



Dominican Republic — Va-PoReg Country Report

Kailitz, Steffen, et al., 2026: Varieties of Political Regimes (Va-PoReg). Country Report Dominican Republic, Dresden: Hannah Arendt Institute for Totalitarianism Studies.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/JYEL7U>

02/27/1844 Start Non-Electoral Transitional Regime: The Dominican Republic was briefly unified with Haiti under Haitian rule from 1822 to 1844. On 02/27/1844 the Dominican Republic gained independence from Haiti. In 1880 male suffrage was introduced.¹ The call for free presidential elections arose soon after independence. Due to the ongoing threat by Haiti the enthusiasm for an electoral process was not shared by all high-ranking officials. The first constitution was passed in 1844 and was remarkably liberal (Hartlyn 2001: 23-24). It advocates for presidentialism, the separation of powers, and comprehensive "checks and balances." (Hartlyn 2001: 24). A second constitution in 1854 was even more liberal, although often disregarded (Hartlyn 2001: 24). In the Battle of Monte Cristi against Spanish occupation, the Dominican sovereignty was restored on 06/15/1865.² After Spanish troops departed, authority in the country was divided between militias and local caudillos.³ During this period, a continuous clash persisted between the primary factions within the oligarchies, namely the Rojos (Conservatives) and the Azules (Liberals), both characterized by a prominent emphasis on personalist leadership (Franco 2005: 239). Stability was brought back through the presidency of Ulises Heureaux that lasted between 09/01/1882 to 09/01/1884 and 01/06/1887 to 02/27/1889, as well as 04/30/1889 to 07/26/1899 even though Heureaux ruled the island through an "iron-fisted rule".⁴ The assassination of Heureaux in 1899 led to six years of instability, in this time there were four revolutions and six different presidents.⁵ Vice-President Felipe Horacio Vásquez led a rebellion against the government of President Juan Isidro Jimenez beginning on 04/26/1902. On 05/02/1902 Vice-President Felipe Horacio Vásquez's forces entered Santo Domingo, and President Jimenez was overthrown.⁶ On 2/5/1902, Vice President Felipe Horacio Vásquez was appointed as President of a Provisional government.⁷ According to LIED multiparty executive and legislative elections were held in 1900 and 1901, in 1903 only multiparty legislative elections were held. Political liberties were coded as absent by LIED, whereas V-Dem's PCLI indicates them with an ambiguous level for this period. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive encountered slight limitations on decision-making power imposed by other institutions. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

03/23/1903 End Non-Electoral Transitional Regime/Start Military Autocracy: On this date, General Alejandro Wos y Gil initiated a coup d'état, leading to the resignation of President Felipe Horacio Vásquez on 04/23/1903. Following these events, General Wos y Gil secured his position as the sole candidate, being elected on 06/20/1903. His inauguration as president took place on 08/01/1903.⁸ Although General Wos y Gil was elected, we code the regime as a military autocracy because there was no other candidate or opposition, and his presidency started with a military intervention. As per Polity5's classification, the executive's authority was subject to minor institutional constraints during this time.

11/25/1903 End Military Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: On this date, a rebellion led by General Carlos Morales on 11/24-25/1903 ended the presidency of Wos y Gil. On 12/06/1903 General Morales established a provisional government. U.S troops were deployed in support of the government. A Jimenista rebellion was suppressed by government troops in March 1904. A peace agreement was reached and signed by the political factions in June 1904.⁹ According to LIED only legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held.

Based on Polity5's assessment, the executive faced slight limitations on power during this period. During this regime period, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, whereas V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. Political liberties continued to be coded as absent per LIED and can be interpreted as ambiguous following V-Dem's PCLI.

