Through all its previous history the country had national feelings, of a justified sense of social and financial disorders and had lacked both the resources and the will to seek to better the community by means of education. This lack prevented the formation of national feelings, of a justified sense of social and personal responsibility, the development of the analytic capacity needed to serve as the criterion of one's acts and their consequences, and the utilization of human intelligence in an effort to live together in peace and unity.

Giving due value to this element of psychological transformation I invested all the funds at my disposal on a multitude of grammar schools, secondary schools and other educational establishments. My purpose was not to increase the number of specialists and professionals; instead it was to give the common man some notion of his own existence, his responsibilities and his potentialities.

I have no intention of herein relating the story of my life. The various incidents and episodes of the struggle I waged to strengthen every facet of our national life have frequently been described in detail in the many reviews of my life's work. If I refer to these events it is to show how their successful conclusions contributed to the self confidence of the people. They were thereby assured of my ability to lead and that their efforts would not be in vain nor go unrewarded. The result was a change in public conduct, a conversion of negativism into positive factors.

I seek only to demonstrate the deep-seated motives for my actions and my philosophy of government, the meshing of its moral and material gears, the duties within its competency, and the essential instrument of government: its primacy. I have introduced mass psychology as an example of the latent strength of each of the elements composing the State. In the following chapters I will describe my concept of the other fundamental values and how I have deployed them.

The first of these is the fact that the United States is a young nation, and that its history is still in the making. The second is the fact that the United States is a large nation, and that its history is still in the making. The third is the fact that the United States is a free nation, and that its history is still in the making.

The fourth is the fact that the United States is a democratic nation, and that its history is still in the making. The fifth is the fact that the United States is a nation of immigrants, and that its history is still in the making. The sixth is the fact that the United States is a nation of pioneers, and that its history is still in the making.

The seventh is the fact that the United States is a nation of heroes, and that its history is still in the making. The eighth is the fact that the United States is a nation of visionaries, and that its history is still in the making. The ninth is the fact that the United States is a nation of dreamers, and that its history is still in the making.



## CHAPTER III

### CONCEPT AND PRACTICE OF GOVERNMENT

I have considered it worth while to clearly establish my recognition of the adjustments the State must make in respect to national realities in order to arrive at a precise interpretation of the policies I proposed to implement when I became President in 1930.

The political evolution of the world has made universal the acceptance of certain rights and juridical bases. Among them is the democratic formation of governments by which public opinion selects the citizens who are to occupy legislative and executive posts. It is on this principle that all the American republics were constituted; each of these nations founded their institutions on the principle that public power is derived from decision and consent of the governed.

I do not believe it out of place for me to express the opinion that this system, by definition and theory, is undeniably attractive and seems the culmination of a laudable exercise of equality of citizenship.

It is founded on the proposition that each citizen of the nation should enjoy the opportunity to take

part in the public administration, whether it be by delegating his right or by opting to become a delegate of others.

But its practical application has been stained by numerous contradictions, beginning with the elasticity of the concept of public opinion, by rules requiring, for example, a minimum of economic capacitation in order to exercise the vote; another is the limitation of the free play of the electoral function under the pretext of party discipline.

The parties have acquired interests and commitments which have absorbed the citizen's autonomy. This perversion of the democratic process has led to situations so at variance with theory as the sway and even control of certain social or political groups, electoral fraude and even the buying of votes which is practiced almost everywhere.

These violations of a glorious theory have resulted in attempts to improve it in practice by such dangerous and anarchistic measures as the *pronunciamiento*, the uprising and the revolt to overthrow by force elected governments guilty of constitutional irregularities in the eyes of ambitious failures or unscrupulous opponents. There is resort to primitivism to correct irregularities not always real. This drastically reduces the institutional solidarity of the democratic structure. And naturally this situation culminates in the placing of the government at the mercy of any adventurer, petty war lord, or even bandit leader who avails himself of the cloak of political action.

These were the thoughts motivating the formation of my policy and philosophy of government and guiding my actions in the exercise of the highest office of the Dominican nation. My government was impeccably democratic in origin and if ever the shining theory of democracy was applied with maximum probity it was in the elections of May 16, 1930.

I assumed the Presidency of the Republic with this conviction: since the Government is the guiding force which sets in motion the inert elements of the nation its guidance and weight must be in proportion to the specific circumstances.

The Government could not act or function the same as in countries with different characteristics; nor could it move in strict accordance with an a priori principle which would be to diminish the demands of reality. Governmental guidance had, in short, to be along the lines dictated by the magnitude of the problems oppressing the country.

The nation, in an act of electoral expression, had charged me with the mission of directing the state toward that goal. I did not accept the position in order to exploit it on my own behalf, nor to passively continue in a bog of bureaucratic routine; I proposed to advance in full possession of the responsibilities with which I had been charged. This consciousness of my duty placed me in a special, well-defined position very different from that of my predecessors.

I decided, therefore, that to adequately undertake the tasks before me, the authority with which I had been entrusted would have to be exercised to the

limit of its power. I express it in these terms because I have always distinguished between **authority** and **power**. This difference does not arise exclusively from the grammatical meaning of the words nor even from its etymology but rather from practical content and efficacy.

In the generally accepted democratic definition **authority** stems from the delegation of powers from the people to an individual or corporate entity for the representation and administration of their interests. But this delegation is sometimes undermined by the weakness of the organization, the system or the delegate. **Power**, on the other hand, is the capacity to exercise this representation.

It follows then that **authority** is a juridical concept whereas **power** is strength in being. The commonly used phrases "de facto" and "de jure", by which governments may be labelled according to their origin and actual status, apply with sufficient exactitude to the distinctions I made between power and authority. The former is the government in being, that is to say, sustained by force, by power, to which the nation is forced to submit. The second is the legal government, legitimate and unsullied in origin, but at times unable to act. Its lack of power may result from failure to gain the military support needed to consolidate its position, or it may be that it has become ensnared in cunning political intrigues that render it virtually powerless even though retaining its de jure status.

I steeped myself in Dominican history —it was this and no other country I was to govern— noting

that it was largely a chronicle of governments with authority but without power and governments with power but without authority —that is, without moral or juridical basis.

The former type possessed legitimate authority stemming from the public will and conferred in accordance with correct institutional procedure. But it lacked power; therefore, any political adventurer who so desired could ignore its mandate, endanger its existence and attempt to substitute himself. When this happened the result was reign not by authority but by power implemented by despotism.

Power does not always manifest itself by the brutality of a rebellion or *pronunciamiento*, by insurgent maneuvering, or the treason of the overly ambitious. Hidden forces also represent power. In the Dominican Republic of 1930 power could be said to reside with the economic interests about which the nation revolved: the sugar industrialists, particularly, provocateurs of an imperialism which at that time still manifested expansionist ambitions.

In one way or another, directly or obliquely, each of these forces weighed upon authority, influenced its actions and limited its autonomy.

If I was to perform with dignity the duties of presidential authority conferred upon me I had, then, to secure the necessary power permitting me to act. My government was not to be subject to the whims of guerrillas nor subdued by other powers, nor made commercial and servile in order to survive. This decision stemmed perhaps from the fact that no



previous chief executive had entered the presidency with a plan equally precise, with such a well-defined consciousness of country, an equal awareness of the realities to be faced, nor with so objective an appreciation of such fundamental concepts as Nation, State and Government.

These realizations, clear and succinct, were those that inspired me prior to entering public life. My military career was founded upon them; consequently when I attained sufficient rank and authority I gave priority to reorganization of the armed forces, concentrating on raising technical standards, discipline and responsibility. I sought to create a strong organization exclusively designed for the defense of our country's sacred principles, contribute to the reconquest of our national identity —beginning with the recovery of sovereignty— and preserve the integrity of our institutions against the machinations of the ambitious. The armed services would prevent the formation of guerrilla bands and mountain gangs in the employ of political parties or factions. They would thus become a massive bulwark for the public peace.

As a result of this policy of military transformation, power would not be seized by the first adventurer to issue a proclamation. Instead, legitimate authority would find responsible power supporting it and continue the effective functioning of democratic regularity. Because of this previous reorganization when I was elected President of the Republic there was at hand a force which would support my authority, contain the impetus of traditional revolution, and

give the people the security needed to channel their energies into constructive causes. Unlike its predecessors, therefore, my government was not a mere political organism surrounded by enemies against which would have to be expended to greater part of its energies and most vital resources. It would, on the contrary, possess both authority and power, exercising firm leadership and imposing discipline on the heretofore anarchistic elements composing the nation.

Specific circumstances of Dominican history had condemned to failure all former regimes and political experiments. The country had little by little drifted away from its heritage as a nation. The State had lost all ability to recover itself by normal methods. This tragic dissolution had culminated in military occupation by the United States, the loss of our economic and financial autonomy —controlled by Custom Receivership— and all the unhealthy by-products of these humiliations. No other country in the Americas had suffered the same experiences and therefore none had the same need for orderly, stable, strong government as did the Dominican Republic.

In other words, the Government could not limit itself to charging private initiative with restoration of the economy, coordination of society, and institutional stability. The Government had to take positive action directing common and individual effort along practical permanent lines.

This meant recognition and acceptance of full responsibility, free of the timidity and confusion which culminates in dispersed, wasted effort. I not only ac-

cepted this responsibility from the first but even demanded it.

“To govern is to nourish”, I once said in acceptance of specific proposals, “To nourish the body, nourish the heart, nourish the soul, nourish the mind, nourish the spirit, nourish the conscience. It is this which impels me to hourly accomplish something concrete which permits me to feel with my hands and see with my eyes a panorama of all the Republic, with employment for all and the home of contented workers”.

The proposition of carrying out a government program conceived with this responsibility could have been proposed—and many times in our history surely was— by any man of good faith acting under the impulse of honest conviction. But to actually execute such a program a method is absolutely necessary. So is a clear realization of reality, an accurate evaluation of national factors, a sense of social balance, an at least basic knowledge of the economic facts of life, and full application—over and above all this— of the principle of authority.

On the one hand, a Government that seeks to lessen its responsibilities and prefers to seek formulas propitious to a passive but static condition would be unable to undertake major tasks. On the other, a government overcome by fervor to the point of slipping out of the orbit of reality would also lead the country to catastrophe. It would be an act of destructive stupidity to endow the government with facilities or functions greater than the strength of its component

elements; it would be still more naive and prejudicial for the Government to consider itself able to basically alter the situation by simple executive action.

Many failures have been the fruit of such errors. For example: if, to alleviate conditions for the poorer classes, rents are frozen or arbitrarily lowered or the prices of necessities are reduced without careful previous analysis, net results may be injurious to all concerned. The lowering of rent without careful consultation may well begin a disastrous economic chain reaction: construction ceases to be profitable business, building projects are abandoned, number of housing units dwindles, unemployment in the building trades reaches dangerous levels, merchants then suffer, and so on. Price freezing may also paralyze many other productive activities. It should never be forgotten that free enterprise moves on the basis of wages and profits.

Similarly, it would be completely impossible to decree a rise in productivity for the purpose of reducing prices if such a rise is beyond the absorptive powers of the consumer. Instead, efforts should be made to expand consumption in order that demand stimulate production. Neither is it possible to promulgate laws ordering the appearance of a sense of culture or appreciation of the finer things of life —only possible, of course, after prolonged programs of public education. And no one can fill the treasury overnight nor cause fiscal revenue to suddenly soar.

The function of the Government must thus be subject to its own practical potentialities. A Govern-

ment with a leader at the helm who uses his authority wisely can initiate a transforming resurgence, thereby creating an environment propitious for his release and guidance of creative energy. He must begin by convincing the public of his executive and organizing capacity and the effectiveness of his plans.

Public opinion must be positive and prepared for the development of all of which it is capable: recognition of the nobility of labor, peace and due process; modernization of production systems and labor by encouraging cooperation between the latter and capital; expansion of consumer capacity in order to increase output; advise and stimulate private initiative; revitalize spiritual strength and encourage a personal and community desire for betterment of the citizen and the nation.

An ordinary government leader is merely an ambitious politician who has come to possess either or both power and authority as a result of political dealing and compromise, or perhaps by an audacious coup, but is too inept to grasp the potential of the state and organize it effectively. The mediocre government leader performs a brief, impermanent function and is gone —sometimes leaving behind a trail of damage and destruction, albeit involuntarily.

Such leaders abandoned their role because of indolence and inertia or have shown themselves unable to struggle with the visible and covert forces impinging on the government. Or they may have fashioned schemes out of step with the realities of their state environment.

In contrast, a true statesman is a leader capable of setting inert forces in motion, of conceiving a plan, advancing step by step, of fixing a goal in exact proportion to the nation's potentialities, and overcoming resistance to his patriotic programs.

In order to better explain my firm decision to grasp power it might be well to explain my conception of some basic points of administration, such as the division of public power into its legislative, executive and judicial branches and the advantages of the centralist form of government.

Extreme defenders of the division of power have planted as the ultimate of administrative perfection the complete independence of Government institutions. In this independence is said to reside the efficacy of democratic institutions. However, the designation of "power" to each of the three branches tends to indicate an autonomy one from another and therefore a lessening of state unity.

I have always been convinced that total independence of the three branches without their submission to a plan, a purpose, a method of work or administration is an invitation to anarchy and contradiction. This is an eventuality —and one which has frequently occurred— which could further lead to the dissolution of authority and a severance of the cohesive ties of the nation.

I have explained how I adapted my own interpretation of power, authority and government to the realities of the Dominican scene. In those interpreta-

tions and those realities there was no place for absolute autonomy of the branches.

I considered them as three organs of one governmental body. I regarded them as being inextricably joined in the unity vital for achieving the identity of purpose of all active elements of the State. Considering them not as three powers but as three organs of one government it is apparent that they must act in concert on the basis of one doctrine and one plan of action, each organ striving for cooperative success in its own sphere.

This integration permits a balance in which each organ performs precisely as if it were a physical body, without one interfering with the other and without discord or controversy.

In effect, a so-called executive power strictly subject to the legislative, as is the case in countries with parliamentary rule, is impotent and inoperative. Such a division prevents the unfolding of any constructive program, the adoption of emergency measures, and the maintenance of the all-important continuity of government programs. The last may be undone by the influence of an opposition group or the verbal excesses of a demagogue. The cause of the wrecking of the economies and public order of many Latin American countries is precisely that supremacy of legislative "power" —a power which for reasons of personal politics, revenge, or mere antipathy, obstructs and renders null the most objective and patriotic undertakings of the executive "power".

My organic conception of government permits consolidation of harmony and balance in all its expres-

sions. This is true not only in the interpretation and application of the institutional bases for the strongest guarantee of civic rights; it is also a stimulant for the power of the State and the energies of the nation to push forward to realize the great goal of redemption of the Dominican motherland. The specific circumstances of our country demand, as I have repeatedly said, methods and ideas attuned to her realities.

And since it is the Executive organ that is best able to conceive a program of national scope or a series of programs based on painstaking technical research—fully adequate to the scope of the project, studied in the light of naked reality, and capable of being compiled without rupture of continuity—it is also this organ which is responsible for coordination of efforts, taking the initiative and ensuring the collaboration of the other governmental entities.

Another question which has aroused heated controversy is that of the advantages of federalism over centralism or vice versa.

In a federal-type government each of the sections, zones or counties of a country enjoy complete autonomy to administer their resources and legislation; their only link to the rest of the nation is by means of a species of pact or multilateral agreement. In the centralist form of government the entire country is integrated into one geographical and political unit and local autonomy is limited by the predomination of the central government.

During the first years following Latin America's independence, when virtually all the founding fathers



were moved by pure idealism rather than practical thoughts, the disputes between proponents of the two systems caused profound schisms. The result was disastrous, particularly in that disorder and anarchy became habitual. The question is now of only secondary importance although federalism is still acclaimed as one of the most typical doctrinaire expressions of administrative liberalism.

It should be made clear that regarding such a controversial point I do not —nor with any of the other questions posed in this book— propose to seek to establish the absolute truth or value of this or any other thesis or system.

As is the case with most social economic or political theories it is the realities of each country or each human group which decide the method or procedure best adapted to the circumstances and most conducive to best and quickest solutions. Federalism has had excellent results in countries geographically, demographically and economically suited to its function. Others, however, have found it necessary because of certain traits and characteristics to choose the unity of government, plans and projects that constitute centralism.

The United States and Switzerland, for example, owe their progress and the excellence of their institutions to the federal system —a system that has come to be inherent in the nature of these countries. But our America presents such contradictory examples of federalism as Venezuela.

There were waged long and bloody civil wars for political and administrative decentralization in Ve-

nezuela until finally the words "God and Federation" were inscribed in the national emblem. The sections in which the country was divided were designated states for the purpose of emphasizing their autonomy. But . . . none of them has sufficient resources for an autonomous administration; therefore, the federal government is forced to supply every cent of their budgets through a form of aid called "situado". The autonomy, achieved at such terrible cost, is impracticable and functions in name only: the State Presidents who were to be elected by popular vote under the original constitution are now appointed by the federal government and the fought-for state parliaments have been abolished as under any centralist regime.

Every act and measure of my government, including those which could be designated purely doctrinaire I conceived by the sole criterion of their applicability in solving the necessities of the Dominican Republic whether or not they were useful to other countries such as consolidation of our national sovereignty and the happiness of our people.

Geographic extension, population density, productivity, construction of works vital to stimulation of the individual efforts in accord with my over-all programming, the meshing of these factors into a coherent system, and above all the need to unify all mediums in attaining the common aspirations of liberation imposed almost by necessity the centralist system —supreme centralized control by one national government.

In view of Dominican circumstances, the sectional or provincial divisions could not be autonomous; their development could only be possible in coordination as parts of an indivisible unit. They could not enjoy sufficient revenue to be self-sufficient. Such autonomy would disjoint efforts to secure benefits for the country as a whole. No region, furthermore, was able, in view of the circumstances, to exist for and by itself alone; it was dependent on the vitality of the whole national community.

The exactitude of these and other concepts relative to government policy and the elasticity of the State obviated from the outset the necessity to improvise regarding the vast patriotic program I had promised myself to carry to an equally well-defined conclusion. These were the tenets which spurred my efforts and their practical application was realized in relation to existing facts, not sudden impulses.

From the beginning, the steps taken by my government were met with the public confidence which was so abundantly demonstrated at my election. The entire country realized that I had come to labor on a program not limited to political considerations. The country knew that this program was conceived on a scale ranging from total recovery of our sovereignty to the establishment of an economic structure founded on labor and productivity rather than speculation and loans.

Enjoying the atmosphere of domestic tranquility and observing the effectiveness of my work, the people soon developed the necessary insight to refrain from



marching behind the false images of demagoguery. They learned to understand the full sweep and depth of the high ideals I represented in consciously personifying the State in its role of prime mover.

Be that as it may, any government sincerely attempting to accomplish a major program needs the support of public opinion and the active collaboration of the people. It is therefore very necessary to mobilize the loyalty and enthusiasm aroused by the program into a strong political organization. This organization must support authority, contribute to the unfolding of administrative plans, and unite behind the government's doctrinal bases and plans of proposed action.

This unanimity, crystallized into a political party representing the thinking and aspirations of the majority, is a true demonstration of democracy: the Government, far from imposing its authority and power, thereby solicits the support and cooperation of the Nation.

The coalition of parties that had placed me in the government lacked —whatever their ample integrity and despite the fact they would have attracted broad support from other political sectors —a homogeneous structure; that is, they had not defined the principles and thought which would give them the permanency that I considered vital to the great program I proposed. I was never a regular of any party nor of any political group that would have formed its own organization to struggle for power. On the contrary, all my life prior to entering the government had been completely aloof from the

wrangling of the political bosses. I was convinced that the discord fomented by these politicians disrupted national unity and that it was the chief source of our country's moral and material bankruptcy. Thus I aspired to gain political support solely in order to carry through my own well-defined program.

As yet were not totally extinguished the consequences of the spirit of factional strife that was standard political action throughout the preceding years. The sectarian controversies that had so often flared into violence during the revolution still excited those who had succumbed to the artifices of demagogues and agitators.

To keep the peace I considered it best that all currents of opinion be clearly defined in order that other ways of thinking express themselves on an ideological level and not merely as the policy of political bosses. This had been the norm; personal ambitions had plunged the people thither and yon instead of uniting them behind explicit programs of national benefit.

This was the origin of the Dominican Party. It was born not as an improvisation nor to secure popularity. Rather, it was to be an instrument of my governmental programs and the concepts that inspired them. Its reason for being had to be national in scale, nor merely political and ephemeral.

I stated this in the founding address, saying that the group being formed had for its objective, "to serve the national interests, guiding and guaranteeing public activities without it being said that we were

moved by self-interest to assemble for transient political speculation. This party represents no calculated scheme by a group of men; it is instead the important, spontaneous and determined movement of all Dominicans toward study and resolution of our national problems”.

The Party surged forth into national life a year after I assumed the Presidency. It was thus founded at a time there had begun to grow a distinct public awareness that I meant what I said when I “brought to the government my determined desire for economic and political recovery”. “The parties”, I also emphasized, “have to be the result of an organization experienced by the vicissitudes of time and cleansed by the friction of events”.

Time has witnessed the success that met the founding of this political organization. As I had foreseen it gave scope to major and minor leaders of opinion who aspired to take part in public life to formulate clear and precise programs, such as those I instilled in the Dominican Party, and submit them for the approval of the people. Thus spurred by the new and dynamic program my government was realizing, the people were determined to freely and wisely elect a responsible and deeply democratic future.

The groups in the service of personal ambitions or perverted ideals soon found themselves without followers. They eventually ceased to exist, abandoned by the people, while the Dominican Party, embodiment of precise ideals, grew to the point of achieving a virtual unanimity of opinion. The party accom-

plished this itself, by its own intrinsic force, because its programs were real and not chimerical, because day by day the people saw their country being transformed by the implementation of those ideals.

The people's response to this mobilization strengthened my initial beliefs regarding government. Their vitality and enthusiasm was being translated into constructive activities and were consolidating the nation's peace and well-being. I was encouraged to take further steps in my role of executive and organizer that I had at first proposed. The first triumphs of economic reconstruction, rapid increase in productivity, the enthusiasm with which my role in national life was greeted were all facts clearly indicating that the public recognized the necessity of having government capable of shouldering its responsibilities and strong enough to ensure peace and security.

Years later, at the inauguration of the building that was to be headquarters of the party, I could justifiably say: "My arm, my heart and my mind have been dedicated to organizing and exalting, with unshakable faith in ourselves, the civic consciousness of the Dominican people. I well know that it is not the same to co-exist as it is to live together. In order that there be a nation it is a primary requirement that groups of humanity live as neighbors. Only thus is produced authentic nationality —holding high the stirring fact of solid community accomplishments."

