

tality of the Batista regime, and the reasons for Castro's spectacular early successes, we are spared the ultra-conservative fantasies which sometimes pass for analyses of these phenomena. However, since the author believes himself under attack or about to be attacked by conservatives, he spends entirely too much time justifying his own participation in the Castro government. He evidently feared that those on the right would accuse him of being either a dupe or a traitor.

As a consequence of this defensiveness, we get too little memoir and too much self-congratulation and flogging of dead issues. The author is at his best recounting his experiences in those early and frantic months when he tried to impose some semblance of fiscal order on a treasury bankrupted by Batista and plagued by the caprices of Castro and his lieutenants. The book is much less satisfactory when López-Fresquet plays sociologist, historian, or apologist. The sociology does not add to what others have said; the apologies are not needed; and at times the history is inaccurate. For instance, the author lists Armando Hart, one of the nineteen "founding fathers" of the fundamental law of 1959, as no longer holding high office in Cuba (p. 77). Hart, however, became not only Minister of Education under Castro, but later secretary for organization of the Communist Party. He is currently a member of both the central committee of the party and of the polit-bureau or party "steering committee" and has been for years one of the six or eight most important men in Cuba. Despite such occasional lapses, however, most of the narrative rings true.

In sum, *My Fourteen Months with Castro* is a useful book. It is not history; it is not sociology; it is not even vintage memoir. But given the paucity of serious writing and trustworthy documentation on the Cuban revolution, we need all the help we can get. And this book, although seriously flawed in some respects, is nevertheless of some help in understanding those critical fourteen months. This is more than can be said for the writings of most other exiles.

Stanford University

RICHARD FAGEN

*Papeles de Pedro F. Bonó. Para la historia de las ideas políticas en Santo Domingo.* By EMILIO RODRÍGUEZ DEMORIZI. Santo Domingo, 1964. Editora del Caribe. Academia Dominicana de la Historia. Index. Pp. 636. Paper.

Pedro Francisco Bonó (1828-1906) was one of the most respected men in the history of the Dominican Republic. A businessman, lawyer, and planter, he moved in and out of politics as duty, rather than ambition dictated. In moments of greatest danger to the nation Bonó

tended to emerge as a leader—for example, in a revolt against the “usurpations” of Buenaventura Báez in 1857, then in the “restoration” following the Spanish occupation in 1863, and again to defend the administration of his friend, President Ulises Espaillat, in 1876. Yet few Caribbean politicians have refused the honor of being president as often as Bonó and meant it.

While a young man Bonó fought against the Haitians, published some fiction, served briefly as deputy and as senator in the national government, and helped to draft the Constitution of 1858. The dictator, Pedro Santanta, drove Bonó and a handful of intellectuals into exile in 1854 but permitted him to return in time to witness the Republic’s annexation to Spain. In spite of poor health, Bonó became War Minister in the government of the Restoration and by 1867 was a justice of the Supreme Court and Minister of Foreign Affairs. At this stage of his life he frequently was suggested for the presidency.

Bonó is remembered primarily as a statesman, and it is his own writings and correspondence that make up the bulk of this book; biographical material is sketchy. Emilio Rodríguez Demorizi, whose busy typewriter has recently given us valuable collections about the Spanish occupation, the Restoration, and Ulises Espaillat, treats Bonó as Santo Domingo’s first sociologist. Bonó’s wide interests are reflected in his essays, speeches, and instructions to his administrative subordinates. His opinions are clear; his own reading is broad and surprisingly reflective of the Enlightenment. He was concerned with the relationship of low living standards and crime; he prescribed programs of broad educational and agricultural reform. He opposed the Samaná cession and any attack on his nation’s sovereignty. He looked to the municipality for the protection of political rights. Always he defended the individual.

Superficially *Papeles de Bonó* resemble the program of scores of nineteenth-century Latin American liberals. Still, as he studied his tormented little homeland from within and without, Bonó looked behind constitutional solutions and argued for the dignified treatment of man as the solution to the world’s racial, economic, and political ills.

Tulane University

THOMAS L. KARNES

*República Dominicana. Clases, crisis y comandos.* By FRANKLIN J. FRANCO. Havana, 1966. Casa de las Américas. Tables. Pp. 274. Paper.

The author of this book, a thirty year-old sociology student at the University of Santo Domingo, indicates his viewpoint in the dedica-