06/19/1904 End Military Autocracy/Start Electoral Autocracy: After the peace agreement General Morales was elected president in May 1904, and he was inaugurated as president on 06/19/1904.¹⁰ In 1905 administration of customs was transferred to the USA. As per the conditions of this arrangement, a Receiver-General, designated by the U.S. president, retained 55% of the overall revenues to settle claims from foreign entities, while allocating the remaining 45% to the Dominican government. In 1906, Morales stepped down from office, leading to the presidency of Ramón Cáceres, who was part of the Horacista faction. Cáceres managed to quell a rebellion led by General Desiderio Arias, which resulted in political stability and a resurgence of economic prosperity. In November 1907 a constituent assembly convened and approved a new constitution in February 1908. Ramón Arturo Cáceres Vásquez won the presidency through an electoral college vote on 05/30/1908 and was officially inaugurated as president on 07/01/1908.¹¹ This was supported by new US-investments in the sugar sector. Cáceres was assassinated in 1911, an event in which Morales and Arias bore some level of indirect responsibility. This event threw the republic back into a state of turmoil.¹² Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. The elections in this regime period were not competitive according to LIED. No cleanliness was achieved during the entire time (V-Dem CEI) because no elections were held between 1904 and 1911, except in 1908. Those elections were not really free and fair (V-Dem EF&FI). Additionally, political liberties are classified as absent (LIED) and as ambiguous by V-Dem's PCLI. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive encountered slight limitations on decision-making power imposed by other institutions. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

12/01/1911 End Electoral Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: In the ensuing power vacuum, General Alfredo Victoria seized control, prompting Congress to elect his uncle, Eladio Victoria, as interim president on 12/05/1911. Allegations of bribery tainted the general's influence, casting doubt on his uncle's legitimacy upon assuming office on 02/27/1912. Former president Horacio Vásquez returned from exile to lead his supporters in a popular uprising against the new government, joining forces with General Desiderio Arias, sparking civil conflict by December.¹³ A bloody civil war lasted from 12/01/1911 to 11/01/1912. The USA escalated the situation by warning that they might shift their official recognition to the insurgents and relinquish the entire 45% of customs revenue to them unless President Victoria resigned. Consequently, on 11/26, Victoria stepped down from his position. American representatives engaged with the rebel leader Vásquez, leading to the appointment of Archbishop of Santo Domingo Adolfo Alejandro Nouel as interim president on 11/30.¹⁴ According to LIED multiparty executive and legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held during this period. Political liberties are coded as absent by LIED and V-Dem's PCLI indicates an ambiguous state of political liberties. Based on Polity5's assessment, the executive faced slight limitations on power during this period. During this regime period, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, whereas V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

11/30/1912 End Military Autocracy/Start Non-Electoral Transitional Regime: President Victoria had to resign due to threats of the USA, which is why we code this regime change event as a foreign intervention. Nouel was assigned the responsibility of organizing open elections, yet Arias promptly challenged the authority of the government. Within a span of four months, Nouel stepped down from his position, and Congress subsequently chose Senator José Bordas as provisional president.¹⁵ On 04/14/1913 Bordas was elected and assumed the provisional presidency. He was a politician independent of the parties. His singular focus was on

maintaining his presidency¹⁶, a task in which he failed, despite a suppressed rebellion and the win of a hastily organized election.¹⁷ He had to resign on 08/27/1914 and make way for another provisional government, which achieved the organization of elections on 10/25/1914. According to LIED multiparty executive and legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held during this period. Additionally, political liberties remained absent according to LIED and can be interpreted as absent by V-Dem's PCLI. Based on Polity5's assessment, the executive faced slight limitations on power during this period. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

10/25/1914 End Non-Electoral Transitional Regime/Start (Male) Electoral Autocracy: On this date, general elections, resulting in the election of Juan Isidro Jimenes Pereyra as president were conducted. He secured victory over his rivals Horacio Vásquez and Luis Felipe Vidal. The presidential selection followed a two-phase system, where voters initially chose an electoral college that subsequently carried out the president's election.¹⁸ The elections were considered to be "comparatively fair" (Hartlyn 2001: 37). Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. LIED considers the election as not competitive. Moreover, V-Dem's CEI scored no cleanliness. The overall election conditions were ambiguous (V-Dem EF&FI). Universal male suffrage had been established in 1865, but women were only granted the right to vote in 1942 (Franco 2005: 243). Besides the restricted suffrage, a non-elected actor, namely the United States, continued to interfere in internal affairs of the state and therefore, restricting the exercise of power by elected state actors (Hartlyn 2001: 37). Furthermore, according to LIED political liberties were absent. V-Dem's PCLI declares them as ambiguous. For the year 1915, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. For 1916, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent.