## CHAPTER IV

### THE INDIVIDUAL THE PERSON AND THE FAMILY

To present in logical order the concepts that inspired my governmental policies and outline their character, motivation and method it is well to explain how I regarded man's social instincts and the results of those instincts in the formation of society.

As in other realms of political activity there is a series of sharp contradictions between man as a social creature and as a being in association. Some of the definitions which have been made in this regard are more generalized than others. To keep to a practical level, however, it is not possible to limit oneself strictly to even those definitions most commonly accepted. It is vital that this, like all matters relative to the role of Government, be studied in relation to times, place, environment, historic influences and the other previously cited factors which make up a Nation.

It is impossible to attempt to effectively govern a country without clearly understanding "what makes it tick" —how does its social structure function? How are its diverse component elements coordinated?



Where is there friction? How are the views and interests of the community reconciled with those of the individual?

In order that I be able to undertake the full sweep of the program I envisioned, as outlined in the previous chapter, my first move would be to understand the exact workings of the social mechanism and the relationship, scope and strength of its component parts.

Only on the basis of such knowledge could be determined the democratic possibilities. This would not be strictly confined nor in an abstract sense; it would have to be a study of the exact needs of the Dominican Republic and its insular, racial, social, historic and economic conditions.

For this purpose I proposed to establish the precise meanings of such words as man, individual, citizen, person, considering each category or being as an independent entity. The terms people, population, society, conglomerate, community, each represent a state different than that of man in association. This clarification could be further broadened to include not only words in a political sense but also historic or sociological, such as tribe, ethnic group, clan, and others.

In the following explanations, as in the foregoing, it is very possible if not certain that I will have to abandon classic concepts and usual definitions: I am trying solely to define my own actions, how I carried out my governmental functions from a fixed point and with unmistakable characteristics. I do not

seek to formulate a theory of universal applicability nor to convert this into a text for statesmen, nor to guide any abstract or practical school of public administration.

I believe that it was precisely this independence of criteria that has been the primary factor in my success as a government leader. It has enabled me to achieve the integral transformation of our country, stimulate a rising tempo of prosperity and progress, forge an unbreakable spirit of solidarity between the people and their government, and invigorate our institutions. I have never sought to accommodate facts to principles; my purpose has always been to achieve the logical maximum from the realities of the situation.

Man, considered in his most elemental interpretation as a human being, is solely a biological or zoological category under which may be listed racial differences, cultural level, economic development and other factors that tend to fix the degree of evolution of the highest form of life on the planet. This point of view, that man has no other attributes than that of his existence in itself and his typical traits, is that of the anthropologist.

For the government official and political leader this human being acquires fundamental importance only when considered in relation to his kind; then he behaves not merely as a physiological organism but as a social being and as such the primary element of the state.

In this category man has received different labels in accordance with his type of relationship and the

political or sociological theory which studies and classifies him. Modern theorists have attached great importance to the designation **individual** by which they would suggest the idea of an autonomous unit, freely associated with other equal units to form society. It is indeed necessary to consider the individual as the basic unit or nucleus of any group, whether formed for military, civil or religious purposes.

But the liberal schools of thought expand and magnify this individual and give him an outsized position. This is done in presenting the doctrines of free thought as a reaction against the system of privileges by which only certain selected groups were permitted exercise of rights while the great masses groaned under the weight of crushing servitude. By making the individual the essential base of society it was sought to eliminate the differences which separated one class from the other. It was an attempt to strengthen the levelling off process and to sweep away the barriers that had been erected in the course of time by reasons of lineage or riches.

Application of this theory culminated, however, in an individual independence so excessive as to be egocentric. The individual came to attribute to himself the right to demand that society assure him protection, justice, aid and other prerogatives — including that of exploiting his poorer or more humble fellows.

He believed such services could be compensated by fiscal offerings. Such a utilitarian concept reached a point where privileges of wealth were maximum

and a profound inequality was again established. At the same time, man's moral bonds to society were destroyed; solidarity and a spirit of cooperation now failed to even function on behalf of the social structure.

Attempting to rescue the individual from the anonymity in which he dwelled until the aristocratic regimes ended, the liberalist and rationalist schools brought forth the remote term, **citizen**. The word was endowed with a series of explicit rights and almost absolute freedoms which the French Revolution embraced unconditionally.

Citizenship was by implication almost a title. Its purpose, at least in theory, was levelling from the top down. It was not accessible, in actual practice, to rural workers and not all city dwellers could exercise suffrage and the other benefits of what pretended to be democracy. In principle, the citizen was also subject to certain duties. In practice, again, these responsibilities were whittled down in the same degree with which the individual came to be the supreme reason for the existence of the state and the purpose of all law and moral and political relations.

The liberal theory imagined a series of utopian premises. It sought to begin the social organization anew and so cleanse it of the inequities which had crept in over the centuries. This concept was founded on the principle that all men are born equal, with free and ample access to property and the enjoyment of goods, and the freedom to unlimited development of their potentialities.

The name given this fiction was freedom of opportunity. In practice, the cleverest, the most apt, those with most commercial ability or possessing outstanding qualities of leadership were those who took over property and goods. They again gathered in exclusive groups, scuttling the famous equality from which they had risen. It was, however, to their own interest to preserve that theory from which came their origin: the theory of individualism.

The word **citizen** also came to acquire a more stringent meaning; in the full flower of individualism it came to be legally and constitutionally accepted that the right of suffrage—the right par excellence of the citizen—only be exercised by individuals enjoying a certain income or, at least, by those with access to schools and who know how to write and read.

This restriction and others like it indicate to what lengths had gone the lie and deception in the egalitarian utopias. To these must be added the prejudices that have always separated men for reasons of race, social position or religion. As a consequence, the liberal doctrine never even remotely achieved the proclaimed equality.

It did, on the other hand, open doors to the dishonest, the clever, the intriguer, the unscrupulous; lagging behind were the naive and credulous, those of limited resources, the humble and gentle.

This inflation of the individual was so extreme and produced such inequities in the social structure that in effect it reinstated all the privileges and abuses

of the system it had sought to replace. It was in reaction to these injustices that there appeared and developed the various totalitarian theories. These glorified the group and minimized the individual. To correct the excess of individualism they eliminated the individual. The rights he had formerly won were mutilated to the point of total degradation in favor of a national or ideological community—depending on the case—for progress en masse.

Man became a mere unit of labor in this group, easily replaced, with little or no attention given his feelings, likes or dislikes, personality; he was treated no differently than any other tool.

By the eve of my first presidential election these fallacious totalitarian doctrines had not yet reached the point of development that was to make them the tremendous danger to civilization that they came to be. Dominican history had, generally speaking, unfolded under the influence of liberal individualism degenerated into personalism. The result had been highly injurious; chaotic and without method or precision, it exacerbated all the difficulties and shortcomings from which the Republic suffered.

I was fully aware that the concept of the human being in association—although it pretended to represent the word individual—was being substantially reduced in proportion with which it was acquiring a constantly more pragmatic and materialist significance. In spite of its initial levelling tendencies its exercise and political corruption eventually produced discriminations which ruptured social unity and dehumanized the individual.

In contrast, the concept of **person** encompasses man in all his essence. From the concept of person automatically stems the duality explained by Saint Thomas. Man is neither solely flesh nor solely spirit; he is a combination of both. And each one needs to be satisfied, has its separate development, harmonizes with those of other persons and if in perfect balance is both individualistic and collectivistic.

The flesh tends to have an egoism that is neutralized by the predominance of the spiritual. However demanding man's material drive it is at least equalled if not subdued by his spiritual aspirations. Man believes that flesh is perishable, transitory and that no matter how much satisfaction he may now derive from the flesh this will not be true in the future; carnal pleasures he considers to be ephemeral and not the supreme reason for his existence. The spirit survives and is, moreover, responsible for his acts. The **individual** concept is unilateral in that it includes only the material. The concept **person** is complex, plural and tending to balance.

The person is not an autonomous unit in the sense that he is as an individual; instead, he tends to join himself with others by ties of love, charity, religious sentiment, intellectual aspiration... in sum, by motives superior to those of mere utility.

It is this consciousness of one's self, lacking in the individual, that forms something so precious as human dignity. Thus, the concept of **individual** suggests egotism and lack of sensitivity while that of **person** implies harmony, cooperation and solidarity.

In order not to deal with this subject more than necessary I will condense this thought by affirming my conviction that the true meaning of the social man is his condition as a **person** and not as an individual. The person has rights regarding himself and others. His extension of these is not by base passions nor egoistic desire; the person extends his influence to complement and collaborate with that of others in a community of ideas. Implied is the recognition of unescapable duties to others; that is, acceptance of a social system, order and hierarchy.

The natural tendency of the human being regarding his own advanced status is manifested differently, depending on whether he is observed as the individual of the liberal doctrines or the person of the Thomist school of thought.

Since the former has been shaped with an essentially egocentric conscience and mentality by principle and by education, his culture, economic progress, scientific discoveries, religious sentiments, expressions of his personality, and other characteristics and acts are for his own exclusive benefit. When he does place them at the service of the community he does so entirely in the spirit of commerce. Since he has no wish to feel tied to society for other than the benefits accruing to association he feels neither the necessity nor inclination to labor selflessly —to forget himself briefly in order to collaborate in a community effort.

This reserved, self-centered being was the practical living result of individualistic liberalism; his development caused to be transferred to civilization



the utilitarian philosophy that is his essence. He has impregnated his civilization with the materialism that is conducive to rivalries and the pugnacity that leads to war.

Considered as a human being the person is not exclusively self-centered. His religious beliefs link him with his fellow man and his sense of morality leads him to seek association and cooperation. He realizes he is not the center of the universe and that society did not form for the express purpose of serving him; rather that society imposes certain ethical obligations on him, and commands fraternity, love and piety. His utilitarian ambitions contract because his convictions and traits form into the conscience of a social being attuned to reciprocity. In other words, the formation of his personality is along different lines than that of the individualist. As a result his conduct is more expansive, generous, considerate, and more in harmony with society.

The social tendencies of the person is first manifested in the family. It is clear that the human being, however defined, feels a unanimous need to concentrate his emotions and sentiments within the family circle as the first step in social formation. The bonds of love which draw together two beings of opposite sex and cause them to set up housekeeping are quickly broadened to include paternal and maternal affection.

The presence of children and the accompanying responsibilities are things which bolster the family unit, endowing it with unity. It is now a truism to

state that the family is the nuclear cell of society and not the isolated man. This is accepted even when the individual is otherwise considered in more superlative context.

The individualist concept of family has even a different connotation than that of the personalist. The former, in effect, is founded on egocentric materialism. The family is conceived of as personal property and an outlet for compulsion to dominate, even if it be only on the small scale of the home. For the individual the family is scarcely even an expansion of his personality. He desires a family for his enjoyment but he is not moved by any concern of a social nature.

In contrast, the family as viewed from the personalist conception—that is, by a man linked to society by bonds of rights and duties—acquires a more human and universal significance within which is the aspiration of his efforts with those of his fellowmen. This culminates in the integration of society.

While the individual seeks only to extract what he can from the state for his exclusive benefit and demands that the government not infringe upon his exaggerated status—and walled by the exclusivity forms his family unit—the person understands authority and order. He submits to them for the general good, raising his family in social contact with ethics and purpose not limited to utilitarian individualism. He is aware of the spiritual aspect which he interprets in Christian faith and practice.

In sum, to the individual the family means vanity and ostentation; to the person it is a stimulus, a

reward, a bond with his fellow men. And only a family inspired by the latter sentiments is fit to carry out the duties required of it as the nucleus of society.

The policy of the State in respect to the family differs according to which definition of human being is accepted. If it is that of the Individual the State is coerced from limiting—even for the public welfare—exercise of absolute independence. Among the liberties demanded by the citizen is that of being absolute master of his home.

The Person, however, admits that the State can and must intervene in domestic matters, at least to the extent of securing necessary protection for the family as a group and for its individual members. This provides a rational balance between rights to family independence and ensuring that that autonomy will not react to the moral detriment or the security and betterment of society.

This feeling for family I share profoundly and consider it worthy of all support. It was in line with my own convictions as well as providing the sense of realism with which I sought to make the basis of my governmental programs.

As I once said at the inauguration of a housing project:

“I propose—and I shall not rest until it is achieved—to raise the standard of living of my people, not only in regard to their food but also by providing comfortable homes. This gives form to the need for permanent security of the family. It is in the family that resides the strength of the structure of society.

And it is the essence and nucleus of all political entities. Without the stability and sane development of the family, the prosperity of the Nation is impossible. There must be available to all Dominican families that most indispensable substance of stability and warmth: one's own home. There, shielded from uncertainty and sudden eventualities, the family nucleus finds security for today and for the future. Thus does it link in a continuity of ideals and sentiment the life of one generation with the other, lending solidity to the work of social betterment."

Only by appreciating the human being as a person, with all the person's attributes, intimate relationships, compromises and ties, could have been realized the national transformation that I projected.

This appreciation has been fundamental with me; it has inspired what my government has done to stimulate the integral expansion of each Dominican's personality by guaranteeing him the rights which fortify dignity, encouraging his instinct for association, enabling him to raise a family, raising his cultural level in order to give form and content to spiritual values, and adequately rewarding his efforts and not oppressed by the weight of the selfishness and exploitation of the more clever and unscrupulous.

This appreciation has also been the guiding principle behind all legislation pertaining to the family enacted by my government or at my behest. This includes public education, social welfare, maternity care, social security, the annual bonus, hospitalization, and all the undeniable advantages enjoyed today by

the Dominican. It has been done for his personal security and for the development of the multiple legitimate manifestations of his personality. It has been conceived not as an element divorced from social solidarity, but as a functional element of the State, the Nation and the Motherland.

## CHAPTER V

### DEFINITIONS OF THE ASSOCIATED MAN

In the foregoing chapter I formulated some consideration regarding man as an intrinsic unit or insoluble element of the social ensemble. I will now survey the range of the different definitions accorded—depending on the purpose—human groups such as people, society, population and so on. If I had found it necessary to secure a clear concept of the human being, it was even more vital to achieve a practical interpretation of the form and manner of group relations. It was necessary to study the object of assembly in congregations, the actions and behavior of the group in relation with the same expressions in individual life. Precise knowledge would be needed as basis and guide in a exacting analysis of Dominican realities.

Customarily, the terms used to define congregations of humanity spring from a superficial criteria and are almost synonymous. This is evident by the subtlety of their differences, doctrinaire approach, sophist complexity, rhetoric, and mental simplicity.

In this confusion, however, one may discern different categories which a statesman must classify and

analyze in order to provide a technical base for his plans and programs.

If the government leaders does not clearly indicate how his leadership is directly geared to the country's activities, hopes, and overall potentialities, it becomes swamped by error and readjustment. He is forced to sometimes trust to change. He has no fixed criterion. Instead, he is at the mercy of uncontrolled events and the eventual intervention of politics. And it does not matter if while developing his own insight, the leader strays from formula or conventional conclusions; in reality, they represent only opinions and lack the quality of absolute truths.

The essential is that his concept and his doctrine be precise, that they must be mustered in orderly fashion to enable his works to be built with the stuff of reality —not with imaginary elements shakily erected on a purely theoretical foundation.

To my mind the word **people**, the term most frequently used by politicians and demagogues, means the consortium of human beings living in a nation. The word represents an utter lack of discrimination or classification, whether cultural, economic, political, sexual, or age. The idea contained in this word is global and is without the specific purpose which would give direction to its components. It is an idea which includes those of impetus and energy without the absolute necessity of any ideological context.

When the thesis of the divine right of kings was discarded the rationalist philosophers and sociologists adopted to concept of people, in all its massive com-

plexity, without distinctions nor inventory, as the democratic source of power and authority. To confirm this creative capacity they referred to the "sovereign people". In practice, however, this assumed entirely a demagogic aspect. Attaining theory status, political exploiters pretended to submission of the government to the immense pull of popular will. In terms that could be sincere but which at bottom constitute a great irony, the Argentine *pensador*, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, recommended above all "to educate the sovereign" when the sovereign—the people—had been turning the world for almost a century.

In any case, the intrinsic concept of people is limitless, without diminution nor exclusions. It is one of the fundamental bases of the State, being dynamic, operative and—like the surf of the sea—is a force in perpetual motion. Considered from this view, people comprise an active entity even though their acts are not emotionally unanimous among the personal elements composing them. Certainly, each man—person or individual—is a cell that contributes to the format of the great whole. But on its own this cell may think and act in a different way than it would as part of the unit.

Recognition of the popular unit is now standard in nearly all sociological studies and research. It is now commonplace to compare the biological processes of a people with that of a single organism to indicate the close functional relationship between the one and the other. Both are entities composed of a variety of elements. "Peoples, like individuals", it has been said,



“are born, grow, and die”. And this is one of the most notable characteristics of the word **people**, a multiple entity which sometimes includes not only the inhabitants of one Nation but even far beyond.

This intrinsic significance of people may, however, be adulterated and twisted by the demagogues of professional politics. They use the concept of people, deliberately perverted for their purposes, to deceive the masses.

This confusion leads to the perversion of the natural tendency of the people to unity, destroying its true form, stimulating impossible ambitions, arousing and encouraging that blind will to destruction that sometimes grips the masses, whipping them into ravaging mobs —or breaking them up into factions —used not for the common good or welfare of the nation, but to further the interests of their manipulators.

To galvanize these groups, agitators, and opportunists spread hate and passions for revenge of alleged injuries. The groups hurl themselves into savage struggles, at times veritable blood baths, with intent to elevate to power quite unworthy leaders and vicious opportunists.

Each one of these factions invariably claims to represent the people. So corrupted has become the meaning of the term that the ruin wrought by madened mobs rampaging through the streets is often presented as victories of the people —even or particularly when the panic has reached a point where it spreads terror among that part of the population

in which reposes the true virtues, characteristics, traditions and tendencies which define and give shape to the human community.

Often this struggle for power has led to savage civil wars in which have been destroyed the people's greatest heritages and drowned in blood the noblest ideals of liberty and patriotism. In the course of these conflicts there have not lacked groups —claiming to act for the people but in reality moved by the cheap personal ambitions of petty agitators —to invoke the intercession of some foreign power in order that it mediate the differences in their favor, even when this intervention is counter to something so basic as national sovereignty. But if such maneuvers achieve their victory it is proclaimed a triumph for the people.

In principle, the pure idea of people, in its massive unity, in its constructive sense, should not be affected by this divergence of opinion, nor degenerate into something as haphazard as to ascribe popular opinion to shrill demagoguery, nor the division of people into majority and minority for electoral purposes. This can only be considered one of the functions of popular dynamism but it should not lessen the essence of the global concept. In real life, however, it does not proceed in such a happy fashion; peoples rupture their unity, destroying themselves internally, are spurred by petty passions infinitely beneath them, deceived by false promises, or are duped by the brassy glitter of pseudo-greatness surrounding these agitators.

From this latently explosive element —not in the idea of people but in practice— always artificially

stimulated but rarely from legitimate interests— has surged political instability, a spirit of revolutionism, the pre-eminence of faction over nation that constitutes most of Dominican history.

By this rupturing of national unity and the channeling of popular strength toward personalist goals there was derived all the evils from which our country suffered —and particularly that of loss of sovereignty.

Taking the foregoing into consideration, my plans for national recovery had to be based on making complete use of popular energy. By that I mean the restoration of unity from above the political splintering. The authority which was mine as well as the ability to act and prevail had to ensure that no longer would political differences degenerate into conflicts. I had to prevent the hate and subversion arising from such conflicts that had always divided the Dominicans. It was vital that this national restlessness be transformed by motives demanding action —but action leading to cooperation and solidarity.

This could be obtained —and was— with the fixing of precise governmental objectives, condensed and highly practical programs to attain these objectives, and the mustering of the people's strength into a strong, cleverly motivated political party to give total support to these programs. It was these goals which, as I have indicated, were one of the reasons impelling me to found the Dominican Party.

The magnitude of our proposals and unification of the civic activity within the Party penetrated deep-

ly into the people's being. And by simultaneously launching a strong, vigorous campaign for public education and culture, the people became increasingly stimulated by exemplary motives and unsullied desire to work for the common good.

In certain sectors of the population it was sheer ignorance of civic duty rather than hostile passions which had led men to blindly plunge into mountain banditry at the behest of any adventurer wishing to destroy the peace. With this in mind I made every effort to teach at least a general outline of a citizen's rights and duties. This was contained in a *Cartilla Civica* (Civic Compendium) which circulates widely. It proved to be invaluable during the interim while—with the inevitable slowness of inadequate resources—a more complete training program was developed.

In this manner the people began slowly but steadily to smooth over their differences. I know that this must eliminate the intensity of the party disputes which had long divided the country. Best of all, the people themselves would come to realize the superficiality and injuriousness of this strife.

Thus inspired and oriented, my policies of administrative organization, method, and popular culture were able to abolish—naturally, without oppression nor violence—whatever destructiveness there was in political controversy. The energy dissipated in agitation for the petty political objectives represented by the personal ambitions of a few habitual rabble-rousers was now being used for higher, patriotic purposes. In this fashion there began to be forged the great

national unity so vital to the supreme well-being of the Republic.

Today we may note with pride the results obtained. This splendid peace has reigned unperturbed for 30 years. This readiness to cooperate, this transformation of warlike people who violently convulsed their political life until 1930 into the hard working, law-abiding people of today, unified by love of country is enough to fill any government leader with satisfaction. It would have seemed enough at one time to have tamed the violence and bettered the general attitude regarding such conditions.

If the word **people** has such a vigorous connotation, representing multiple and at times diverse impulses that the leader must harmonize and coordinate, the word **population** assumes a more demographic or statistical significance. This is true although both represent the same idea of group or community of persons or individuals and have, therefore, the same semantic value. I refer solely to the suggestion arising from the concept that the government obtains an exact knowledge of the elements with which it must work and what is the exact function corresponding with the definition.

In the mere use of the word **population** there is implicit the variations and attributes that determine it and which take the form of census, growth, density, and other factors belonging to the statistical lexicon. The **population** is simply the numerical count of inhabitants of a region and their productive potentiality. The **people**, however, are the vital force of that same region.

It would be correct to say, for example, that a population supports or rejects a government, a governmental measure or a political leader. Because the formulation of opinion is limited to people and is not the role of the population. In sum, this concept of population may be into classification by race, cultural level, religion, productivity, etc.; the term people, however, can only be understood as a single massive unit.

It was, thus, necessary to separate these two concepts to use and develop them in their respective context. Since the population concept has an economic objective my government would have to begin by determining the population breakdown, its distribution, work capacity, and productivity in order to introduce the necessary reforms. I wanted to be certain that the stimuli I proposed to introduce would have maximum effectiveness. Therefore, my first move would have to be to determine what support I could count on from each sector of the nation.

A new bureau, technically organized from the beginning in spite of the national poverty, devoted itself to exact compilation of data on the population, its rural and urban distribution, its productive potential, and all other information falling in the category of statistics.

In this way the concept of **population**, differentiated from the word **people**, was endowed with a dynamic role that it had never before had. Plans for the betterment of the population could now be implemented with knowledge of that population's resources

for productivity, in its demographic distribution, industrial and agricultural potential.

Implicit in differentiation between the **people** and **population** concepts was the classified analysis of the contribution that each citizen could make to the Dominican renaissance in his particular sphere of activities.

The word **society** is what is most habitually identified with the word **people**. It is my belief that the idea of **society** differs from that of **people** in that it tends to conjure up a utilitarian objective and more precisely defined purpose.

While **population** is a statistical concept and **people** a dynamic concept, **society** is a practical concept. A population is merely a result of grouping, people are characterized by movement but society encompasses the reason for being a motive for that movement. Thus, the word **society** has come to take in the human potentialities of a nation: the people's creative and constructive capacities. In the sense that **people** is opinion, **society** is creation. In this context **society** is a living, operative entity; it, like the **people** but with different objectives, should constitute a consolidated unit.

In this light, **society** acquires other unique properties such as its representative capacity of the nation, its coordinating action, and permanence. The first of the above properties presents its own specific appearance, distinguishing one from another the various national societies; it sets up limitations, suggests selectivity and, therefore, exclusivity. While **people**

indicates anonymous mass, society implies order and hierarchy. While people is an amorphous whole giving multitudinous impressions, society establishes scales, organization and discipline.

Now then, if those values together with economic and other differences are so vast as to appear antagonistic, society will assume the characteristics of privilege and excessive inequality: the elevation of some and the humiliation of others. This produces internal seeds of decay and anarchy. The state of constant blind rebellion of the prostrate keep latent the inclination to subversion, social hatred and other destructive factors which, once unleashed force the real causes of the country's internal unrest to drop from sight. They are smothered in class and group hatred.

A government leader who aspires to competently perform his duties cannot afford to lose sight of such a fundamental issue. He must strive to achieve that people as a concept advance as far as possible toward the society concept in order that there be harmony and integration.

He must realize that the true human reality is not the individual per se and his riotous development. Nor is it society in its voracious communalism. It is the man, conscious of being a person who takes part, deliberately and freely, in society. Without losing his essence and vital force he becomes part of society.

The person is not converted, however, into a mere plurality of individuals with their ambition-ridden strife; rather he is linked by bonds of unity as re-



presented by meeting of minds in the true sense, by the precision of purpose, identity of mediums, the coordination of wills.

In sum, the function of a statesman blessed with a real sense of country must always further the coordination of the efforts of those associated for the common welfare, not lessening their initiative, but exalting the feeling of personal dignity. Both initiative and dignity, must be stimulated and their development must render tangible benefit and an affirmation of conscience and responsibility. By this I mean that the Dominican society which I would establish had for its purpose the harmonizing of man and social environment into a well-defined balance of rights and duties.

To achieve this I proposed to lessen the differences dividing each group, encourage a universal spirit of cooperation, allay simultaneously the pride of the powerful and the agitation of the oppressed—in short, stimulate harmony and consideration in the unfolding of the common effort. Achieving this, it would mobilize in behalf of the nation all the now-unified civic forces, each working in its own sphere, and from them would flow the strength needed for maximum accomplishments.

This is the guiding spirit of my government and from this stem the successes I have achieved. The old structure of Dominican society had been less divided by the prejudices of the colonial period—those failed to survive in the Republic with the same intensity they did elsewhere—than by political hatred

and clash of ambitions. Dominican society lacked that spirit of unity and cooperation without which the only rule possible is that of anarchy and conflict.

These differences, at times seemingly insoluble, created an atmosphere of acrimony, were propitious to revolt and subversion, undermined the principle of authority, and made of revolution a natural state of affairs. And this situation existed even when the upper classes were unable to show off, economically or otherwise or to deliberately humiliate the humble. Such conditions could prevail only because the individual had not been defined in his dimensions as a person and because his rights and duties to society had never been established.

By forging this link, by demonstrating the real value of unity, by returning to the person his place in society from which he had been thrust when considered an individual, Dominican society began to undergo a transformation of character. In the process it became unified, integrated, meshed.

One of the measures taken for consolidation of the social equilibrium —besides the modifications universally inherent in this concept— was that of preventing the formation of influential groups in government or finance. This would mean the appearance —consolidation, the Dominican case— of a privileged caste whose mere existence is an affront to the rest. From the beginning, therefore, I decided never to seek my closest collaborators or aides among any specific social group, nor to bestow special favor to any such group, to make no distinction in laying

down the law, in the collection of taxes nor in any other realm of official activity.

And so, beginning in 1930 Dominican society unified to the extent that it almost became one class. It was defined by unity of purpose and basic concepts. Lacking were the utopian, stupid and absurd expressions implying prejudice or aggression against anyone. Lacking, too, was the absolute equality so impossible to achieve: man's status in his society depends on his intelligence, capacity and skills.

But these irremedial inequalities could be and were prevented from degenerating into acts of offensive arrogance on the one side and servile humiliation on the other.

This has meant the translation into fact of the theory of equality of opportunity—a theory which has never found effective application in countries which have founded their institutions on the individual and not the person.

And although I must recognize the circumstances attending the formation of the colony—which limited at least in part the manifestations and consequences of the discriminations which are such powerful factors in other countries—the policy of my government in not allocating to a special class or group the privilege of filling official posts contributed much to our social balance and stability.

This policy also stimulated the other two social qualities I mentioned previously: the coordination of society's diverse elements and permanence. This permanence implies continuity, a fundamental require-

ment if a government is to fully and methodically carry out its programs. It is not a brief permanence; rather, it extends through generations so that past, present and future are united and harmonized in society without ruptures nor breaks.

“We will continue to make tomorrow today and we will not permit that it be yesterday. Only thus will we attain the fruits of our toil and pessimism will never block our vision of the light”. Those words I once used to express this thought.

This time permanency enables society and its progressive forces to experience an evolutionary growth and development —and not a revolutionary impetus tending by its very definition to break the continuity by severing links with the past and destroying the present in order to create an artificial future. And even as society must be one unit in the political and administrative sense so it must be in time and history.

All these concepts were of immense practical use to me. It is to them in great part that I owe my success as a government leader. Upon them I have built the foundation of our greatness as a nation, the harmonious development of all social classes to create the present unity, the solid peace and concord, the harmony and balanced output of our economy, and political unification.

Nothing has been imposed by force. Nothing has been obtained by means not logical and spontaneous, nothing has been created contrary to natural laws. The constructive impulse of my government has

always been to implant method and order in the social structure and in all its political and economic realms. Its purpose has been to eliminate or prevent privilege in order that there be an environment in which all citizens have the opportunity to develop their own potentialities.

When I explained in previous pages the economic values which guided me in achieving the Dominican Republic's present state of prosperity and progress and the fundamental contribution of this social organization on behalf of the total liberation of our national sovereignty, I described how my government coordinated capital and labor to even further integrate society into one vital unit in order that those concepts not be mutually antagonistic. For from that antagonism has resulted the dread menace now hanging over our civilization.

## CHAPTER VI

### ESSENCE AND VICISSITUDES OF THE DEMOCRACY

The foregoing has been a condensation of my concept of one of the most elastic, deceptive and highly charged words in contemporary politics. The word: Democracy. I believe, however, it would be well to outline with greater exactitude how I have always practiced the theory of democracy in my government.

No one can deny that democratic ideals, in theory, represent a profoundly significant step in the evolution of the human spirit. These ideals are born of the legitimate and praiseworthy sentiment of equality among men. They have as their primary objective the nullification of all forms of privilege.

According to democratic principles, power comes from the people; each man is born with the right to take part in the public administration and functions of the government if he can qualify by virtue of the honesty, intelligence and morality which make him an outstanding citizen.

All civil functions, contacts, financing, execution of justice, and other functions of authority should be

ruled by inflexible law, publicly discussed analyzed and accepted. No one should escape the dictum of these codes designed to protect the individual —particularly the individual socially or economically ill-endowed— from the arrogance of the State, from its public officials, or from any possible source of domination, violence or exploitation.

Implementation of these principles constitutes the essence and basis of the theory of democracy. It was in this spirit that the nations of the Americas were born. Historians and researchers have taxed their erudition and investigative powers in seeking out the origin of these ideas and the moment they crystallized into the loftiest attainments of civilization and culture. In these pages I could not adequately put forth more than the briefest outline of this subject and it will suffice for my purpose to review how these principles have been applied in our countries and what has been their fruit.

Unquestionably, enunciation of these principle enthalls our spirit of justice by their interpretation of man's yearnings for equitability and equality which springs from the purest Christian philosophy. In this aspect the democratic doctrine assumes a noble, idealistic character tending to protect man's integrity and decency. Its nature is at once both materialistic and spiritual and therefore favorable to the realization of man's potentialities.

But in practice it is neither so straightforward nor simple. Its processes are constantly tampered with by the most savage and conflicting interests.

As a matter of fact the history of countries that boasted of their democratic organization is dominated by violence, shot through with injustice, swayed by perfidy and deception. In almost every sphere money and influence prevailed over legitimate interests as did fraud and deceit over liberty. In almost every instance economics and politics became the exclusive property of privileged social groups. Thus, ancient class distinctions became ever broader, assuming a form that bore no trace of the elemental precepts of the democratic doctrine.

The American republics without exception were founded on the bases of theoretical democracy. Their first constitutions were drawn up in accordance with its precepts. They stipulated almost unlimited human rights while securing a minimum of responsibilities from the citizens. And thus did these constitutions render impractical or unrealistic the exercise of those rights and run counter to blunt historic or economic facts. Political parties were also founded on the proposition of the exercise of those rights. The majority also accepted the doctrines of a liberalism—conceived for totally different circumstances—which aimed at reducing the government's power and authority while emphasizing individual development. I have referred in another chapter to the consequences of this attitude.

The initial clashes of these parties began under the pretext of securing further equality of the people and to reinforce their liberties and rights in regard to the State and all its attributes. But, however



idealistic these endeavours at the very beginning of independence there had already appeared that inequality and privilege. This led to further fiction and lies.

The families and the clans which had traditionally owned the best lands and exploited them under a feudal system, who boasted of the purity of their Spanish lineage, had by merit or fortune, reserved for themselves the right to continue enjoying their privileges and prerogatives. The natives had been humbled by the conquest. They and their descendants—even those who had mixed with the new race—formed inferior classes that were forced to continue their status after the founding of the Republic.

This situation prevailed because the new social order could not evolve apace with the new political order—that is to say, an almost overnight transformation. In many countries slavery persisted until well into the middle of the Nineteenth Century. In the United States itself a bloody civil war was required to achieve emancipation.

But even with the achievement of legal freedom not even the most ringing claims to democracy have as yet been able to eliminate the social and economic inferiority imposed on certain racial groups. This fact is certainly poor testimony to the real application of theoretical equality.

As a consequence of the historical and sociological debris incorporated into the structure of the new republics, society remained stratified into a minority of exploiters and great masses of poverty-stricken

exploited. This was the hard reality in spite of ingenuous theories of ideologists struggling to achieve the expected democratic equality.

While the theorists waxed eloquent over this illusionary philosophy, actual political control fell into the hands of intriguers and demagogues. These new leaders sought to use the discontent of the masses to further their own interest. And there were the political hirelings of privilege who employed endless legalism and verbose sophistry to protect their wealthy masters.

There was civil war, the barracks coup, the substitution by violence of the elected officeholders for the usurpers. Inevitably, political instability coupled with economic injustice were the fruits of the experiment. But in the midst of and throughout this seemingly endless convulsion one word was waved like a banner by each rebel, each exploiter and each exploited, by each politician, capitalist, peon. The word was Democracy. It was their battlecry, not their philosophy, yet each claimed to be its interpreter and infallible administrator.

Latin America's situation has become even more complicated in recent decades. There are various reasons. To the initial shortcomings, hardship, and lack has been added the clashing element of creature comforts to make even more glaring these social inequities. Then there is the growing concentration of workers in urban areas as a result of haphazard but rapid industrial development; the soaring population increase and the accompanying rise in consump-

tion; simultaneously, it has not been uncommon to experience a drop in agricultural production as a result of the farmers' influx to the city.

We have seen grow the sinister operations of Marxism —a direct result of the chaotic practices and lack of results of liberal democracy as well as a reaction to the callousness of the privileged classes who grew steadily more rich, powerful and inclined to international collaboration.

These facts and the antagonism stemming from them have brought almost every country in Latin America to the present state of permanent internal conflict —a state wherein weakness inherent in the nature of the social structure itself are further exacerbated.

From this situation has emerged the present climate of danger in which all that is civilization's finest and purest is gravely menaced.

The social formation of nearly all nations has been erected on the bases of great injustice, of abominable farce and polite lies. And this social formation is the result of the insincerity by which, since the beginning, democratic ideals have been exploited, commercialized, for the benefit of privileged interest.

The great mass of people, crushed by misery, ignorance and permanent hoax, constitute the revolutionary potential which Communism exploits, artificially stimulating problems with false promises, and making hypocritical pledges to create a better world, a world without class, privilege or humiliations.

But with insane blindness the ruling or dominant groups fail to see that their traditional greed, social callousness, lack of humanity, and failure to practice Christian charity, are fanning the flames which may well consume their own vanity and presumptions.

The danger of total subversion has been increased by the policies of inept or corrupt politicians, irresponsible journalists, the greedy and over-ambitious of all stripe. These are the best servants of Communism, precisely because they do so in the name of democracy.

It is their manipulations that from the outset have made impossible that social solidarity, that concord and cooperation that can only result from true democracy.

The American panorama of today is one of turbulence, disorder and confusion. The new apostles of this chaos claim as victories for democracy the seizure of power by violence, the success of an assassin or political gangster. The label as exercises in democracy the actions of the mindless mob, the destruction of wealth under the pretext of social revindication, the systematic strikes, the permanent state of rebellion and the instability of legitimate governments.

In the sweet name of democracy and its pure liberties the walls of Cuba have been blackened with the blood of those who dared to differ with or censor the actions of a brutalized despot.

The label democracy has been placed on governments and politicians who have made themselves veritable corporations for the exploitation of entire

nations and who illicitly enriched themselves beyond the point of scandal.

Democrat is the word that has been applied to the journalist who incites the people to senseless rioting and disorder, who exalts Communism, rejects national patriotism and even that of sovereignty itself. By any true criterion such individuals are manifest traitors to their countries.

The term has been appropriated by mere vandals dedicated to looting and pillaging but who, when organized in gangs, call themselves revolutionary armies. These and their employers, obsessed conspirators seeking to propel themselves to power by bloody uprisings motivated by lust for vengeance, in practice prostitute every basic human right and mobilize new gangs of terrorists to hurl against the public freedom of neighboring nations.

In the indescribably nebulous world of today virtually every political crime can be cloaked in the word democracy: cooperation with the all-consuming intrigues of Communism, launching of revolutions to satisfy personal ambitions regardless of the resulting misery and death, service to the greed of privileged groups holding an iron grip on community wealth while imposing slave labor conditions on the masses; demagoguery and appeals to the base instincts of the uneducated and lawless, holding of farcical elections with predetermined results, wrecking the continuity of constructive programs; the overthrow of legitimately established governments; suppression of human freedoms, that have been man's right since the Stone

Age, under the pretext of sublimating them to "liberal individualism"; the commission of every conceivable crime, excess, lie.

The practitioners and beneficiaries of this violence call themselves democrats and each claims to be more pure and advanced than the others. On the strength of such claims they constitute themselves implacable judges empowered to rule upon the way of life and system in other countries.

Each of these new pseudo-democrats seeks to impose his will —his delinquency, his lie, his exploitation, his gallows, his jails, his misery, and his ignorance as models of democracy.

Of this type are the judges and critics who have warred upon my regime and my works. Vicious murderers, agents of Communism, international thieves, hypocrites, venal journalists, bandits become revolutionary leaders, and other criminals who have drowned their own peoples in bankruptcy and anarchy. It is they who have rendered impossible the ideal of hemispheric unity. They have made themselves judge and jury to condemn the spotless and sincere application that I have given democracy. From that application and that democracy has arisen the splendid reality of the modern Dominican Republic with its institutional stability and outstanding social, economic and political accomplishments. Most of all, they cannot forgive that I succeeded.

What is the inspiration which has guided my administration from the beginning and which was my deep conviction even prior to entering public life?

In the first place I would put my practicality. This has tended to subordinate theory —however beautifully conceived and phrased—to the physical realities of the situation to which they are to be applied. This, I believe, has put in motion an expanding, living growing democracy.

I have stated my intent to be that of administrating in exact accord with Dominican realities —not to attempt to adjust those realities to the purely idealist aspects of democracy which have never been possible to implement anywhere. I have never sought to warp our situation into any rigid mold of principles and a priori judgements. I have clearly stated: "Democracy must operate in rapport with the necessities and characteristics of each group, impelled and guided by objective confirmation of a determined society. Democracy is economic, religious, political, social, human. In brief it must evolve and operate in accord with the tradition, history, ethnology and geography of the group when, of course, that function is essentially oriented to the betterment of the community".

From the outset of my administration I was determined to establish in the Dominican Republic a democracy, "that must go beyond the limits set here, as in many other countries, regarding man's interests and well-being".

It was precisely because my convictions were clearly outlined that my policies and actions in building a democracy limited only by Dominican realities, were equally clear. I never accepted that subversion,

under whatever pretext, constitutes a legitimate political medium. Nor did I labor for the fulfillment of personal ambitions. I did not foment discord and conflict among the citizenry. I persecuted no one; I have never known personal hate. Corrupt practices do not tempt me, nor did I seek to perpetuate the irregularities that were part of Dominican history until 1930.

My concept of democracy has been as true as I enunciated it at the beginning. It includes every realm of man's potential: the enjoyment of rights and the fulfillment of his duties, the exercise of his personal liberties and respect for those of others; obedience to the law and maintainance of order; elimination of privilege and achieving of a balanced society; protection of the personal dignity due human beings and man's right to progress and the concord resulting therefrom; social integration and the permanent clarity of the fundamental concepts of the Government, the State, and Society; the guiding of our national life by a realistic plan for the achievement of maximum benefit; the sublimation of the *patria* as the sum and total of all to be attained.

Thus, I did not conceive of a democracy in the conventional term. That is to say, the protection of special interests, political or otherwise; nor in the continuation of inequitable privileges standing in the way of national progress; nor in fierce disputes for control of a weak, precarious government —disputes motivated by desire for personal gain.

I conceived of democracy in all its dimensions: in the exercise of political liberties as well as economic



equality; in social justice as well as institutional stability; in absolute autonomy and national sovereignty as well as the safeguarding of personal dignity and all that is encompassed by that term.

This broadening of what Democracy means I expressed in a message to the National Congress: "Democracy has no function except as an instrument of solidarity", and added. "The State cannot easily carry out its fundamental purposes of organization unless it feels itself strongly supported by the readiness of the individual to accept inter-dependence and a community of interests. But the only agent for the cementing of this inter-dependence is the effectiveness of authority. This is only achieved, however, when authority genuinely responds to the legitimate demands of the public welfare. No one likes to make concessions to the State unless there is returned to him in services, comfort and tranquility the value of those concessions.

"Never have I regarded democracy as an agent of misery and retrogression. A hungry, ill-clothed, undernourished, disease-wracked, morally-deficient population does not qualify to reach the goals of democracy —although, theoretically, on paper, that population has given itself that system. Democracy surges from prosperity, physical health, the moral well-being of the individual and the family. Democracy is something organic, vital, evolutionary that today can not be founded but on the basis of the better capacity of the Government to make meaningful and valuable the lives of human beings.

“A country without funds, without enough schools, without roads, substantial agriculture, industries, hospitals, hotels, aqueducts, streets, sewage systems, electric power, police, sanitation, public buildings, higher education, worker security, social services, archives, libraries, census, statistics, technical services, merchant marine, newspapers, recreation centers, may wear the facade of democracy but will not be a country that can effectively meet the necessities and demands of civilized well-being.”

Thus, for me implicit to democracy is the entirety of man's being and his place within the national community.

From this point of view democracy comes to signify social harmony, the formation of a unique solidarity which, as I said before, is somewhat equivalent to the existence of only one class, or at least eliminates the discrepancies which make for degeneration into conflict. This harmony must be on a scale proportionate to the problems of the community, to internal circumstances, and realities historic, economic and human.

The duty of the sincerely democratic leader is to classify and arrange each social factor according to his criterion of how to best achieve an orderly, cohesive society by the coordinated effectiveness of the dynamic whole.

If society realizes its aims, if the essential national values develop in a constructive direction, if solidarity is achieved as a natural consequence or expression of social unity; and if, as a result of these factors there

is manifested universal accord, spontaneous cooperation, the consolidation of public opinion, then it is evident that not only is the country democratically governed but that democratic convictions have taken root in the spirit of the people.

I must recognize that the social unification of the Dominican people has an important base. The various types of discrimination —racial, religious, political, etc.— that have produced such deep schisms in nearly every American country have always lacked any real depth in the Dominican Republic. There exists, of course, some tendency for certain groups to be more nationally active than others; this, however, has never taken the shape of hostility and systematic exclusion. Our former inability to live together peacefully had its cause in other sources: chiefly the sway of personal ambitions over the general good. By this I mean that political differences did not have the same ideological intensity they did in other nations; rather they were procedural in nature or sprang simply from the followings of *caudillos*.

I am not attempting to formulate an analysis of Dominican history. I seek only to present facts. And it is certainly an indisputable fact that it was precisely as a result of the moral superficiality of this internal conflict that the Nation and its constituent elements preserved a latent democratic will that flourished in civic activities in both peace and war and which constituted part of the make up of our national psychology.

Never in our history had there appeared a mind capable of clearly appreciating this fact —an ill-

defined one, to be sure— nor was there a will capable of formulating and applying a concrete program for its adequate interpretation. When I put these two qualities at the service of the country, however, and began to act on them the people —with their massive will— and society as a whole —with its organic instincts— rallied to my programs and followed them through to success.

Some of the socially nihilistic forces which had represented the hard core of our historic internal strife sought to outlast the unequivocal decision of the vast majority to embark upon my programs of development. But from the beginning, national interest overcame such obstacles and the democracy latent in our national character surged to the fore. It was eventually to be transformed, when I had amply stimulated it, not only into a conscience but also a way of life.

In order, however, that this positive structure not be undermined by treason, greed, anarchy, nor by any of the forces of nihilism which had shaken our history, and that this reconstruction not be constantly menaced by dislocation, it was necessary that every citizen, regardless of status, cooperate steadfastly.

This cooperation had to be rendered not as a favor to the government, nor by imposition of the government; it had to be the combined result of emotional motivation and reasoning. To further clarify, I wanted the citizen's loyalty to my policies to be fully conscious, voluntary, the result of his own free determination. I had not come to shepherd a flock, but to lead

a society of people capable of exercising reason, discrimination and sensitivity. United, these factors form a total infinitely more solid than the sum of the parts.

It was this conviction, added to my belief in man as a person and not merely as an individual which has always caused me to consider public education and culture to be one of the most vigorous supports of democracy. It was that cultural development which was to prevent both passive submission and systematic rebellion. It was to make social unity both a conscience and a force.

From the first I had realized that any government which attempts to build its authority on the foundation of the ignorance of the governed is precarious and brittle: the support for such governments is not based on conviction but on volatile impulse and with no origin in reason.

The immense task of cultural development which I began in 1930 took form in the constantly growing number of schools, the application of every medium of instruction and their adaptation to every age group, the building of a civic conscience and understanding of the links between the citizen and his community and country, the constant campaign against illiteracy, the steady stimulation and encouragement of the people's artistic expression—in sum, systematic education not limited to the economically able classes. The program was primarily intended for those situated in a more economically precarious position whether the cause was ineptitude or indolence. This was and

is one of the major forces to dynamize Dominican democracy and make it flourishing and fruitful.

Employing the concepts I have outlined with those social groups whose civic preparation as Dominicans was truncated or incomplete, I attempted a realistic interpretation of the situation. I believed I may take pride in having organized and supported a democracy exactly balanced as to necessities, antecedents, possibilities, and to the moral historical and even geographic characteristics of the people.

It is a democracy whose design and methods would surely not be applicable to another country not having the same exact characteristics of the Dominican—a land that has not suffered as this country has, that has not faced the same adversities and dangers, that need not direct its energies along the same lines. Ours is thus a democracy which does not seek to thrust itself on other peoples as infallible dogma. Nor is it merely a grandiose theory to win elections.

My government and the type of democracy into which the nation has been organized have frequently been attacked on the pretext that I did not blindly follow the theories and doctrines that others have sought to sublimate. They have criticized because I submitted them to a painstaking analysis and adaptation and then conceived and brought into being a system exactly geared to Dominican realities. But these diatribes have been unable to destroy the results of a policy that has so plainly produced a wealthy, stable nation and thereby created harmony and peace. In having brought prosperity to my people my satis-

faction is not dampened in the slightest by the criticism and vilification of adversaries saturated in prejudice or ignorance. They would have liked to implant their own particular brand of democracy motivated by self-interest or farcical stereotype —not the true realities and genuine well-being of the Dominican people.

In 1940, after 10 years experience in a struggle which was achieving undeniable success, I could assert to following to the National Congress:

“We have lived for democracy, we have fought for it and suffered at the beginning of our life. And for it we have built a peaceful world in which all disputes may be easily reconciled for democracy. We will fight if there arrives a day that it be necessary to defend by force of arms the great treasure of fraternal liberty that we have created in this peace.

Twenty years have passed and these words have the same truth and currency that they did then. They represent exactly what I have always believed and condense the essence of what my government has sought to accomplish.

## CHAPTER VII

### PUBLIC FREEDOMS

Apart from the word "democracy", perhaps no other has been given so many interpretations, definitions nor been the subject of so much controversy as that of "freedom". The most contradictory philosophical, judicial, economic and even theological systems have been founded and formulated on its various meanings, and no other abstract idea than that which it represents in one way or another, has been the cause of such bitter strife or has had such a decisive influence on the historical process of humanity.

No other right of the human being has ever been subjected to so much misuse and yet, so defended. It has been abolished or ignored completely; it has been extolled to fever pitch; it has been restricted; it has been granted limitless scope and it has been conditioned to artificial circumstances. Its restriction or its enjoyment has ranged from slavery to licentiousness, from its subordination to the common good to individualist absolutism, from complete flexibility to rational responsibility. And in the heterogeneous exposition or practical application of its theories,



everyone has believed himself to be in possession of the real truth and to represent the natural hope of mankind. Everyone attempts to put his beliefs and opinions into concrete form, and the struggle to impose such forms on others has led to the most disastrous strife among men.

In the same way as with other basic beliefs that sustain the organization and structure of all American nations, I believe that the so-called unchangeability of the definition of freedom, and the impossibility of reaching agreement as to its legitimate scope and object have contributed greatly to uncertainty and confusion.

No one can be unaware of the fact that every movement for independence, every heroic struggle and every great sacrifice made by the founders of Nations, have been exclusively inspired by their desire for freedom, and how, despite their victories, slavery has in fact existed for many years after the birth of any Republic.

The abstract idea has been written into every Constitution as a fundamental principle, but the circumstances of each and every country brought about the establishment of differences as to its meaning, operation and limitations. Thus it is that while in some countries an excess of freedom led to anarchy, in others, the most drastic steps were taken to limit the activities of the inhabitants and the cruellest of despotisms was introduced.

In the process of its development in practically every country, controversies, polemics, civil wars and

the ideas of ambitious leaders and of politicians lacking in all sense of patriotism, gradually weakened the basic idea, making it ever more obscure.

As with democracy, every insurgent who ever took up arms, every man who has been a candidate for some public post, every representative of some obscure and ill-defined interest or of an unconfessable desire, has become the self-appointed representative of freedom. This has resulted in still greater contradictions and these, in turn, have increased doubts, confused the issue and weakened the significance of the basic idea.

Finally, the present position was reached in which freedom and democracy have lost their real meaning and scope and no longer constitute a cohesive force for nations, but rather a reason for turbulence, dissension and even hatred. The hazy flexibility of democracy has become identified with the soft enjoyment of freedom. Any low class bandit, any politician who is a failure, any ambitious agitator, can organize a revolution on the pretext of restoring democracy or freedom, as they understand them, that is, in a way that will permit them to take possession of and to enjoy the contents of the treasury, and impose bureaucracy. And when these conspiracies achieve victory, the first show of democracy and freedom promised by their promoters, consists in the erection of scaffolds for the elimination of their conquered adversaries and for satisfying their personal thirst for homicidal vengeance. The jails open wide their voracious doors in order to strangle any show of

disagreement or lack of confidence, and confiscation places in the hands of the victors, the wealth that had for long been coveted.

In this fashion, revolutions for freedom have frequently culminated in the most terrible crimes and in the elevation to absolutism of a petty thief, or of an unimportant agitator who decrees the death penalty, abolishes natural rights and violates human dignity—all in the name of freedom and democracy.

Communism has raised this profanation to the category of a technique. Its agents, while speaking only of liberty and democracy, destroy everything that is noble and clean in the human spirit and in the structure of society. The most bloodthirsty tyranny, the most terrible killings, the most infamous slavery, the even distribution of poverty and vilification are all presented by the spokesmen for Communism as demonstrations of peace, freedom and democracy. And with these monstrous lies they have been poisoning the life of American nations, have imposed lack of understanding, censorship, hatred and the conflicts they require for carrying out their plans of domination.

During the first days of my Government, the Communist monster only showed itself as an ill-defined threat. It had disguised its true meaning and presented itself as a new ideal of justice, highlighted against the backdrop of Tsarist autocracy. It was impossible for anyone to guess to what extent it would develop, and the American countries, concentrating on their century-old struggle to organize themselves,

could never have believed that the corrosion of Marxism would so deeply falsify the sense and purpose of the principles on which the nations had been founded, principles which, as we already know, are excessively abstract in character, unadapted to the realities of each country, of each people, of each region, but which are nevertheless stated in an absolute form, with few exceptions or attenuating circumstances and, therefore, lack any possible defense.

However, if it was impossible to guess to what extent the Communist power of destruction would grow, and the type of arms it would employ to destroy our nations and sink our civilization, the clarity of the ideas and principles which guided my actions, corresponding strictly to Dominican reality, enabled me to guarantee the essential values of the Nation. This resulted in the protective and impenetrable covering which began to take shape in regard to Communism whose attacks, triumphant in less defended countries, have been frustrated here. Among these essential values was that of a proper evaluation of freedom.

Having established the pre-eminence of the idea of the **person** over that of the **individual**, so materialistic and pragmatic, in the human being, it is essential to recognize freedom as one of his chief needs. Without it, the human being would be incapable of carrying out his fundamental domestic and social functions, and would lose the reason for his existence.

This freedom has been fully established in the field of theology and religion, and is what makes man

responsible for his acts, justifies the reward and punishment set forth by divine justice, defines virtues and vice and what sustains the structure of public and private morals. It is a universal axiom that responsibility diminishes proportionately to the human being losing his freedom.

Consequently, even social structure itself is based on the freedom of its associations which, in turn, presupposes the importance of each and every one of these. It is also the freedom of the human being, that is to say, his ability to decide his own behavior, that maintains and consolidates social harmony, permits crime to be defined, laws to be decreed, punishments to be established and regulates the conduct and the behavior of all members of society.

Despite the complete clarity of this mechanism, the operation of which has been the basis of my government, it appeared to me to be indispensable to better define the relations that exist between the freedom of man as human being, considered by itself, and as a social element linking society as a whole.

If as a human being he has certain inherent and well-defined freedoms which cannot be violated, such as those of choosing his own place of residence, of working in whatever profession he may think best, of rearing a family, of possessing property, and others which constitute the natural expansion of personality, he is entitled, as a unit of society, to those freedoms which can only be held in relation to other people, such as those of expressing his thoughts, meeting with others for political or commercial purposes, participat-

ing in the administration of the State through public activities, cooperating as an official, his ability to elect and to be elected, and of others of a like nature. Some freedoms are his in both senses, like that of property which, apart from being personal, is related to society by reason of the influence it can exert on the economy in general.

In fact, almost all freedoms, even those of a most intimate nature, are really conditioned by set norms of general convenience; that is to say, their use implies an undertaking, or a compliance with a duty. For example, a man is entirely at liberty to choose his place of dwelling, but must pay certain taxes, submit himself to municipal regulations in regard to housing, and avoid any act which might reduce or inconvenience the freedom of his neighbor.

However, if the interrelation and stability of society can only be conceived by taking for granted the freedom of each one of its members, it becomes evident that only by establishing the rights and the obligations which pertain to this personal freedom, is it possible to organize and develop such society.

The recognition of rights is a powerful force for harmony as the knowledge of the exact scope of such rights avoids any invasion of the terrain of others, and such limitation is one of the component parts of the duty of everyone in relation to the rest.

Starting then from the idea of the freedom of the individual, one comes to the existence of rights and obligations which are not only correlative, but consequential one of the other. Indecision as to the

scope of rights falsifies the interpretation of freedom and must of necessity lead to privilege or violence. Thus, only by a just balance of all those ideas can order exist, and order, of necessity, establishes hierarchy and authority.

Therefore, when people speak of absolute freedom, it is not only of an unreal abstraction, but of something fallacious. Individualism, by proclaiming the supremacy of the individual, attempts to isolate him from every relationship with others, and to establish his own convenience, from an isolationist point of view, as one of life's supreme norms.

The idea pleases certain irresponsible and irreflexive minds, and many of these even come to believe that only that country could rightly be called democratic in which such an illusion can function. They do not pause to remember the tremendous conflicts which have destroyed social harmony where this has been attempted, even in a reduced form; when the individualist absolutism, selfish and fierce, of each one, has attempted to impose itself on the theoretic absolutism of the rest, nor in the way in which the simple proclamation of their tenets has led to the hegemony of the strongest or the weakest and, consequently, to dictatorship and the preponderance of minorities which end up by converting themselves into oligarchies.

The Utopian country in which the absolute freedom of the individual can be exercised with no other limitation than that of its own interest or individual caprice, cannot exist, not even by a return

to the pastoral or sylvan primitivism eulogized by some Utopians. But, as a theory, it has been useful to some speculators in public faith, and to those ambitious revolutionaries who have promised this phantasy of freedom in order to recruit adepts who will subsequently reclaim, in vain, free rein for their individualities.

In order to be able to judge the freedom through which the individual, with all his prerogatives and fulness, fits into the social organization, it is essential, in the same way as it is for any other government function, that the true statesman should appreciate human realities with their specific circumstances formed by history, by local atmosphere and by the destinies of the Nation, in an essentially practical sense.

This concept is what exactly fixes the scope of freedom and the corresponding exercise of rights and obligations without which no social organization can be maintained or can survive. Such exercise can only stem from a spirit of equity and justice, the result of the clear appreciation each one has of his responsibilities.

“Freedom —as I said in a speech on the 8th January, 1938, declining the Presidential candidacy— is the best clime in which to conciliate the practical effectiveness of the political regime of representative democracy; but its existence as an indispensable social factor in the unrestricted and sincere formation of public opinion will be more imaginary than real if freedom has not been preceded by social customs of equity and justice”.



When, in 1930, I accepted the supreme leadership of the Government, I had evolved for myself a precise plan for rescuing the violated prerogatives of the Nation, and this plan, synthesized in its political and material part in the declaration of principles which I drew up on the 14th May of the same year, included from profound respect for the freedoms of the public and of the citizen, and the inherent rights of the human being, to achieving and preserving public security, political stability, guarantees for peace, economic recuperation and social harmony and solidarity, and ending with the complete re-establishment of sovereignty.

My plan and the decision to put it into operation, meant the adoption of measures and instruments necessary to that end. I have already explained how I forged my own political ideas to suit my ultimate goal. In the field of the citizen's goodwill, I needed complete cooperation, and I started out to achieve this from the very first moment by stimulating popular confidence, by elevating the cultural level, by immediately rewarding effort, by unifying the principles and objectives set forth by the Dominican Party and by strengthening the collective psychological transformation. The formation of this spirit of collaboration would be completed by establishing very clearly the balance of freedoms, and by fixing the scope of each one of these, whether personal or public.

It is possible that in the history of America no other people has struggled so hard or made such great

sacrifices as did the Dominican people in achieving their freedom. And yet, their conquests were never positive, only hazy and limited. Really, never even at the price of their blood, so generously shed, did they enjoy such freedom as would allow them to develop their potentiality.

Foreign dominations, some of which endeavored in vain to destroy the very essence of our national life; selfish leaders, who assumed power for themselves and for their friends to the detriment of popular majorities; insurgents arising from nothing, who achieved the principal posts urged on solely by their audacity and lack of scruples; hordes of revolutionaries who laid waste whole regions, terrorizing their inhabitants and destroying everything in their path, all these, counting on the support of an invincible military power, were the factors responsible for Dominican slavery.

Every leader, every insurgent and every politician plotted on the pretext of recovering one or other of the freedoms violated by the government. Groups of revolutionaries, sometimes guileless and at others nefarious, held meetings and threw themselves into revolt; and when these revolutions triumphed, the government which emerged from their violence would suppress freedoms, cancel guarantees and protect its followers, and all this would once again awaken the fears of other leaders, and so on, successively.

On many occasions, the citizens, roused by the resultant demagoguery, would ignore the governments elected by them on the pretext of their having

betrayed certain freedoms; and when their guileless sacrifices achieved victory, the coveted freedom would change its direction and sense, but, only as far as the victors were concerned, while the vanquished would go into exile or mount the scaffold. And this confusion, this anarchy and this predominance of insecurity was what had impeded the Republic from fulfilling its destinies, from following its historical routes, even such as were parallel to those of other countries, and caused it to suffer greater depths of martyrdom and pain than its American brothers.

It was necessary, therefore, to establish a sincere and coordinated exercise of public freedoms so that these would serve neither as a pretext for personal ambition and political anarchy, nor be seized by a small group to the detriment of the Nation, or lead to such lamentable situations as that of foreign occupation, ending in national humiliation. It was necessary to define, and above all, to bring about a harmonious meshing of rights and obligations in order that none of the essences of the Nation and of the attributes of the human being should be besmirched, and no individual or collective dignity, mistreated.

“Simple statutory freedom, this is, the formal rhetorical dedication of freedom through the precepts of public rights, is not sufficient to make us free”, I said on one solemn occasion. And I added: “Seldom, if ever, have measures been missing from our substantive law, or from those others which qualify them, measures by which to provide a long and magnificent life of public freedoms. Nevertheless, because the

essential was missing —the powerful spirit of true freedom, the result of an education which is incapable of improvising goodwill— we have often witnessed the sad spectacle which has provoked so much distress among our people in the past.

Abandoned to their own impulses, they became prey to extremist oscillations fluctuating between the excesses of tyranny and those of licentiousness, always omitting to adopt that half-way position in which a judicious use of legal freedom represents one of the most beautiful conquests of human culture”.

By the coordination of every factor comprising it, freedom would be protected, and the exercise of freedom, represented, as has been said, by rights and obligations, would result in the development of those inherent virtues of the people, shown throughout the length of their history, in adversity as well as in fortune, which, under upright and patriotic direction, would tend to the relief of all the forces of the nation: peace, wealth, harmony and national unity.

One of the freedoms most preached by demagogues and revolutionaries is that of politics, with their innumerable verbal and written expressions. In the same way as every principle on which nations have been founded, the theory and definition of this freedom has reached unimaginable and ingenious proportions.

It was supposed that, by nature, people are concrete beings, incapable of erring in their decision as to their destiny, moved by one single will, that of love, inspired only by the interest of general harmony,

and coherent as a psychological body. It was forgotten that world history is the recapitulation of passions which perverted men and drove them to conflict and belligerency, like ambition, which incites to ignoring every ethical norm so as to satisfy a cupidity for money or a thirst for power, or like vengeance, which exalts hatred, and that these passions are such as upset the unity of a people and betray the common interest. Without taking all this into consideration, and believing that the people would make only just and equable use of unrestricted political freedom, every force which could have regulated them was annulled.

However, the truth did not coincide with the illusions of such guileless ideologists, nor did the exercise of such extremes lead to the abundance of which they had dreamed, but rather to despotism, privilege, exclusivity and humiliation, and by a defensive reaction, to revolution and anarchy.

By eliminating the retaining wall against excesses, a wall in which they did not believe, and which consisted of the establishment of correlative obligations in the use of political freedoms, human nature was overestimated to the point of thinking that men act always exclusively toward the general good, to such an extent that, with considerable frequency, they become over-enthusiastic and sacrifice themselves through the emergence of a personality which, in order to triumph, is capable of destroying even the foundations of the life of the nation and, which on achieving victory, condemns the vanquished to op-

probrium and to extermination in order to establish its own absolutism.

Forgotten was the wise maxim with which George Washington defined the true equilibrium of freedom and the jurisdiction of the law: "Freedom is no more than a word in those countries in which the Government is too weak to resist the maneuvers of various factions, to confine every member of society within the limits prescribed by Law, and to keep everyone secure and peaceful in the enjoyment of the rights of the individual and of property".

Naturally, it is an undeniable fact that man tends to lean towards his well-being, his evolution and his progress. However, he does not always have the necessary discernment to be able to define exactly what these goals are, nor the will-power to escape the treacherous influence of those who wish to take advantage of his ambitions in order to place them at the service of their own personal ambitions. It is precisely in such circumstances that the significance of the word **people** is deliberately disfigured and where, instead of giving it a dynamic and constructive sense, it is torn into factions or parties which are incited to fight among themselves.

To sum up, political freedom cannot be exercised in practice in a completely unrestricted manner, but must rather be conditioned to collective beneficial ends, to national stability and to order and organization, and these can only be defined by an authority that, apart from being legally constituted, bases its actions on deeply sincere ideals of service to, and

love of the Nation, the supreme regulator of all common acts.

In our times, Communism has taken tremendous advantage of this denaturalization of human truths. People have become steeped in sophistry under the exaltation provoked by romantic ideologists and treacherous intriguers, and believe that absolute freedom, whether or not leading to national ruin and desintegration, is democracy's most pure and authentic expression.

This idea, which becomes an attempt at collective suicide under the effects of the bloody influence of treacherous direct or indirect interests, leads to the theory that any uprising for the purpose of overthrowing a legitimate government, any disturbing of the peace, any mob attack on public buildings, any assassination of a leader, or any united and systematic opposition in order to block a regime, are acts which constitute just and suitable expressions of human freedom.

Furthermore, any Government which tries to impose respect for the sacred principles of the Nation; that keeps order despite the infuriated mob; that does not give way before insurrection; that protects real freedom to live and work in peace without let or hindrance, is called despotic, dictatorial, tyrannical and other names which Communism has coined for the use of those guileless people whom they would subjugate; and only the Government that tolerates subversion; that collapses before the first onslaught of an anarchist mob; that gives up the field to Com-

munism and permits the total liquidation of the country, is worthy of the name of democracy.

Communist agitators encourage this interpretation of freedom for their own ends as it gives them a free hand, and people abandon themselves to it without pausing to think that they will end up by being devoured alive. Because, when through violence, revolution or the use of any other brutal means, Communism gets into power, it immediately becomes the most ferocious of despotisms. It does not endeavor to restrict freedom, but rather to eliminate it altogether, and to destroy something that is so essential to Christian philosophy as the rights of the human being.

The immense peril of Communism, the breadth of human evolution and the present state of society and of nations, prove that I was not wrong when, from the inception of my Government, I established the existence of certain unalterable primacies in order that the balance of progress should not be impaired, and I declared that public freedom must be conditioned by principles and factors which are more important than freedom itself.

I once said: "In the world of human relations, together with written rights there must always be those inner ethics by which honest and upright men always behave as such". One of these principles is personal dignity, and another is national sovereignty: without the first, man becomes a machine, without will-power, freedom or responsibility, a plaything of despotism, loaded with obligations and subject to every kind of violence; without the second, the Nation



is no longer a Nation, and must bear whatever humiliation, subjection or slavery any foreign power, wishing to limit its autonomy, may care to impose upon it. Consequently, any exercise of freedom which might lead to a weakening of these principles or of any other essential, is imprudent, and can only lead to destruction or demagogic ostentation, a vain and fleeting illusion.

This was the situation the Dominican Republic found itself in in 1930. The people's dignity and the sovereignty of the Nation had been weakened. And even if Communism had not yet acquired either the necessary impetus or technique to achieve its pestilential infiltration among our people, it was obvious that it was already proving itself to be a danger of considerable importance.

Certain rulers and political leaders of those times may possibly have thought that Communism would bring with it certain forms of social justice which they could use where convenient, and reject the rest. I did not fall for this ingenious idea. "Dominican sociology is not facing any phenomenon of a socialist nature—I said in a speech in 1932—and any action not in keeping with the natural conditions of the medium, would be inconsequential to the realities in which the Dominican people are living." I had already declared that nothing justified any Communist-style orientation of the country.

I was inspired by the supreme objective of a healthy Nation and of reconquering its essentials, and to this end everything must be subordinated, and any

influence liable to turn me aside from such a goal, must be avoided. My efforts must be directed towards the rational and harmonious exploitation of all national forces, balanced by a methodical exercise of freedom, in order to unite the will of all in favor of a noble and pure ideal.

Precisely because of these convictions and of my determination to put them into practice after having laid my plans and established the basic ideas, I was not prepared to lead a Government subject to the ebbs and flows of demagogy, nor disposed to interrupt its labors by occasional and artificially prepared strife. I would defend the two main principles of national sovereignty (I have already explained the means by which I would attempt to reconquer this) and the human dignity of Dominicans, against every attack that might imperil them. Consequently, all public activities and the exercise of freedom, would be conditioned so as not to injure either one. Rather the contrary, freedom would be directed towards the civilized end of serving both essentials, the personal and the national. I would protect every public freedom, that of expression, of reunion, and of criticism, public as well as private, on the indispensable condition that their exercise would in no way affect either the dignity of the citizen or the stability and sovereignty of the Nation. Economic freedom would be subject to a plan and an orientation with no limitation to its development, but rather fostered by official aid, since by reason of world circumstances, and particularly, the circumstances of the Dominican

Republic, it would be impossible to create any sound economic structure.

The Government's experience and the results obtained have shown me that I was absolutely right in my appreciation of the fact that only by a methodical exercise of freedom, with its consequent rights and obligations, within a logical hierarchy, can true democracy exist. When contemplating the work performed, I feel satisfied at having rejected the subversive notion that democracy can only subsist on the theory of licentiousness of every kind, on popular uprisings and on the weakness and instability of the regime, which has caused so much harm in those countries that have fallen for it.

Furthermore, it is true to say that in those countries in which government action was reduced to the least possible expression during the experiment of doctrinary liberalism (today, there are none in which such an absurdity exists) every single freedom was conditioned in one way or another. For example, that of worship, which was adopted as the synthesis and symbol of rationalist exaltation and of classic materialism, and which tended to protect atheism, was decreed with every possible latitude, although such latitude did not cover protection for obscene, sacrilegious or scandalous behavior since, despite all extremist philosophies, the existence of something supreme, intangible and essential for the life of the collectivity, such as public morals, had to be admitted: that of the press, which was another stylization of political romanticism and considered to be the most precious

of the rights of the citizen, was limited by the interpretation of the laws of slander and perjury, and by respect for the reputation of one's neighbor, even in the most elastic of regimes.

Every law is really a regulation which conditions the exercise of freedom and establishes rights and obligations. Under the sway of total freedom proclaimed by ill-intentioned theoretical demagogues and revolutionaries, any law, even the most elemental, is considered an abuse of authority, a restriction of freedom and a dictatorial act.

The Dominican people, accustomed in the hard school of their history, fully understood my reasoning and the principles my Government would uphold, and accepted them with enthusiasm. When I put my proposal into concrete form in the declaration of principles of the Dominican Party, and explained my objectives, the people made haste to admit me into their ranks with an enthusiasm that showed a total unanimity of opinion. They understood that by founding a completely voluntary collectivity, the enlistment in whose ranks could only stem from discernment, from example, and from the will and decision of each citizen, that is to say, from the full use of his freedom, I was impregnating my Government with the purest of democratic ideals.

The Dominican people have always enjoyed every opportunity for analyzing my work, not only as regards the doctrine which governs it, but also as to its concrete results. They have found it good, progres-

sive and benevolent, and have confirmed their faith in me on many occasions.

The proper exercise of their basic freedom, which I interpreted and have applied with all my influence throughout the period of my Government, has consolidated peace, order and social collaboration, all of which have led to wealth, the development of inherent virtues and the restoration of our national sovereignty.

These results are due, precisely, to the fact that I conceived a method, a spirit and a procedure of government essentially suitable to Dominican circumstances, unsubjected to hazy theories, to abstract and ill-defined ideals which have led other countries to moral confusion and material ruin. I well know that I have been attacked by reason of the practical sense which has inspired me, for the realism of my actions, for not having submitted to extraneous arbitrary ideas and their blind acceptance, as the demagogues and political intriguers of other countries would have wished, and precisely by those who have been most abject in their failure. But, in the face of any verbal exaltation proceeding from stupid or impassioned adversaries, there rises as an indestructible pyramid, the positive fact of Dominican prosperity, harmony and dignity.

## CHAPTER VIII

### ECONOMIC BASES OF SOVEREIGNTY

In accordance with my basic principles, neither the Nation as a reality, as I explained on another page, nor democracy as a system intended not only for the methodical exercise of public freedom but also for the vast and concrete objective of the unanimous cooperation of the live forces of a country towards the common welfare, could exist or function other than with the unrestricted functioning of national sovereignty. And it is well-known to what extent this sovereignty had been restricted in the Dominican Republic of 1930, and how the fate of the Nation depended on its redemption, not only for its legal institutions, but for its very existence.

It is evident that throughout the course followed by America's international policy during the past, and of a good part of the present century, there moved many factors of various proportions, some clearly expressed and others cloaked with indirect forms. To them, it was necessary to apply the most appropriate measures to suit each individual case, occasionally physical pressure, economic combinations, diplomatic intrigue or even the corruption of conscience.

Many historians and economists have referred at some length to the origin of the Dominican Republic's foreign debt; the traps and ambushes to which the guilelessness or covetousness of the original rulers had made them easy prey; the colonial ambitions that hung over the country as a constant threat and as a permanent source of intrigue, the squandering of loans, and the concentration of debts in the hands of one powerful company with the backing of the United States government, which converted private transactions into affairs of international status in order to impose on us the extortionate covenant of 1907, by which the Customs were handed over to the United States government, and the administrative autonomy of the country curtailed.

A vast number of volumes have been written about the foreign military occupation of 1916, of its causes and effects, the most serious of which was the ratification in 1924 of the same extortionate agreement which deepened the ignominy of our Nation, although the recapitulation of these events in no way coincides with the objectives which have inspired the writing of these pages.

For my purpose, it is enough to start with the objective facts which existed in 1930. The Republic was under a regime of interdiction, and United States tutelage over the collection of Customs Dues extended in all directions and affected every factor of the Nation. The State could not fulfill its obligations, and the hands of the Government were tied insofar as concerns the performance of its duties. In short, sover-

eighty was a simple verbal fiction and the Republic, both in its internal policies and in the international manifestation of its existence, was deprived of all autonomy and subjected to controls which implied the impossibility of acting on its own initiative, or to its own convenience, every one of its acts being governed by the extraneous force incrustated in its midst.

This humiliation extended to every field. "In 1930—as I stated in a speech—we lived without schools, work, frontiers, industries (apart from the large sugar estates), social aid, hospitals, roads, a currency, banks, public buildings, electricity, a University, irrigation canals, bridges and money, and we had no appreciable production. Until 1930, not one single step had been taken to recover our financial freedom and under the yoke of the agreement, we owed much more than the debt which had been readjusted by us in 1907; the peasant had neither land nor water with which to work; poor mothers had no place in which to give birth; the sick, to be cured; the laborer, where to earn his daily bread. Until 1930, not even one scientific census had been taken in the Republic, nor had one single statistical center been opened. Not one law of a social kind had been enacted, nor had any effort been made to reform taxation".

Our prostration was really overwhelming. In that same speech, I recapitulated the insoluble drama we were living: "We are at the cross-roads—I said. The same scant resources as always; the Dominican spirit discouraged by hopeless scepticism; wealth stagnant, services paralyzed, business inactive, the capital de-



stroyed, creditors pressing, public opinion divided into numberless personalist factions of a primary character, local bossism as active as ever before and, at the bottom of the picture, armed rebellion awaiting an opportune moment to strike."

The picture, by itself, was enough to discourage even the most enthusiastic and optimistic. However, I believed in the future of my country, in the good faith of my people and in the inherent will of God. I had the necessary patience and faith to initiate and carry out a government program which can be described in one single word, "construct".

It was a government program which appeared simple on the surface but which involved indescribable complexities. It started with the most elementary of requirements, that of living, and extended to the restoration of the Nation to the fullest extent in order to achieve sovereignty, this being the supreme objective. It was impossible even to commence trying to obtain less humiliating treatment. Of no avail would it be to propose formulas, argue theories, cite doctrines, have recourse to legal norms, invoke clauses and treaties, since everything had already been attempted in vain. In every verbal battle or national dispute into which we brought the argument of our rights, we were left still further humiliated. Consequently, any other attitude not in keeping with the pragmatism with which we were treated, was superfluous. The only real and practical solution was for us to pay off our debts.

I once said, when voicing an idea and a conviction which had always been present in my mind: "I am



fully convinced that if peoples exist in the international field enjoying no more than a tottering and unstable independence, it is entirely due to their lack of economic potentiality."

Cancel our debt! Only now is it possible for us to say that with calm and ease. But in 1930, the declaration of such a natural formula appeared only as a figment of the imagination or a Utopian dream. If one accepted the theory that the Nation could only be properly united by paying up, even to the very last cent, then everyone was agreed that such an achievement was totally impossible.

Pay up, when the city had just been destroyed by a hurricane! When the financial crisis which had caused havoc in the United States' industrial field had made our creditors more pressing and distrusting; when what I had taken over was an enormous budget deficit and a series of fiscal debts, including the salaries of public servants, to all of which must be added the burden of the foreign debt; when production had reached its nadir, and our economy, based solely on sugar, exploited principally by foreign companies which left nothing for the national treasury—all this was no more than a fanciful dream.

And yet, not only did I suggest it, but I also decided to put it into practice. I must acknowledge, however, that I had tremendous faith in myself, perhaps because I had already decided how I would lead my Government, and because the basic ideas which I have already mentioned provided me with the necessary material from which to furnish a new structure

for the country, and to cause the various elements of the State to function coordinately.

This functioning must be directed in such a way as to correct the faults of the economic inferiority on which the political obligations rested principally, that is to say, to impart movement to those sources of wealth which had been wasted through indolence, lack of stimuli and the disorder of our national life. I conceived it my duty, therefore, to organize every element of enterprise, work, compensation, credit and method, these being, as they are, the sources from which all wealth flows.

My ideas in regard to the State and society showed me automatically what order should be established, this consisting of stimulating private wealth from which would be derived, naturally and logically, our economic potential. Only when the country is rationally exploiting its resources, when personal effort is able to obtain satisfactory and tangible results, is it possible to impose the necessary taxation so that the State may operate comfortably and achieve the necessary economic independence on which to establish its political sovereignty.

The selfish absolutism of a State which attempts to enrich itself without taking into account the circumstances of its citizens, is what constitutes a totalitarian and collectivist regime, no matter what others may call it. A man must sacrifice every one of his natural benefits to the insatiable greed of a State which daily creates for itself greater needs, complicating its organization to the detriment of the individual.

A humanitarian and democratic government does everything possible to encourage private wealth, and bases its index of this on progress in general.

The most contradictory theories have been set forth and defended; the most daring schools of thought have been founded, and the most extraordinary definitions made in regard to the play, meshing, systems and mechanisms of economy. All of them present convincing arguments, and each one will surely be applicable in its strictest sense, in any country possessing the necessary pre-established conditions.

However, in the same way as with every other aspect of my Government, I considered it neither suitable nor convenient to concur with any of these considerations, not even with those which most moved my spirit or appealed to my reasoning, or to attempt to give life to a theoretical operation, but rather, I decided I would interpret Dominican reality as fully as possible. For this reason, I decided to analyse the various factors of this reality: human, material, potential, class and volume of production, consumption, transport and, in short, every factor which, properly coordinated, would establish an economic system.

In this aspect of public administration, the true statesman must base his initiatives and acts on objective facts, and as far as production is concerned, he must do so still more intensely and with greater technique. He must start by recognizing that neither wealth, nor the means of achieving this, such as the fertility of the soil, the capacity for work of his people

or the volume of consumption, can be created by means of legal and executive measures, but rather, that they are the result of an organization in which all these factors are knitted together, each one to its own extent and scope.

The process of this knitting together is sometimes somewhat slow. For example, it would avail nothing to increase certain production indexes if there was no market to absorb such an increase, and no return, with interest, of the investment and the cost incurred. A statesman must create a favorable atmosphere in which private enterprise and economic freedom may develop and prosper, applying measures which will increase the consumption potential, maintain remunerative prices, and offer other inducements so that production will increase as a natural result of favorable circumstances.

At the same time, however, he must coordinate such enterprise and freedom so that they may function in an orderly and methodical manner and be subject to a plan which is beneficial to the Nation, in order that the economic structure shall not depend on errors, ambitions or conflicts which might possibly arise from a totally disorderly production.

Time and experience have already given the lie to the theories of primitive liberalism which proclaim that any economy must be completely free to follow its own course, like a river whose current is only subject to its depth and width. This doctrine led to the excessive enrichment of the most skilfull who monopolized every means of production and enslaved

the great majority of peoples; to the formation of trusts and monopolies which fix prices and increase the gains of the producers far beyond the limits of usury; to an increase in the political influence of such monopolies, which impose themselves on and dominate governments, invariably for the purpose of being able to count on the backing and protection of the law; to anarchy and disorder in production, by confining this solely to those natural or manufactured articles which best suit the plutocratic groups, while permitting the existence of a scarcity of the most essential items for the life of the public; to monopolies of raw materials or foodstuffs, in order to create a scarcity and increase prices and speculation, and other similar violations and abuses.

Reacting against these procedures, and taking advantage of the credulity of the public, demagogues and petty politicians arose everywhere offering simplistic or fraudulent solutions which could only contribute to monopolistic abuses.

The greater part of these formulae tended to incite hatred and subversion in the lower or exploited classes, using techniques which were the forerunners of what Communism was later to perfect. And, instead of restoring justice and order, through the violence of their protests, they accentuated the desolation and ruin which grew like an avalanche and led to the tragic present-day situation of certain countries.

Likewise, reacting against the excesses of a liberal economy, certain writers proposed the doctrine of State intervention, or of controlled economy, terroriz-

ing and angering the classes which had possessed themselves of most of the wealth under the protection of a free economy and of the famous Gendarme State.

However, even in those places where such intervention was adopted, never in its entirety, but with cuts and limitations which reduced its power, regional or national realities were never taken into consideration, such consideration being given only to the abstract which supported it, leading to a barren imitation of methods. The insincerity of politicians and their perennial habit of promising the moon in order to win an election, or to provoke a revolutionary uprising, and the undeniable interests of others, often internationally linked-up, were factors which caused any proposed State intervention to become a series of ruinous and injudicious boasts which could only arouse public protest and turmoil.

If on any occasion there were fleeting successes, these subsequently had to be paid for dearly since they were based on deceit and lies, and had ignored the truth.

Almost every country in Latin America has been the victim of the most absurd experiments, and it has been in the development of these that so many common hopes have been dashed, and through which so many insurmountable difficulties have been created, leading to that political instability which has made them so fertile for Communist penetration. And it is precisely in these experiments in which the exercise of democracy has been deformed, resulting occasion-

ally in the victory of one of those irresponsible and crafty demagogues who agitate the masses.

These absurd experiments have been many, and have adopted innumerable forms. For example, charlatans and petty politicians purporting to be statesmen, have attempted to impose State intervention in economy, under the pretext of social service, by the simple method of decreeing a drastic reduction in prices, ignoring the fact that any such reduction can only lead to a lessening in production by reason of the fact that no one is prepared to work gratuitously but only for some reward or payment. This lessening leads to bankruptcy for many agricultural and industrial producers, the closing down of establishments and, consequently, unemployment.

On other occasions, they have proposed the raising of the standard of living by means of an increase in wages by arbitrary Government decree. However, such an increase raises the cost of production and, therefore, of the price of the article, the latter rising more rapidly in proportion to wages owing to the fact that capital attempts to defend itself and maintain its benefits.

An attempt is then made to solve this higher cost of living by means of further increases in wages, and so, one reaches that terrible state of inflation which is now strangling, like the eight arms of an octopus, many Latin American countries.

Many of these political busybodies believe that in order to maintain a balance, production should be stepped up by coercive methods and not by the natural



requirements of the market. In their culpable ingenuity, they attempt to increase credit, or adopt protectionist measures, all of which lead first to saturation and subsequently, to over-production and an excess of supply over demand, in other words to chain reaction.

In their systematic flight from national reality, opportunist and ignorant politicians who have assumed the functions of government, adopt totally inadequate methods, such as when, for example, in countries which are practically deserts through an insufficiency of population or means of transportation, the agrarian legislation of France, suitable for a country in which there is a scarcity of land in ratio to the population, is adopted; or as when, in order to solve the rural problems of the peasant, scientifically cultivated land is expropriated and divided up into small plots which cannot be worked by their improvised owners owing to technical incapacity, lack of money or simple laziness.

From the application of such measures as these, inspired by foolishness or by demagoguery, there stem the greatest ills, the lessening of agricultural production, and what is still more serious and consequential for the future, the demoralization of the workers.

All these and other errors stem from the influence of inapplicable and absolutist theories, sometimes fraudulent, and others, naive. Both the stupid and the fraudulent politician attempts to adjust the country's circumstances to the ideas of some theorist, or to the dreams of a Utopian, without taking into consideration

the deep and unshakable impositions of the truth. On the other hand, the true statesman creates his own system exactly in accordance with the physical and moral factors at his command.

On taking over the reins of government in 1930, I had already come to a conclusion about all the ideas explained up to this point, and they were sufficiently clear in my mind as to limit any possibility of error to a very minimum. Under the circumstances, I would not decree that the country should become wealthy overnight, but would create the conditions under which wealth would accrue as a natural consequence. As head of the Government, I would not attempt to direct economic activities in such a way as to harm private enterprise, but would stimulate the latter and provide it with the necessary sense, orientation and coordination to prevent anarchy from annulling its efforts, convinced that any such step would bring with it positive and permanent wealth. In short, I would obtain from the live forces of the Nation, organized and directed by my Government, not only the necessary money to be able to satisfy all the undertakings which affected our sovereignty, but also to give the Nation practical and stable conditions, and impose upon it a democracy of action which would reach all Dominicans, and not just one group. This would provide a new rythm for the development of the Nation as a whole.

In order to achieve this, I had drawn up a plan of campaign which would cover every aspect of my official activity; I would not proceed blindly like any

other politician who bases his prestige on lies, insofar as appearance and improvisation is concerned, but rather with the penetrating multiplicity and clarity of the true statesman.

My first plan was to adhere strictly to national truths in every aspect of the task before me. I have already said that I was always a practical man and, because of this, my temperament would never allow any adulteration of the truth. Many imaginative innovators in the experimental lives of our countries, have felt themselves bedazzled by industrialization, and in order to achieve the enforced construction of factories, which later are of no use whatever because they were not the consequence of a pre-prepared market, but rather of an arbitrary imposition, have sacrificed every national truth.

Later, these factories languished; the quality of their products deteriorated; their costs rose owing to the fact that production had to be in accordance with the reduced scale imposed by a limited market, these same facts not permitting the use of modern techniques and machinery. In the establishment of factories, later found to be inserviceable, the small reserve of currency was invested, sinking the monetary system and making it necessary to have recourse to private and bank credits in order to support the absurd and bedazzling whim; the authentic sources of wealth which are those that stem from the natural resources of the country, having been ignored.

The excessive hopes of certain poor and sparsely populated countries, that is, poor consumer markets

for manufacturers, would, if they were industrialized overnight, have certain points of similitary with the hopes of a poor man who at all costs wants his son to be a doctor. When his hopes are finally realized at the cost of immense sacrifice, the recently graduated son is unable to prosper because he has no vocation and, consequently, is mediocre in his profession or lacks the funds necessary to enable him to study further or to specialize, the sum result being total failure.

The falsification of national truths is an error into which many rulers of America, whose phantasies have meant ruin and bankruptcy, have fallen. I had no intention of converting the Dominican Republic into an industrial country which would have to import raw materials, purchase second-hand machinery and try to compete with these precarious resources against highly industrialized countries on the childish and simple pretext of stopping the egress of currency which limited foreign trade. Far from it: I was convinced that the obtainment of sufficient currency by means of a healthy volume of exports, is a more practical method by which to strengthen the economic structure of a country, and for the general well-being of the inhabitants, than that of attempting their illusory defense by manufacturing articles which have habitually to be imported, and by not producing those that constitute the basis of a rational foreign trade.

The Dominican Republic had no tapped deposits of raw materials, no necessary capital with which to establish factories, no markets to consume production,

no industrial tradition and no chance of competing, even in the home market, either in quality or price.

Under the circumstances, to attempt industrialization by means of orders, decrees or impositions would have been completely ingenuous, stupid, or a demagogic fraud meant to bedazzle a people and achieve fleeting success from their enthusiasm. And if I say it, it is because I have observed how some American governments, on a number of occasions, if not on all, have fallen into these errors.

However, if there was no basis for any kind of industrialization, the Dominican Republic had, on the other hand, great expanses of fertile land which were totally unexploited though entirely suitable for intensive cultivation. The climate, with constant variations owing to the orographic configuration of the Republic, a well-distributed river network which could furnish a vast system of artificial irrigation, and even the regularity of the rainfall, established and confirmed the agricultural potential of the country. This was the truth, the future and the chief and logical source of its economy.

Taking into consideration the fact that my rule would be based on a just interpretation of the truth, I would convert the Dominican Republic into a great agricultural country. And only when the measure of the development of its wealth permitted, when consumption, proportioned to the purchasing ability of the public, made it necessary, when the diversification on which my economic planning had been based, was in full swing, would a greater industrial complexity

commence to appear as a natural factor, stemming from natural circumstances and not from arbitrary impositions.

It would be necessary to commence by correcting any number of anomalies. While great regions possessing excellent quality soil lay untilled, the supply of foodstuffs was precarious and much was imported which, like rice, could be grown here in vast quantities. While the fertile ground cried out for seeds, its fecundity abandoned to bush and heath though offering rich reward, many were unemployed and the country was steeped in abject poverty, reducing its present independence and the possibility of its future recovery.

I also perceived that these anomalies stemmed from lack of order and method, and that such order and method should commence with a stimulus to work by guaranteeing suitable wages and by planning a more advantageous distribution of the population. In the stimulus to work, I included the assurance of peace, technical instruction, credit aid, transportation, irrigation canals, the obtainment of seeds and fertilizers and other similar items. I was convinced that if such things could be offered to the Dominican peasant, his natural industry, his noble ambition for progress and his patriotism would be powers which, put into operation, would lead to natural enrichment. It would not be necessary to enforce work, impose action, or resort to either political or economic violence. With such impulses, production would increase of its own accord and would branch out in its natural directions.

Not only by my conviction that the Government, as I have always understood it, should guarantee both stability and public peace as a basis for its authority and power, but also because such guarantees give vigor to the civic virtues of labor, of order and of social collaboration and other creative energies, I dedicated my chief effort to the task of winning public confidence, the existence of which represented the orderly utilization of other forces which until then had been squandered in insurgence and personalism. The whole country, fatigued by the painful hardships of its history, longed for the presence of a leader of sufficient honesty and decision who would define and help it to fulfill its future. Not only my first acts of Government, particularly those necessary as a result of the meteoric cataclysm, but also my unblemished military career, proved that I represented the possibility of a new, more dynamic and more fruitful life.

Specifically, my decision to maintain peace, and the success I achieved in exterminating the spirit of warlike existence and insurrection which were habitual in the Republic, led to the establishment of that security of which the peasant was so much in need.

However, this alone was not enough. It was necessary for me to offer as much stimulus as possible, and I dedicated all the resources of my Government and the whole of my energies to this end. In this tremendous task, all my actions were based on the conceptual interpretations I have previously explained; these being to consider man as a person with every right

to his own growth, and yet, indestructibly linked to society as a whole; and the Government as a coordinating force —not simply as a guard against social dementia.

In the field of productive organization, my convictions were based on the idea that economic development is not the result of a series of unconnected enterprises, often conflicting by reason of the fight for personal enrichment, but rather the fruits of combined, methodical and structural effort from which stem not only personal wealth, but also the diffusion of well-being and the permanent raising of the standard of living. Without there being ample possibilities, even personal fortunes become precarious and are subject to unexpected contingencies.

Consequently, apart from giving impetus to productivity by means of a plan which would cover architectural harmony, it was necessary to orientate such productivity; to establish order and method and not leave the field abandoned to individual competition or to its own anarchy.

I shall explain later how I interpreted the gearing of economic freedom to international necessity in order not to fall into the trap of a directed economy, or to deviate in any way towards a totalitarian State, but to an organization in which every factor must participate proportionally.

It is a fact that anything that may occur in the course of any economic process, may, on occasions, lead to the most unexpected results. If, for example, seduced by the prospect of good transient prices aris-



ing from fortuitous circumstances, every farmer decided to grow the same crop, the phenomena of overproduction of such a crop will arise at harvest time, leading to the ruin of every effort and hope and to the scarcity of other articles of consumption, the prices of which will rise inordinately.

Consequently, if dedication to work and legitimate ambition are to be the first impulses, Government action must cover both the stimulation of these virtues and the adoption of technical systems, with indications as to the quantities and quality of products required, at least, insofar as basic articles are concerned, in order that those grown may produce profits for all. Any such indications not only imply no restriction on freedom of labor, association, trade, or choice of occupation, but rather the contrary, it stimulates them and gives them the assistance which only the State can give, such as credit facilities, means and ease of transportation, scientific investigation, technical instruction, tax exemptions and other forms of aid.

My Government endeavored to correct the errors of the past, and to commence a new era giving due consideration to the tremendous handicaps of our real situation, and for this reason, it began to organize labor and production on a plan in keeping with the requirements and potential of the market which would in no way affect private enterprise, and in order that production should be in proportion to such market requirements assuring firmness and stability for prices and diversification of crops, thereby freeing the

country from the disasters of single crop production, and providing other advantages of a like nature.

The ills which had been besetting us previously were caused, to a large extent, by the fact that only sugar was being produced. These ills included the scarcity of basic foodstuffs, low wages, an empty treasury and the enrichment of foreign companies which had obtained generous concessions by taking advantage of the defeatism and ineptitude of our former rulers.

Sugar cane-growing had occupied the best land, that nearest to centers of population and having the greatest facilities for irrigation and transportation, and it gave rise to the most merciless and unjust exploitation of the Dominican peasant.

Certainly, export figures were high, but such exports produced no foreign currency, nor did their flow enter the economic current of the nation. The shareholders of the companies were usually foreigners living abroad, and it was there that they received their dividends.

I was in no way worried as to whether or not the technical and realist orientation in regard to quality and quantity of the plan for a diversification of crops I proposed to develop, might clash with any political or economic doctrine, or whether my adversaries might malevolently consider it as being State intervention, directed economy or restriction of that freedom of industry so loved by the liberal school whose excesses had made enormous fortunes possible.

Nothing worried me other than saving the country from financial and moral prostration; giving it back

its sovereignty; exploiting its abandoned potentials of wealth; causing stagnant energy to function again and, by imparting dynamism to the component parts of the Nation, to establish general and firmly based prosperity.

It is not my intention here to recall how, step by step, I gradually carried out all the details of my scheme, from that of ensuring peace, to the strict conservation of public funds; from facing up to the consequences of the hurricane under really afflicting financial circumstances, to transforming the bases of our national life; from initiating an investigation of our potentials, to bringing about method and order in public and private activities; to better preparing our men for work and to providing them with every stimulus that might be necessary. As I never attempted to submit to any given theory, but rather to achieve something positive, I followed my own dictates, based on the universal idea of the values of the State. This allowed me to provide my Government with the essential qualities I required.

The picture of the Dominican Republic over the last few years is proof of how right I was. Every aspect of the life of the Nation and of the individual, has been modified. Democratic ideals, which in other countries are no more than words, are fully operational here as a result of social and economic order. Extensive non-productive areas were made fertile. Transportation and communications were made to link every place in the Republic. Farming became technical and diversified, and by means of technical and scientific

measures, the State achieved the necessary improvement of quality and the limitation of quantities.

Items which had previously been imported were now grown in sufficient quantities to allow for their export. A budget of less than ten million was increased to one of more than one hundred and fifty. Our foreign trade balance shows a currency surplus of fifty million or more, this being really exceptional in America.

The past scarcity of foodstuffs has been converted into limitless abundance, and the standard of living has risen rapidly. One of the most effective and stable monetary systems on the Continent was established and, above all, the Republic, by paying off up to the last cent of its foreign debt, including excessive interest and surcharges, finally recovered the full enjoyment of a sovereignty and dignity that had been mutilated, reducing every power of the Nation, now in all its splendor, to the point of annihilation.



## CHAPTER IX

### THE HUMAN ELEMENT

The principle and application of responsible freedom, that is, the logic of the correlated rights and obligations of the citizen towards the Nation and Society which was the basis of my policies, coincided fully with Dominican reality, this being the reason for their producing such magnificent results.

The people changed the somewhat ambiguous and hazy ideas of freedom and democracy which had moved them throughout the course of their history, causing them to go from failure to failure: ideas which bred in them a permanent state of rebellion and insurrection against everything, and which induced them to put their passing and fleeting faith in a name which, generally speaking, embodied no more than personal ambition.

By transferring these feelings to a permanent and concrete objective, like that of Nation, a modification in the general conduct had to take place, and this modification consisted in an understanding of the need for regulating and directing united and joint action in behalf of a plan for total recuperation.

This spiritual standard of the Dominican, arising from his putting his faith in the future of the Government that came into being in 1930, has been consolidated over the years, and has converted itself into a way of life. This is due to the fact that, never since then have his efforts been misapplied, his hopes defrauded, his abnegation exploited or his dignity mistreated; to the fact that he has become possessed of a clear idea as to his personal responsibilities in relation to common objectives, and of a clear and well-defined concept of Nation, not just reduced to abstract formulae, but to positive achievements.

For his same reason, his adherence to the Government and his loyalty to my person, the ratification of his faith in my capacity as representative of the supreme interests of the Nation, and his constant cooperation in my policies and schemes, were in no way a passing fancy, which would have shown itself as weak and fleeting, nor the imposition of a dominating regime, but rather the result of a reflexive attitude, of comprehension and of an analysis of national realities.

This attitude and this capacity for analysis had their origin in the work undertaken by my Government from the moment of its inception; work which led from the explanation and presentation of problems and their solutions, through the creation of an atmosphere of harmony and solidarity, to raising the standard of public culture and the dissemination of those civic virtues which constitute the vinculation of man with the community in which he lives.

Little by little, the sentimental factor began to be absorbed by this new Dominican philosophy, together with other moral factors for strengthening political unity and the unity of objectives and of methods of achieving these. The first of these factors was that of gratitude for my efforts and due recognition for conquests achieved.

The feeling of adherence and spirit of national collaboration are the most interesting aspects of the specific forms of Dominican democracy, and the consistency of these features, coinciding exactly with our national circumstances, makes me feel proud and satisfied, since not every country in America has attained this clarity of perception. Most of them are sunk in doubt, poverty and a spirit of subversion, all of which have been cleverly fostered by Communism.

When calculating the contribution which, in order to carry out my decision to rescue all its attributes for the Nation, the human element would have to give me, I made no abstraction of the truth, nor did I conceive the people as impeccable beings or pure spirits. Far from it, I always bore in mind the passions, unrest and impulses which determine men's acts, and the specific form which such circumstances have given to the psychology of the Dominican.

His historical process; his obstinate efforts for independence; the misapplication of his vital need to provide himself with a stable organization, were facts which, coupled to his own biological formation and the influences which surrounded him, created a



psychology and a position in life, the analysis of which was indispensable to his just employment in behalf of the Nation, and to the positive course of action into which to steer his energies.

Generally speaking, every human being tends to progress and improvement. But circumstances, interference on the part of agitators and politicians and the influence of powerful interests, among others, generally acquire sufficient power to be able to steer this legitimate tendency towards subversion, insurrection and self-destruction.

This is what had happened in the Dominican Republic. But if the vital instinct of the people, which leads fundamentally towards the survival of the Nation, had been impaired, the primary tendency towards improvement had been maintained intact. A high sense of unity had preserved ties which, in other parts, would have broken up into irreconcilable schisms through the appearance of racial, religious and political prejudices.

This dissolving element, so very evident in other countries, was never very prominent in the Dominican Republic. Not even the long period of slavery left resentment on the part of blacks towards whites, nor created in the latter a superiority complex as a result of their past condition of masters. The fertility of the island, the simplicity of its customs, and the humanitarian feelings which distinguished the Spanish colonial period, made a benevolent servitude of slavery, with no preponderancies or humiliations such as were established by the French, for example, in the western portion of the island.

This reciprocal consideration on the part of Dominicans showed the existence of qualities and circumstances which, properly oriented, stimulated and compensated, would prove an invaluable constructive force. In order to take advantage of it, it was necessary, above all, to superimpose on every human being, his status as a person over his condition of simple individual. Individualist interpretations cause every longing to be developed to the exclusive benefit of egoism; to the deplorable economic prostration of those nations which are incapable of exploiting their own resources, usurped by the voracity of certain influential persons; to the impossibility of achieving a permanent and cooperative organization for objectives of national benefit, and to other equally depressing consequences.

From the very start of my Government, I endeavored to establish bases for social equilibrium, the outlines of which I had conceived in all clearness, and the scope of which would be immensely beneficial—such equilibrium being based on the recognition of the inherent rights of the human being. The right to live, work, own property, trade, enhance his knowledge, raise a family, and others which would constitute valuable factors for national consolidation if put to function in an atmosphere of harmony; the privilege of none and the constant benefit of all. For this harmony to exist, it was necessary to establish correlated obligations in order to restrain excesses and eliminate the causes of lack of balance.

For example, the peasant would be one of the bases of the economic restoration leading to the

recovery of our national sovereignty, in pawn at that time through a senseless debt and agreement, and would have every right to own land; but such a right, however, would not imply his severance from those obligations which, as a human being, linked him to society. In other words, the exploitation of his property must be subject to a plan and to regulations which would include the adoption of scientific methods of cultivation and subjection to production, and trade and consumer requirements, so as to avoid overproduction or scarcity of certain items with their corresponding fluctuations and uncertainty of prices and supply; the payment of adequate wages to those people required for working his land, and other obligations, such as the payment of taxes, which the government would later return to him in the form of roads, credits, seeds, farm implements, irrigation canals and technical instruction.

The absence of any restriction, in other words, any absolutism on the part of the owner, would harm the right to live and to work of non-owners and laborers, and would introduce anarchy into production to his own exclusive benefit, and in detriment, not only of the population, but also to the high interests of the Nation.

The theory that it must be freedom of activity and individual planning which must show the way to a sound economy, has been extremely inefficient and has led to social ruin and insecurity due to the fact that such freedom has resulted in speculation, the establishment of monopolies and high cost of living,

among others of the deplorable factors to which I have alluded.

At the present time, the unrestricted freedom of certain social or economic classes, which had its moment of flowering and brought with it a concentration of capital and the necessary resources for the technical mechanization of industry, no longer exists. This mechanization introduced certain changes by virtue of which, at the present time, no country could prosper effectively excepting by the development of a belief in national coordination, which means, looking upon the Nation as a large company in which some contribute their money and others their labor, all of them with the same spirit of collaboration, in order to exploit their resources scientifically, and not to abandon these to financial groups or privileged politicians.

This new concept of solidarity for the achievement of progress cannot in any way be compared with totalitarian systems under which the State not only takes over all material resources, but also destroys man's personality. In a prosperity resulting from solidarity, such as I have explained, the State does not confiscate profits or benefits, nor does it restrict any other right to ownership than that of natural obligations, and every working man receives his full profit and full official collaboration.

To sum up, small properties cannot be exploited other than with the assistance of the State, or could only be done so under the worst possible conditions, resulting in no benefit for the economy as a whole.

The small property makes man more independent, more his own master, and develops his appreciation of freedom. However, it only produces benefits when it is exploited in the common interest since only with collective cooperation can the owner avail himself of transportation, credits, and the means for carrying on his work. Only in this way can he remove himself from the primitivism in which he lived while subject solely to his own initiative, lacking direction, method and connections. In dedicating his efforts to the common good in accordance with the economic planning of the Nation, he will get immediate compensation, and his profits will be assured.

It was always possible for the Dominican peasant to possess land, but he only learned to love it when it became productive and when he could contemplate and appreciate it with that new feeling that came into being in 1930. Until that year, he had always been hostile to it because it needed all his attention and care and yet gave him back little or no compensation.

Political agitation wrested man from his agricultural sphere; it buffeted him along roads of sacrifice and, at the same time as it made him forget his love of the land, it destroyed his plantations. On many occasions, his poor body would fall, riddled by the bullets of violence, precisely on the furrow which had been fertilized, to use a biblical expression, by the sweat of his brow.

When previous governments fell into financial difficulties, foreign companies, through over-generous

concessions, obtained the best land on which they availed themselves not only of the forces of nature, but also of the labor of Dominicans whom they antagonized and enslaved by miserly wages in the Nation which, with such exemplary abnegation, they had defended against all outsiders.

The land, therefore, did not compensate any humble industry. Without means of transport and road networks, its products could not be converted into factors of trade and wealth. Revolutions destroyed even the most ingenuous hopes. The companies exploited the poor peasant, and the law forsook him. The State was powerless to legislate on the matter, or even to give him the most elementary assistance. The peasant had been abandoned to his own devices and, if he continued to insist on identifying himself with the land, it was only because of a platonic feeling: only because it was the soil of his nation.

However, in 1930, a new idea emerged. Special laws decreed protection for the peasant. Peace and harmony guaranteed his crops. Never, on any occasion, did I use demagogic promises which could only arouse hopes impossible of fulfillment, and which lead not towards method, but to subversion. The possession of land was regulated with a justice and security never known before, not only by means of new and dynamic legislation, but also by the creation of special tribunals charged with the duty of making the most sensible distribution of land ever planned.

Some of the vast and unjust concessions reverted to the State and were then rationally divided up. As

I had no intention of trying to stir up the passions of the people, but rather to bring about an increase in all production, the peasant found himself greatly encouraged, and his natural laboriousness soon commenced to function. His innate love of the soil could be fully developed without fear of sudden attack.

My Government, precariously at first, but later with greater efficiency and profusion, came to his aid with seeds, credit, technical advice and farm implements. Transportation facilitated his access to markets, and irrigation increased the fertility of his land. Ownership, the supreme and rightful ambition of the peasant, was no longer an illusion but a positive fact, and by means of strict laws, it was defended against the powerful and against the monopolist. Public services such as electricity, communications, hygiene and sanitation, libraries, school and recreational centers, made rural life pleasant and lifted it out of its secular primitivism.

Those who did not aspire to ownership on a small scale but who preferred, by reason of freedom to work, to be wage-earners, were given every opportunity which, until that time had been impossible. The State intervened not only to protect them against speculation, but to improve their situation. Companies and great landowners were obliged to respect the rights of their workers and to improve their living conditions, feeding and culture, to give them medical assistance and to undertake other obligations in their respect. All of this contributed to consolidating peace. A peace which, little by little, became a civic pride

and insured the constancy of personal effort and the fulfillment of those hopes and wishes which, previously, had only been fanciful dreams.

This protection given to the peasant was the result of my convictions and ideas born, as I have said on many occasions, from the close observance of Dominican reality, and not from theories of impossible realization, and certainly not adapted from completely inapplicable and inflexible definitions, but adjusted to the human, historic, social and economic factors of the Republic.

My ideas in regard to the human being established for him a minimum of inviolable rights which were his by nature. My ideas as to the Nation included the urgent recovery of its sovereignty which, under the circumstances, could only be achieved by eliminating the foreign debt. My ideas as to economic development for the purpose of eliminating this debt, implied the adoption of order and method in production. And as production, principally agricultural, could only be the result of labor, my thoughts returned to the human element which, only by full recognition of its essentials, could provide the necessary output, develop itself satisfactorily, experience the pleasure of cooperation, enjoy its benefits, ennoble its spirit and rid it of prejudices and manias.

This human element had no exceptions; it emerged from the fact of birth and the more humble it had been, the greater protection it was entitled to to restore to it the use of its faculties.



Such were my ideas as to the human element which must contribute to the development of my work of national enhancement. Not as a mechanical instrument compelled to certain labors in which no consideration need be given to its hopes, doubts and feelings; nor as a wild plant, abandoned in the open, absorbed in a terrible and lone struggle for existence, but rather as a thinking and conscious being with a right to its own perfection and to the expression of its own affections.

Only by sublimating man, guaranteeing the immutability of his freedom and dignity and returning him to the bosom of society from whence individualism had wrested him, would it be possible to obtain the joyful contribution of his will, and so make sure that his work and cooperation in the plan of national achievement which I had evolved, would be spontaneous and natural, being, as they were, the result of a new appreciation of his existence and value.

Nothing imposed by force can be lasting. Generally speaking, a man who feels himself oppressed maintains a constant longing for freedom, even when such oppression is beneficial to him. I am proud to be able to state that as a result of my political and social ideas, the Dominican has never felt the pressure of State or Government on any of his vital interests.

I am not unaware that in certain foreign quarters that have been particularly hostile to me, and which have emerged as the result of the slander and lies of obscure agitators or ruined revolutionaries, inspired

by Communism, our wonderful Dominican unity is considered to be the product of gross impositions.

By interpreting it in this manner, they have lied deliberately. No one who knows, even superficially, the truth about the Dominican Republic of today can deny, unless he is inspired by bad faith and deceitfulness, that the dedication to work of all the upper and lower classes, the increase in production which is the result of their assiduity, their acceptance of method and regulation for the purpose of uniting their efforts and freedoms in a social order, their repeated manifestations of confidence in my capabilities, every one of these has been the result of due reflexion, of free discernment and of an analysis of the moral and material advantages to be obtained.

This was the way in which prosperity was brought about; how the fulfillment of the highest ideals, the mere enumeration of which under the circumstances which prevailed in 1930 seemed no more than a fanciful dream, was achieved.

This policy of stimulation and sublimation of human rights included every sphere of social activity, not being directed solely to material progress, but also to the formation of a feeling of brotherhood and cordiality among every class of Dominican. Each one within his own sphere and capability, each one in his own position and following his own inclination or vocation, all could contribute to common progress and achieve its fulness without feeling humiliated, starting as they did from absolute equality as human beings.

Their place in society, economic circumstances and hierarchy, depended on their own capabilities, talent, assiduity, character and the way each one faced life. If the inherent rights and the vital expressions of the human being are protected, the broadening of his faculties cannot be restricted without affecting his freedom, although this must be regulated and given some kind of order.

The power of this universal definition of the human being is one of the reasons that caused me to consider Communism as an abominable violation of natural laws; as an encroachment upon the untouchable rights of the person; as an attack on the dignity of man and, consequently, as a return to barbarism.

If the realism of my interpretations and plans did not allow me to apostatize the typical characteristics of the Republic, but to achieve its economic development principally by means of a diversified and technical exploitation of agriculture, this did not infer that national progress must be strictly circumscribed to agricultural development.

All progress, to be effective, must be harmonious and must include all the potentials of the Nation; and if the basis of economic consolidation must be the land, the enhancement of the Nation must include its judicial institutions, its intellectual and artistic manifestations, its scientific progress, in fact, everything that can contribute to the development of its potentials and spiritual, moral and material prospects.

When, at the beginning of my administration, I stated that "my best friend is the working man", I made no exception as to the class of activity, nor did I restrict or limit the significance of the word "work", but rather gave it the fullest possible interpretation. Work means to cultivate the soil, to exercise an intellectual profession, to subject oneself to the working hours of a factory, to educate the people and, in fact, to carry on every activity which not only produces personal, but above all, social benefits.

In 1934, I said: "Men and nations can save themselves through their own efforts, without discrimination as to the meaning of effort. Nations, when the crash and unbridled violence of the storm have passed over them, leaving them cast down, can rehabilitate themselves through work. Through work, the errors of the past can be wiped out, opening the door to new horizons; the door to the future."

The scope of my ideas as to work brought with it the need for official protection for all sectors and forces of the Nation, and included various forms of assistance to agriculture, from stimulating the peasant to the perfecting of university studies in order to raise the standard of the liberal professions; from rational and orderly encouragement for industrial and commercial activities, to the efficiency of all those who, in one way or another, serve the interests of the State. My action was comforted by the knowledge of the industry of my people.

"I have often stated —I said in the speech referred to above— that in the problems I have encountered

as a ruler, I have always trusted to the capacity for work of the Dominican people. This capacity for work must be stimulated from above. The first who must work constantly are those whom the people have raised to the highest posts in the Nation. Insofar as I am concerned, I am no more than a laborer who, after completing his task, lays down to rest every night, ready at the first light of dawn to take up again the instruments of his labor and return to the hard work of the new day."

Within the plan I had evolved for carrying out this widening of the production potential of the people in every way, I had decided that the protection to be afforded by the Government to industrial and commercial enterprise must be given in such a way as to enable development to take place in constant ratio to general finances, and not by the creation of economic artificialities, such as those of producing articles which have no market, or disfiguring the aspect, potentiality or natural expansions of the geography or of the people.

So it was that, as the capacity for consumption increased through an increase in production, the results of which extended in every direction, new industries started to appear. In 1930, there existed only a very few elementary industries or basic manufactured articles, and it would have been futile to establish other factories for the production of articles which could in no way be absorbed by the market. However, the improvement in the purchasing power of the people brought with it industrial potentials,

and this meant the appearance and constant increase of a labor market.

The experience of the last few years, the orientation of universal events and the degree of Communist infiltration, have established clearly that the majority of the ills of the world stem from the formation of great labor masses resulting from excessive industrialization; from the ferocious insensibility with which capital, represented by these industries, exploits such masses until they rebel, and finally, from the impotence of rulers to regulate these relations, the injustice of which produces an antagonism which leads to revolution and establishes a suitable climate for subversive activities.

My ideas of liberty and justice; the respect I have always felt for the human being and the common sense which has always governed my actions, led me to foresee this antagonism and to avoid its conflictive appearance in the Dominican Republic.

For this reason, as industrial development progressed and the number of industrial workers increased, legislation also took place which, from the first moment, established and regulated labor relations. The realism that governed this transformation made it impossible to take precipitate measures which might possibly create difficulties in newly established enterprises needing to consolidate themselves; or that the exploitation of the laborer from the first moment should establish precedents of privilege for capital which would later be difficult to correct.

From the beginning, capital was aware that its function and dynamism implied certain obligations; and the worker, that he would find protection in the law.

Through this, a balanced situation was established, guaranteeing progress for both sides. Nothing exaggerated or out of proportion, and nothing intended to create demagoguery, win over the masses, or influence capital.

As a result of this policy, Dominican industry has developed in consonance with the country's natural capacity. Investments in the establishment of factories are protected by the security that stems from political stability. The labor force is continually increasing; and as capital is consolidated through generous and legitimate profits, the laborer acquires greater advantages such as increased wages, improved social services, greater comfort for his family, better living conditions, educational and comfort standards and, consequently, greater dignity and decorum.

Through the foresight of the Government, the Dominican laborer has never had to have recourse to hot-tempered protest, to subversion or revolt in order to improve his condition and lessen the exploitation to which the laborer is generally subjected in other parts. His natural rights have received spontaneous legal protection, set forth in a Labor Code, the spirit and procedures of which are profoundly human and realistic.

The responsibility for this protection of the labor force was not given over exclusively to capital and to the companies it represents. Rather did the State

give the invaluable cooperation my Government had proposed offering, not only for the development of the economic structure but also in order that such development should bear with it those fruits of harmony and social cooperation to which I have previously alluded.

A vast chain of scientifically equipped social assistance centers, details of which it is not necessary to give in these pages, being as they are more doctrinary than narratory, and insurance and pensions protect the workman from prenatal days until old age, and for this reason, no Dominican, since 1930, has ever been abandoned to his own luck, but has always found the hand of the State outstretched to help him and return to him his personality by means of education or money with which to look after his immediate needs.

This economic peace, the collaboration between capital and labor, the vigilant attention of the State, the methodical arrangement of the production front, the balance between the various social groups, the harmony and solidarity which have permitted the exceptional prosperity achieved by the country, are due principally to the fact that the ruler who, in 1930, decided to bring about the fundamental transformation of history, started by considering the human being, not as a production machine, which would infer absolutism on the part of the State, nor as a loose cog in the machinery of the nation, which would infer anarchy, but as a person with rights and obligations of a totally inherent nature, resulting from the fact of having been born, and at the same time, as a part of the organic and harmonious whole.





## CHAPTER X

### NATIONAL FULFILLMENT

Despite its insular position, which seemed to condemn it to a life of isolation, the Dominican Republic has always maintained an attitude which could almost be called extrovert towards the rest of America, that is to say, an anxiety to communicate with and expand in the cooperation of human sentiments. This national tendency which, in the past, has had such expressive manifestations as that of annexation to Grand Colombia, an act which constituted a romantic attempt to incorporate itself into continental life, always exercised an orientating influence on my ideals and thoughts in regard to my international policies.

The natural cohesion of American peoples proved itself to me by the simple means of looking at a map, and by my knowledge of the process by which all the nations into which the Continent was divided, had been formed. The same origin, equal development, language, philosophy and a feeling for life which started to emerge from the transfer to a new atmosphere of the virtues and qualities of the Castillian spirit, strongly oriented towards Christianity, austere,

strict in its moral principles and in its sense of honor, and anxious for its own grandeur, constitute the common denominator of all these countries, whose founders, ideals of freedom, sincerity of spirit of democracy and vital expressions are basically impregnated with the same identity.

So it was that the idea of a brotherhood of our peoples, in other words, the Pan American ideal, was born almost spontaneously in my mind due to the fact that in me was the consciousness of Dominican obligations to history, and the instinct for spiritual expansion which includes an understanding of the unity of American destinies.

Thought and study strengthened my conviction that the future of all our countries is connected by the many bonds which unite and define them, and that America can only fulfill her destiny when the process of her material development, her spiritual ideals, her social and political structure are the result of common effort, coordinated and directed towards clear and precise objectives, and not towards hazy and vague ideals.

The geographic unity of America is a fact which has the power of physical imperative and which establishes indestructible relations between the peoples who were born and grew up in its vast territories.

With its greatly variegated topography, its geological strata, and the wealth of its flora and fauna, the Continent has the means to build its own civilization, its industrial power and its economic

potential, and as a consequence of all this, its own culture and the specific expression of that new feeling for life which the scientific and philosophic investigations of the last few years has produced.

Circumstances, such as the availability of raw materials, transport possibilities, density of population and indolence or activity of the local inhabitants, have produced a corresponding inequality in the development of each of the zones and nations into which the Continent is divided.

If it is true that in the exploitation of raw materials by foreign capital or enterprises in the respective exchange which is dynamic and makes geographical unity operative, injustices and outrages have been committed, it is also true that under a better balanced regime, the Continent has sufficient means to live on its own in abundance and wealth, and this constitutes a factor for cohesion, and the seed of brotherhood.

Historical unity, which identifies the origins and formation of nations in their conquest and colonization based on the religious sense and philosophical content of European civilization at the time, is a further impellent towards unity of action and continental balance.

The epic of the Conquest was carried out from the first island discovered by Columbus, and an identical spirit of courage, faith and culture guided the explorers who spread themselves over the Continent, founding cities and laying the cornerstones of future nations. This same impetus and the same

noble ambitions which moved the Spaniards, also moved the French and the Saxons to great exploits, and to sow the seeds of civilization in the soil of the New World, causing unity and brotherhood to take root in the glorious epoch of those first days.

The racial differences stemming from the ethnical forces which intervened in the great adventure of the Conquest and colonization, did not, until the Latin American generations of today, produce any appreciable germ of conflict or lack of understanding. Far from it. Generally speaking, the three elements which make up the demographic basis of our countries tend to fuse into one intermediate type of characteristic, ever more generalized, with no color prejudice, legal restriction or any other kind of impediment to halt its evolution.

In my opinion, this is due to the fact that the paternal and benevolent spirit with which the Spanish colonizers treated their black slaves, did not create the enormous complexities of inequality which arose in other countries, and which have persisted even until now, in which the slave was considered simply as a beast of burden.

Generally speaking, the docility of the native element also caused it to accept the domination of the Iberian conqueror who, once he had established himself permanently, saw no humiliation in mixing the two bloods. Finally, the religious feeling which existed in the Colony, firmly and vigorously expressed in the practice of the doctrine of Christianity and in that feeling of love and charity towards one's neighbor

which is its essence, tended to eliminate every kind of harshness in racial relations, and gave rise to no irreconcilable discrimination.

Certainly, in some southern countries such as Argentina and Chile, there has been greater diversity in the structure of the population, especially in Argentina where a large Spanish and Italian immigration numbering several millions, has exercised a decisive influence on customs and the way of life.

Nevertheless, this did not impede the emergence of a vigorously American conscience throughout these nations and, even though based on European culture, it has its own method of expression and constitutes a form of common denominator which implies unity.

Reaction to racial differences, which has distinguished the Latin American from the Saxon, is a circumstance which could easily constitute a barrier against the application of practical forms of true unity. Unfortunately, it is not possible to ignore the fact that there are also other elements such as the religious, idiomatic and the pragmatic philosophy of the Saxon and the Christian of the Latin, which are vital features with different facades. On the other hand, the differences which separate one Latin from another, are not wide or vital, but are due more to fortuitous circumstances, artificially created on occasions through the fault of egoism, or the intromission of political interests.

However, economic interests, represented by ever-increasing industrial development and trade expansion on the one hand, and on the other, by the

generalization of certain political and doctrinal foundations, which, although not identified, possess evident points of contact, are every day eliminating more and more obstacles, great or small, and preparing the ground for continental progress to develop harmoniously.

All these factors for American unity existed from the beginning, but none of them ever had either the power or the potential they have now.

Firstly, each country had to solve the problems created by its own independence which sometimes emerged as an inopportune reality and, at others, even prematurely. These problems found the countries practically abandoned and obliged to improvise; and even though the political and economic regime adopted by them all was based on the same principles, the adaptation of these to each national requirement was a slow and complex task.

The first authorities and ideologists believed that a simple series of abstract doctrines without clearly defined bases, such as freedom, democracy, equality and others, were sufficient for the people to achieve their destiny. However, on putting them into operation, they found population, transport and communication, productivity and climatic conditions to be other realities which made the pure and simple philosophical ideal impracticable, leading to a series of difficulties, conflicts and controversies which were sometimes so irritating as to provoke bloody revolutions.

This adaptation has not yet ceased, and some countries have discovered that their problems arise precisely from the application of inadequate measures to solve them, and in an excess of ideological factors.

They have opposed the clear and concise viewpoint with innumerable arguments, such as interests inherited from the days of their being colonies, to their becoming Republics; foreign ambitions and greed, which have managed to reduce their independence; extremist political passions; doctrinary prejudices and many others which have retarded the establishment of objective ideas. In recent times, the basic determination of American states has been subjected to more powerful, negative and brutal pressures than ever before in their history; the pressure of Communism.

Simultaneously with the birth of the Nations, the desire for American unity not only developed in the minds of their liberators, but also in the conscience of the people. It was like a condition inherent in its nature and the natural result of continental circumstances. However, like a small child, it was unable to find the means by which to express itself. Its stammerings consisted of the signing of reciprocal aid pacts and in military cooperation in the decisive struggles for its freedom.

However, in the actual process of its organization, there appeared factors of desintegration composed of premature nationalist tendencies of an antagonistic character. Certainly, these tendencies showed neither the spirit nor the meaning of our modern ideas of



sovereignty, and, for this reason, constituted a real obstacle to every possibility that the general feelings of the Colony's community would have any practical influence on the organization of the new nations.

These feelings have always existed and have endeavored to find expression in many ways which, even if ending in failure nevertheless have gradually reduced the initial harshness.

The first manifestation of the instinct for unity and collaboration was expressed lucidly by Bolivar, even before independence was achieved, and its crystallization was attempted in 1827 at the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama. Certain countries, however, were born with signs of suspicion and distrust towards the sincerity and cooperation of their neighbors; others were too occupied with the organization of their own internal administration; others were terrorized by the vastness of the enterprise while others, finally, never showed any signs of that international awareness which was so necessary for their own determination, and the Congress became reduced to the inoperative expression of a great and wise ideal.

The Monroe doctrine seemed to constitute a basis for possible American unity. But unceasing United States expansion towards the west and south, and the ever-increasing economic development of this country gradually gave it a unilateral sense, while for some Latin American internationalists, it appeared to acquire a tendency to tutelage and preeminence, making it impossible for it to start from that level of absolute and legal equality which was so necessary.

The idea of a Pan American Union was based on an interpretation which was wider and closer to this equality. However, its operation did not halt certain absorptionist attempts; nor the cupidity which certain influential elements of United States capitalism developed in regard to a number of weaker and defenseless countries; nor even the excesses of what came to be called imperialism, when persons or national political groups started to exalt patriotism and the heroic aspirations of the lower classes.

The Pan American Union gradually acquired a more and more inoperative and static nature, and its meetings constituted simple excuses for diplomatic conversations, carried on in ambiguous terms and characterized by a magnificent interchange of courtesies.

My appreciation of American realities and my understanding of their characteristics and general possibilities induced in me an early and firm conviction that those factors which determine unity, and the attempts to achieve it legally, indicated the need for a joint organization.

So, while I pondered on the profound Dominican problem, long before the consensus of popular opinion had decided to charge me with the solution of its difficulties, I became aware that no American country could achieve progress and fulness by isolating itself from the rest, and having recourse to its own devices, and that this could only be achieved by participating in the common effort of the whole of the Continent.



The Dominican Republic had lived its history on its own, as had been the case with other countries, and its efforts to recover its vitality would be in vain if it did not incorporate itself morally and materially with the Continent, in a community orientated by identical objectives.

However, in view of the specific circumstances in which our countries were born and grew up, it seemed obvious to me that it would be impossible to achieve coordination of effort by means of impositions, or as a result of an unbalanced condition in which the richest or the most populated would dominate. Rather the contrary; in order that American destinies should not become dissipated, relations between the various countries should be based on a spirit of reciprocal collaboration and understanding, and on the absolute legal equality of all nations which would in turn be extended to all commercial pacts and agreements.

The manner in which the various nations emerging from the immense Spanish colonial empire gradually became defined, brought with it the spontaneous idea of sovereignty. The emergence of this ideal and feeling was not the result of theoretical investigations nor of legal appreciations, but was inherent in independence.

The simple idea of State and autonomy includes sovereignty, and the fixing of boundaries indicates the territorial scope of such sovereignty.

In their efforts to consolidate their political life, several of the original States divided themselves up

into various nationalities, like Gran Colombia, the Confederation of the Plata and Peru; and each of these divisions automatically implied the respective sovereignty of the sub-divisions, crystalizing into their own Constitutions, governments and autonomous legislation.

These facts brought forth the heroic idea of Fatherland, and acquired a high degree of refinement and susceptibility making it impossible to bring about any attempt at cohesion and collaboration if the main fact was not realized, not only of sovereignty, but also of the intangibility of such sovereignty on which the doctrine and practice of non-intervention are based.

Founded not only on these ideas, but also on continental history and psychology, it always seemed to me that Bolivar's idea of creating an organization capable of protecting friendship or of solving whatever problems might arise between the countries, or of assuming the personality of all in matters of universal importance, could only be carried out when the unalterable principle and effective fact of sovereignty and non-intervention had been established.

At the time I came to this conclusion, Communism had not yet put in its demolishing appearance with the force it acquired later. However, its ambitions and intentions for the domination of America could be seen even then, and this threat, at least among men of action and thought who usually understand and direct the destinies of peoples towards their realization, accentuated the natural desire for unity and

prepared the ground for really efficient formulas of solidarity and harmony.

As the enormous threat became obvious and Marxist penetration frankly more subversive, threatening to destroy every essence of our culture and civilization, the spontaneous tendency towards inter-American collaboration became an ever more pressing and fundamental need.

My belief in the practical and legal necessity of a union achieved in all sincerity; the correct analysis I made of the situation in regard to the fulfillment of these hopes, latent in all countries, and my conviction that the political and administrative re-structuring of my country and the recovery of its total independence, could not be achieved as an isolated fact, but only as the result of our incorporation into a continental unit with full use of unrestricted sovereignty and based on absolute legal equality, were some of the factors which led me to conceive the necessity for establishing a new basis for relations between American countries.

Furthermore, the appearance of new political and economic problems imposed the necessity for adopting another more dynamic and workable program than hitherto; for again setting forth objectives and for more rapid, efficient and far-reaching measures, all of which could only be achieved by the creation of a highly positive organization, one endowed with sufficient authority and prestige to be able to act in behalf of the community, and maintain the balance of objectives and the solidarity of effort.

This was how the idea of a League of American Nations was born in my mind. A League to which every effort ever made previously would be devoted in order that the common desire for unity and cooperation, so often declared by rulers and by public opinion spokesmen in every country, could be converted into an operative force to the benefit of all, and for the unalterable stability of peace and progress of every nation.

Circumstances were ripe for this idea to prosper and to be converted into brilliant reality. President Franklin D. Roosevelt had adopted a policy of understanding and sincere friendship towards Latin American countries, until then, frequently treated with such arrogant attitudes as to arouse suspicion and enmity which contributed to the failure of the great ideals of continental coordination. Precisely on account of this conciliatory attitude of Roosevelt, which involved indispensable legal equality, I decided the moment had come to inform him of my idea, as soon as I had put it into concrete form, and I did this by a letter dated the 11th February, 1936, which was received with the greatest satisfaction.

The proposal, clearly set forth, based on the clearest principles of inter-American solidarity and the purest ideas of efficiency, was taken by the Dominican delegation to the Conference for the Consolidation of Peace, held at Buenos Aires in 1936, and was received with well-merited enthusiasm.

It would be deviating from the purpose and plan of this book to relate the vicissitudes which my idea

met with, and the obstacles which it encountered through the prejudice and lack of understanding of certain publicists and political leaders, until its incorporation in the Bogota Charter, adopted in 1948 by the IX Pan American Conference, with the amendments that were introduced after long and violent discussions.

The essential part was that the fraternal desires of the people, clearly interpreted in my project, found just expression in the Organization of American States into whose hands the nations delivered the custody of their peace and harmony.

Inspired by the principles of legal equality and non-intervention, which appeared to me to be indispensable to any agreement, the Organization, at least in theory, was endowed with the necessary attributes for fulfilling such a task. Nevertheless, the inopportune eruption of violence in Cuba and Venezuela came to show that the simple moral force of legal statutes, even though they may express a unanimous wish, are not yet sufficiently powerful to act as a regulator of inter-American relations, nor have they the intrinsic vitality necessary to enable them to impose their wishes at any given moment on the arbitrariness of a government lacking in responsibility or sense of national honor.

-----

The restrictions to which Dominican sovereignty was subjected in 1930, could very well have limited the scope of those hopes I proposed developing in matters of international policy. But right from the

start, my ideas had been solidly constructed, and the very circumstances in which my country found itself contributed to giving continental scope to the modifications which appeared to me to be necessary to introduce to our national structure. The experience of the Dominican Republic could be used to avoid a repetition elsewhere of the errors and faults which had created so many difficulties in our country.

The Republic, to all intents and purposes, was impeded from entering into any undertakings and fulfilling them with due loyalty. Foreign greed, sinuously spread over the territory and throughout its economic potential; political and financial difficulties; instability of regimes, all were factors which contributed to the lessening of our legal efficacy and our national importance in the system of American countries.

The life of the Dominican, in all its moral and material expressions, was precarious; the permanent quarrel with our neighbor in the same island made it impossible to state with any accuracy the geographic extension of our sovereignty; the 1907 Convention and its ratification in 1924, reduced us to a totally subordinate fiscal condition, leading to the complete failure of every effort we made to occupy the position to which we had every right in the international scene.

In view of the fact that I proposed a doctrine which, instead of being composed of prejudices and aberrations, had acquired in my mind a subjective prominence in which Fatherland, Nation and State had their set functions, it became necessary for me,



above all, to establish the rightfull position of the Republic in the concert of American nations, this being one of the main factors for the full sovereignty I intended to achieve.

The Nation must constantly demonstrate its legal existence as a State; it must participate in the international field in a firm and well-defined manner and abandon the habitual passive reserve it had been adopting for some years past. Also, it was indispensable that it show audacity and prove that we were a united and legitimate entity.

The task of liberation I proposed to perform, the planning of which embraced all spheres of life, required the collaboration of every element, its principal objective being our elevation to international status. Only thus would it be possible to achieve the national well-being I intended.

For this reason, from 1930 on, our country began to make more brilliant and frequent appearances on the international stage. In accordance with my designs, the country altered its policy of keeping itself in the background at congresses and conferences, as it had always systematically done previously, more by reason of an inferiority complex and shyness than of any economic or intellectual failing, and our delegations achieved notable triumphs.

The country increased and expanded its diplomatic relations achieving interest and sympathy from all sides, thereby supplying proof of its existence. It signed pacts and agreements that represented undertakings, contributions and obligations and constituted

proof of its autonomy, and also of its being a free nation. It occupied its rightful place on committees and bodies instituted for the benefit of world interests. In short, it availed itself of every opportunity to demonstrate the orientation of its culture and the solidity of its structure, and claimed its rightful historic and cultural primacy in the discovery and conquest of America.

As an indispensable complement to its world status, the Republic must take good care of its moral position. In the past, through causes which, on many occasions, were foreign to that upright and just spirit which are characteristic of the country, it failed to fulfill certain of its obligations with the result that our national reputation declined. But this would never occur again, either now or in the future.

For all the plans and the principles that were to govern my policies and be employed in giving a new understanding, not only of Fatherland and Nation, but also of the functions of government, I imposed absolute austerity and sacrifice in order to restore our lost prestige. Despite the catastrophic hurricane, the resultant problems of which overwhelmed the country, and my decision to change every way of life, submitting to the raw and painful truth rather than to any thought of speculation, our undertakings were fulfilled with unprecedented rapidity.

The effects of the tremendous financial crisis of 1929 lasted many years. The vast majority of American countries that owed money to the United States, suspended payment of the principal and even

of the interest, leading to the Dominican Republic appearing as an exception in the financial world. But it was impossible for anyone to know the penury and privations we had to suffer to be able to achieve and maintain this position.

Little by little, the Republic commenced to recover the personality it had lost through its internal vicissitudes, and international respect was gradually strengthened by fresh contributions to the solution of far-reaching problems; by the presentation of assertive arguments in matters of international jurisprudence and by frank and firm attitudes indicating the existence of a well-defined criterion and a feeling of concern for human anxieties. My initiative in regard to the League of American Nations was, at the same time, the culmination of this policy and the reflection of these feelings.

Between 1936, when the Dominican delegation proposed the creation of this League, and 1948, when the Bogota Charter was adopted, a series of far-reaching events took place that confirmed the fact that the Dominican Republic's international policy, ever since 1930, had been not just an improvisation or an elastic and volatile attitude subject to any contingency, but the result of a high sense of responsibility and a vigilant spirit of collaboration.

The fundamental ideas that governed my task of internal reconstruction had sufficient solidness for their effects to transcend the domestic field and to influence the Republic's relations with other countries, not through the inspiration of inoperative

routines, but by the creation and interlacing of common interests, both material and spiritual. Considerable proof of this fact had been given since long before 1935.

Precisely on account of the pre-existence of the doctrinary structure which guided me, every single one of my acts in matters of international politics, the setting forth of which would not only occupy several volumes but would transcend the intentions which inspired these pages, represented perfect unity of thought.

From the unlimited application of the right of asylum in order to protect the victims of the Spanish Civil War, to our speedy enlistment on the side of the democracies against the totalitarian ambitions that shattered world peace; from the acceptance of the sacrifices which our position imposed upon us, to our cooperation in all agreements, pacts and covenants adopted for the prosecution of the war and the organization of peace; from the unlimited hospitality we offered the victims of the struggle, to the thousands of persons who found themselves stateless and no one in the world to give them shelter, to the ratification of democracy and our rightful suspicion of the peril that Communism represents for civilization, everything followed a uniform line, the result of the steadfast convictions that I have set forth in the pages of this book.

While in this way I inexorably affirmed the position of our country in the concert of nations, my efforts and diligence finally achieved a solution to

the frontier problem which had existed for more than a century, costing so many lives and sacrifices; to the recovery of our financial independence through the Trujillo-Hull Treaty of 1940, as the result of intense labor and great determination, which finally put paid to the 1907 Convention and its ratification in 1924, and which had always caused us so much trouble and humiliation; to the definite assertion of our sovereignty through the total payment of our debt in 1947, and to our conquest of an almost unparalleled position in the field of international affairs.

By reason of this line of action and the performance of deeds which history has noted and analyzed and the effects of which have been lasting, the Dominican Republic finally achieved a national integrity never before enjoyed in its splendid entirety.

## CHAPTER XI

### A POSITIVE DOCTRINARY BASE

As I have explained before, a precise evaluation of every factor that constituted the Fatherland, Nation and State, and the function that each must perform so that the whole might operate with the balance of a physiological organization, is what permitted me not only to achieve liberation, progress and stability for the Dominican Republic but, what is more important still at the present time, to render it immune to the Communist advances that have penetrated with such great ease into those countries dominated by ill-defined or ductile basic definitions.

In the years following the Russian Bolshevist Revolution of 1917 and 1918, there arose in practically every country in America and in the world, a mistaken idea, not only as to the real objectives of the movement in question, but also to the ideology that inspired it. Marxist theories were unknown excepting to a few groups of intellectuals who found in them both an historic and economic base. The harrowing experience of the First World War and the disconsolateness it left in the new generations; the existence of problems which political conflicts were not sufficient to solve;

the efforts on the part of practically all Latin American countries to evolve plans for their improvement and, it is impossible to ignore it, the excesses of certain representatives of United States capitalism who humiliated countries and carried off their wealth without just compensation, were all circumstances which contributed to cloaking or dissembling the immense danger to America of that revolution, and the objective of world domination that inspired it.

During the first ten years of its existence, from 1920 to 1930, Communism began to show its real intentions, those of exterminating Christian culture, of demolishing those social and political organizations which had been in operation until then, and of constructing what their propagandists called a new world.

In many places, the working classes were incited to insurrection; disorders and riots occurred; political crimes were committed; there were bloody strikes and other demonstrations of Communist activity. But it was still not possible to see clearly through all this. Many political leaders adopted the social justice proclaimed by the Bolshevik agitators, as part of their political renewal programs and, although by no negotiated alliance, became their agents for penetration.

None yet suspected, unless perhaps some excessively cautious persons whose warnings would have fallen on deaf ears, the degree of subversion, annihilation, class hatred and brutality that Communism intended to develop, not only for the complete destruc-

tion of our countries and the enslavement of their inhabitants through the cruellest and most implacable purges, but rather for the purpose of converting them into a bloc for resistance to and hostility against the United States, which was later to become the most powerful obstacle to the imperialist ambitions of world domination that was the essence of the Soviet organization.

All the fundamentals of Marxism which constitute the philosophical and theoretical inspiration of Communism, and all the activities and propaganda of the latter as a practical organization and a negative and destructive force, were absolutely contrary to the principles and ideas which I had adopted long before 1930, and which were to guide me in my task of government.

On several occasions, even at the commencement of my government, I took the opportunity to state this fact and to denounce the anarchising and subversive content of such doctrines, the objectives of which were far-removed from American truths.

The whole world was deceived when, during the Second World War, and after a number of dubious and suspicious maneuvers on the part of Stalin with regard to Nazism and Hitler, Russia sided with the democracies. Without in any way accepting either its doctrines or its promises to mend its ways, and much less, approving the inclusion of the Soviet in the ranks of the democracies, all of us who had united in the common cause against the totalitarian regimes—the Dominican Republic declaring war on the day



following the attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941— were obliged to give our cooperation to Communism to the best of our ability.

It was then that the gravest mistakes in history were made. Communism took possession of the key posts in order to widen its scope of penetration and, while the democracies acted with all good faith in the hope of a better and cleaner world, Communism treacherously plotted to take advantage of this good faith, as well as of the technical and scientific help it received, in order to convert them into instruments with which to break and shatter the finest fundamentals of every democratic organization.

Immediately on the cessation of hostilities, the depth of Bolshevik treachery began to make itself felt. Central European nations were enslaved and, despite their hope of freedom, Russia imposed upon them oppression and slavery. Every cruelty, every crime and even total destruction were employed to obliterate the traditions of these countries, to change the course of their lives and to submit them to the exacting yoke of Communism.

The Marxist idea of revolution on a world scale started to function, and Soviet universities began training the necessary people for carrying out subversion everywhere. This training included both intellectual and material matters and was composed of the attractions and fallacies of Marxist theory, such as historic materialism and increased values, sabotage, strikes and the encouragement of conflicts.

The training of these agents was specialized so as to take advantage of the national characteristics of each country in economic, political and social matters, and provoke clashes and differences between the various classes. Through everything being carefully planned and a real technique acquired, hundreds of subversive agents were distributed throughout America. Latin American students were invited to attend Soviet specialization institutes, and a movement of agitation and subversion was put into operation on a scale the world had never previously experienced.

All of this is well-known, and a great deal of literature has been written about it. Nevertheless, the defensive reaction has been weak and disjointed. No one is unaware of the importance of the Communist threat. Every country is suffering from it through waves of illegal strikes and other subversive acts which are serious upsets to their political and economic organization, leading to the bankruptcy of their finances and every other kind of disruption. The defensive measures adopted by the various nations have been fruitless or imprudent, and have done nothing to stem the progress of their disintegration.

Communism has even perverted minds which seemed unshakable. The attractiveness of the fallacious and apparent science which Marx and his disciples used for teaching their absurd ideas, took possession of weak minds, of so-called intellectuals, of newspapermen with no cultural background, turning them all into propagandists. Although not all of them

were always self-confessed Communists, they often contributed powerfully to the disfigurement of events and to confounding the origin and development of these.

Certain deficiencies in the social structure of our countries have also been exploited with undeniable cleverness, and attractive though impossible promises of economic equality have been used to tempt social groups sunk in ignorance and poverty.

But what most facilitates Communist penetration is the lack of a sufficiently compact and realistic doctrinal basis to counteract all its propaganda and incitement. Actually, with the exception of fanatics and people who have been definitely inoculated with the terrible virus, every country, through its own natural instincts, and every person with a certain degree of culture, feels the urgent need to save the political, moral and economic life of our nations.

There arose, however, the obstacles of anarchy and discord; personal animosity and ideological controversies; party interests and economic prejudices and other elements for disintegration.

So, theoretically united in their fear of Communism, are to be found liberalist capitalists —those who favor absolute freedom; doctrinary conservatives — who favor a strong and centralized government; practicing catholics and impassioned protestants; those left-wing people who look for radical though democratic solutions to social problems, and those of the right-wing who defend hierarchies and would even wish for the restoration of the old guilds. In

short, a whole range of opinions that will never agree or unite their forces in the common cause of saving the civilization and culture they all pretend to love.

Far from getting together, each group carries on a disreputable propaganda about the other and follows, sometimes unwittingly, the Communist line which condemns certain institutions or cautious governments. Their solely verbal anti-Communist manifestations and their lack of defensive unity and coherence cause these isolated groups to become far and away the best and most useful Communist agents by reason of the fact that they contribute, better than anyone, to discord and the dissipation of those forces which pretend to show a common desire for survival.

As I have stated previously, the doctrinary element and the conceptual factors I brought to the Dominican Government, and which enabled me to perform my task successfully, also possessed the virtue of protecting the country against Communist penetration, even in those dark hours when Russia participated as an ally in a war which saved the democracies from totalitarian domination.

This was due to the fact that my ideas and inspirations sprang from natural and realistic appreciations of politics, economy, society and the human being, and were so solid and fundamental that by constituting the basis for the progress achieved in every sphere by the Dominican Republic, they provided the citizen and society as a whole with the necessary defenses against any type of destructive

factor which might try to hinder their normal progress and organization.

Communism was aware of this from the moment of its first appearance; even from that moment when it started to spread its tentacles over America and came up against the totally invincible resistance of the Dominican Republic. It also gave rise to a systematic, ferocious and implacable hatred against the ruler who had achieved this immunity for his people, and this hostile feeling, cleverly presented and invested with ingenuous reasoning, found an echo precisely in those circles which were most favorable to Communist infiltration; among those who, at every moment, spoke and wrote about freedom and democracy while exchanging them for even less than the proverbial mess of pottage.

I have been the victim of unjust attacks, and my work, my principles and my person have been maligned and betrayed. However, this has never affected me, or caused me to deviate from my ideas or to revoke my decisions.

My ideas have been clear and well-defined. Their fundamental norm has been the converting of my country into a noble, dignified and free Fatherland. They were born in my heart and in my mind as a result of knowledge of the truth of what the Republic was suffering. They have been the summary of the fervent hopes always present in the spirit of the Fatherland, even through its vicissitudes.

They do not spring from ideological prejudices, nor have they simply been derived from ready-

prepared phrases, impracticable theories, illusory idealism or impossible ambitions. They have placed every factor which constitutes a Nation in its correct place in order that it shall perform its legitimate function.

Now, at the conclusion of my task, in the full ratification of my work and life, I have given concrete form to my basic ideas, those that have given unity, consistency and continuity to my task, in a few clearly expressed principles, with no hidden or double meanings. Each word is given the exact measure of its expression and intent. Each constitutes the intimate essentials of my acts and rule and the moral, ethical and legal forces which have permitted me to achieve my most fervent desires. And because they are based on reality and not on theory, on the nature of things and men and not on their conventional interpretation, they represent a universal declaration of doctrine, capable of opposing every Communist evil intention and of counteracting its effects.

These principles are as follows:

I.—The Fatherland is fundamental and can only function within a Nation.

II.—The Nation is an idea and a reality which unite in a series of physically and morally cohesive factors, and its essentials lie in its own sovereignty and in the absolute autonomy of its internal regime.

III.—The State is an organization composed also of physical and moral factors with a sense of unity and hierarchy, capable of imparting action and movement to the live forces of a Nation.

IV.—The Government is not simply a political and organically fragile entity but an authority invested with the necessary power and capacity to direct the life of the nation and to put into ordered operation the elements of the State. Its three organs, legislative, executive and legal, are independent one of the other, although their functions harmonize and are carried out with exactly the same concept of State and Nation.

V.—People are an idea and a basic fact, and the State must unite them behind its national programs and works.

VI.—Society is not just a simple grouping of individuals, occasionally gathered together in one geographical spot, but constitutes the regularization and systematization of the strength of the populace in the interests of all. Its existence is not confined to the present, but is linked to the past and the future by indestructible moral and spiritual bonds.

VII.—Society is as one with the elements that compose it; rejects any class of discrimination in the same way as it does any division into class antagonism, and its structure is based on a balance of economic factors and on the constant improvement of its moral and cultural attributes.

VIII.—Man, as a social being, cannot be regarded with the exclusivist and isolated criterion of individual, but rather as having the coherence of a human being in his spiritual and material duality. For this reason, he has every right to his own preservation, and to the development of his well-being. The

State protects his moral and physical integrity, cooperates in the development of his capabilities and in the expression of his legitimate feelings, and guarantees his safety.

IX.—The human being is connected to that Society of which he forms a part by certain bonds of rights and obligations which he cannot disregard.

X.—The human being fulfills and perfects himself through family, the basis of all social organization, and consequently deserves the State's fullest protection with a view to strengthening Society.

XI.—Democracy is not a political theory or an abstract idea with no practical application, subject to conventional interpretations, but is the effective exercise of rights and obligations. Every citizen must be culturally and economically capable of exercising such rights and obligations.

XII.—Public freedom cannot be given an absolutist sense, which leads to anarchy, but must be ordered and regulated, thereby ensuring social harmony and solidarity.

XIII.—The organization of a nation cannot be left to the arbitrariness of party disputes or political combinations, but must be planned technically, economically, administratively and socially on a solid and permanent basis.

XIV.—Production represents the economic power and the stability of the Nation and State and, consequently, cannot be given over exclusively to private enterprise, but must be made subject to the realities of supply and demand and to other economic



factors. It is up to the Government to regulate production according to the needs and convenience of the State, although the profits may accrue to private enterprise.

XV.—The right to ownership is inherent in the human being and the State must guarantee it. However, it carries with it certain obligations and responsibilities.

XVI.—Work, meaning any honest, intellectual, manual, artistic or other type of occupation representing profit or social benefit, is still one more function that is inherent in man, and its performance produces inalienable rights which must be defined and protected by the State.

XVII.—Capital and labor are the basic pillars of economy and wealth and, consequently, are not only compatible, but are complementary, one to the other.

The chief power of these principles lies in their unity and national cohesion, and in the spirit of order and collaboration of each and every one of their elements for the material progress and ethical stability which moves them. It was in the lack of any precision of intentions, any adequate means to condense hopes, that lay the ills of the Fatherland in the past and the threat of dissolution in the future.

The defining of relations between Fatherland, Nation and State; the fixing of their respective objectives and the absolute autonomy of the internal regime of the country, that is, the achievement of sovereignty, automatically impedes the interference of any foreign power, influence or domination; and this

principle, intended particularly to free the country of the burdens which weighed upon it, closed the door to Communism.

The idea of a Government invested with the necessary authority, power and unity with which to develop its functions, implies the strengthening of a regime, and the assurance that it will be safe against any insurgent who, moved only by ambition and base intentions might try to take possession of it by means of a lucky or daring coup d'etat.

Under the unwholesome influence of Communism, it has already been established as an accepted fact that well-organized rioting, mob attack, the victory of gangs of thieves and even attempted assassination represent a legal force that gives power to any authority and paves the way for the brutal and bloody Communist leaders.

Under the influence of Communism also, the idea of **people** has been so prostituted as to be applicable to any infuriated and irresponsible mob, a mob that drags a dead body along a street, stones the public lighting system or sets fire to someone's property, with no other purpose than that of destruction.

Demagogy has coined the words "popular revolution" for this kind of brutality, and has converted the exercise of democracy into this loose meaning and interpretation of the word **people**.

As far as I am concerned, **the people** was always something more dignified, more representative and united, impelled forward by noble and constructive ends and oriented towards self improvement and

progress, and I have fostered this idea and placed it at the service of great causes. A gang of ruffians or drunks cannot be considered as being the people without the whole magnificent and evolutionary instinct of man being adulterated and betrayed.

If society, as I have conceived and defined it, is an entity that is united in itself and with its component factors, and rejects every kind of discrimination or division into antagonistic classes, then it becomes a solid and impenetrable organization against the grudges, conflict and anarchy that constitute that most destructive force called Communism.

Looked upon as an historic unit, linked equally to the past and the future, it operates as a bond between generations in that it is a continuity of objectives and a desire for improvement in a constant and logical evolution permitting perfect stability and balance at any given moment.

My ideas and definitions tend to provide society with a solid base, a base of which the great deeds of our founders form part; likewise with concrete coherence so that, far from forming a fragile whole, cemented together merely by material interests, it may constitute a solid and invulnerable structure against the attacks of adventurers and agitators.

Experience has shown that it has been those societies which have broken their relations and historic intermingling that have found themselves the more readily involved in civil war, or in the unleashing of destructive passions and, consequently, that provide

the biggest gaps for the penetration, sometimes silent, often brutal but always insistent, of Communism.

The concept of man as a human being and not as an individual tends to link him to society, and to grant him rights and responsibilities, that is, to integrate him with the task which is to be of benefit to all.

Such was my principal intention. But the truth is that the recognition of the moral personality and unalterable dignity of the human being fosters the consciousness of his own significance and purifies his individuality, and these circumstances make him impermeable to Communism by reason of the fact that the latter is based precisely on the destruction of such precious factors, and on the dehumanization of the human being.

The glorification of the family as the basis of society, not only stimulates the natural feelings of man, but gives him a reason for his existence and an impulse for his own betterment.

Teaching, the raising of cultural standards, art and other intellectual expressions awaken an analytical and rational regard for his conduct and impede him from throwing himself into adventures of doubtful results, risking every possible and tangible advantage he may have.

The idea of individual lacks intrinsic value by reason of the fact that, as I explained earlier, it is essentially materialistic. The linking-up of the personal with the collective function establishes a correlation of obligations and rights which neither

leave him abandoned, nor overburden him with the one while releasing him to the point of licentiousness and moral intemperance through the excesses of the other, but rather balances his legitimate private hopes with those of mutual security and benefits.

It is tantamount to giving permanent prominence to individual personality, concreting it with the definition of man as a person and thereby including his useful and valuable collaboration in the process and fulfillment of social objectives.

My first thought was to insure the harmony and solidarity of citizens, through the application of such a definition, bringing about in them a form of inter-related undertaking which would raise moral standards and productivity.

In actual practice, this has resulted in a truly defensive armored shell against the destruction of personality and totalitarian absolutism intended by Communism.

My ideas about democracy make of it a constant truth, one that is based on the people's lofty opinion of it. It does not reduce it to the level of an instrument of argument with no positive personal effect, or to the constituting of a transitional force with which to win an election; or to a simple political pronouncement, diluted by the economic or party interests of the leading classes, that never reaches those social groups which find themselves in conditions of inferiority.

Individual training by means of culture, and any economic possibility for the exercise of democracy

impedes, on the one hand, that the citizen shall be used as an instrument for demagogic impetuosity, so efficiently employed by those political agitators who conciliate Communism or aspire to their own eminence, and on the other, it establishes the basis for rational behavior in the political activities of the citizenry.

All this implies an absolute pre-eminence for freedom, based on prior discernment and not on the luck of irrational or mob impulses. This idea constitutes, therefore, a real element for restraint against any incitement to that anarchy, bloody revolt or permanent conflict generally used by professional politicians to achieve victory for their private ambitions.

The existence of national planning in order to give technical direction, not only to official enterprise, but also to private activities, for their organic and efficient development, eradicates all the improvisation and incoherence that has consumed an immense proportion of the natural wealth and labor of practically every Latin American country, without providing any element for reproduction. In short, it avoids chance benefits promised as the reward of political adventure or of any convenient election, and coordinates all public works and personal effort to an objective of national profit.

In this way, progress is achieved coherently and generally without any areas being abandoned through regionalism or favoritism, and without any unjust discrimination being aroused.

Communism's chief efforts are directed against the economic and social articulation of our countries. Anarchy in public expenditure; budget disequilibrium; arbitrary taxation; the disappearance of solid backing for the monetary system; everything that constitutes confusion and disorder, all create an excellent atmosphere for subversive activities. From this emerges bankruptcy and poverty; high cost of living; unbalanced wages and other similar phenomena.

The principal mission of all Communist agents is to bring about every kind of disorder; to incite governments to excessive public expenditure through unproductive investments, gratuitous subsidies paid on the pretext of lowering the cost of living, the construction of sumptuous buildings or of secondary works which are additional to the overall plan, social assistance undertakings which are beyond the possibilities of the State, and other similar expedients that not only swallow up public funds but also foreign loans and aid which humiliate the national dignity, making it necessary to float additional loans.

This unbalanced condition automatically leads to higher cost of living and this is seized upon by agitators in order to provoke strikes, sabotage and other acts of destruction and insurrection.

My assertion is that the administration of a country must be dedicated to rational and technical planning, sane expenditure, to budgetary reality and solidity of investments, and to the elimination of all

weak points through which Communism has penetrated in other countries, wrecking their lives.

A clear and precise defining of the rights and obligations of capital and labor, and constant protection for the rational exercise of such rights and obligations, promote social peace, and contradict the Marxist theory that any natural and open hostility between the two elements that constitute the basis of all economy must be solved by the triumph of the working classes.

Proper legislation, inspired by principles of justice, by respect for certain natural rights like that of ownership, by clearly defining the obligations resulting from the exercise of such rights, by the principle, already alluded to, that every human being has a right to a dignified standard of living, establishes a permanent and invulnerable balance against the attacks of greed on the one hand, and of animosity on the other.

Within a society in which capital and labor maintain harmonious and cooperative relations, neither trusts, monopolies, the preponderance of certain classes, the humiliation of others, nor the "exploitation of man by man" —a very fashionable phrase in Marxism because on it is based "class struggle" which is the prelude to revolution— can emerge.

So, in reducing to doctrinary theorems the fundamentals of the task of basic transformation which I have performed in the Dominican Republic, and by which the country has been made impervious



to Communist penetration, I would like to repeat that one of my virtues consists in never having turned aside into the intricate labyrinth of hazy and impracticable theories, nor of having allowed myself to be seduced by verbal mirages or conventional and ephemeral definitions, suitable only for political interests and not for the good of the nation, nor to any other of the factors that have been the origin of the organizational and development difficulties that have beset every American country, including even our own.

As I stated at the beginning, I have always confined myself to the realities that constitute the life of the Dominican people, never with any thought to material considerations, but only to the moral, ethical and spiritual values which my Christian faith considers should be the indestructible basis of every work of progress, civilization and culture.

# I N D E X

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CHAPTER I</b>	
The Motherland, the Nation and the State.....	5
<b>CHAPTER II</b>	
Elements of the State.....	21
<b>CHAPTER III</b>	
Concept and Practice of Government.....	37
<b>CHAPTER IV</b>	
The Individual, the Person and the Family.....	57
<b>CHAPTER V</b>	
Definitions of the Associated Man.....	71
<b>CHAPTER VI</b>	
Essence and Vicissitudes of Democracy.....	87
<b>CHAPTER VII</b>	
Public Freedoms.....	105
<b>CHAPTER VIII</b>	
Economic Bases of Sovereignty.....	127
<b>CHAPTER IX</b>	
The Human Element.....	151
<b>CHAPTER X</b>	
National Fulfillment.....	171
<b>CHAPTER XI</b>	
A positive Doctrinary Base.....	191