11/29/1916 End (Male) Electoral Autocracy/Start Direct Rule Occupation Regime [by USA, Electoral Democracy]: When the elections set for 12/03 appeared to be incapable of producing a candidate approved by the U.S. Government, Washington took steps to substitute the existing Dominican government with direct rule by the U.S. military. This decision was announced by U.S. Naval Captain Harry Knapp on 11/29. Knapp justified the U.S. actions by referring to breaches of the 1907 treaty.¹⁹ Based on our observations, no multiparty executive or legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. For this colonial time, LIED's continued to code political liberties as absent. Since 1916 V-Dem's PCLI outcomes decreased into a range which we interpret as not really present. From 1917 to 1919, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent. From 1920 to 1923, V-Dem's JCE indicates that judicial constraints on the executive are absent. Simultaneously, V-Dem's LCE shows no value, which, with appropriate caution, can be interpreted as an absence of legislative constraints on the executive. For 1924, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent.

03/15/1924 End Direct Rule Occupation Regime [by USA, Electoral Democracy]/Start (Male) Electoral Autocracy: General elections were held in the Dominican Republic on this date. We code this regime change event to be a Negotiated Transition, as it was the result of political pressure on the United States occupation, both coming from the Dominican Republic as well as forces inside the USA.²⁰ The negotiations led to the so-called "Hughes-Peynado Plan", in which the United States and members of the elite of the Dominican Republic agreed on a provisional president, a schedule for the withdrawal of troops and the organization of national elections, which concluded the process.²¹ Horacio Vásquez of the Progressive National Alliance won the presidential election, whilst his party won the parliamentary elections and the Constitutional Assembly

election.²² Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. The elections were competitive according to LIED, whereas V-Dem's CEI indicates no real clean election. According to V-Dem's EF&FI somewhat free and fair conditions are given. Moreover, political liberties were absent (LIED). V-Dem's PCLI considers them as ambiguous for the whole period. As per Polity5's classification, the executive's authority was subject to minor institutional constraints during this time. The last US troops left the Dominican Republic in September 1924.²³ When in office, Vasquez pushed through changes which made it more difficult for the opposition to mobilize and modified the constitution four times, extending his term in office (Hartlyn 1998: 90-91, Casey et al. 2020: 5). For most of the regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. For 1930, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent.

02/23/1930 End (Male) Electoral Autocracy/Start Personalist Autocracy: On this date, through a military coup supported by Brigadier General Rafael Trujillo president Horacio Vásquez was deposed. Trujillo installed himself as regime leader (Pons 1990: 509, Hartlyn 1998: 85, Casey et al. 2020: 5, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 56). On 08/02/1931 the Dominican Party was founded as an outgrowth of the Patriotic Coalition of Citizens that supported Trujillo's run for president. Soon afterward, it was proclaimed to be the only legal party. All adult citizens of the Dominican Republic were required to be members of the party. The party had no real ideology other than support for Trujillo. While there were several presidents in this regime period Rafael Trujillo remained the power center as the leader of his personalist party.²⁴ From 08/16/1930 until 08/16/1938 and from 05/18/1942 until 08/16/1952 Rafael Trujillo was president of the Dominican Republic.²⁵ Dominican women won the right to vote through a constitutional reform of 1942.²⁶ During the interim periods Trujillo began to install figurehead-presidents for instance Jacinto Bienvenido Peynado to pacify foreign dissatisfaction with his authoritarian regime, without relinquishing his actual power.²⁷ In the presidential elections 1952 Héctor Trujillo, brother of Rafael Trujillo, was the only candidate. The Dominican Party won every seat in the Congressional elections.²⁸ Trujillo controlled both the military and the secret service, enriched himself and his family through state monopolies over the largest companies, eliminated political opponents, and awarded offices to family and loyalists.²⁹ Moreover, the personality cult of the Trujillo era was very significant. This cult also extended to the family members.³⁰ Taken together, the regime must therefore be classified as a personalist autocracy, even though Trujillo was not president for the entire period. Trujillo formed the center of power through the party presidency and as commander-in-chief of the armed forces. Trujillo was assassinated on 05/30/1961, nonetheless his regime remained until 11/19/1961 when the military uprising carried out by members of the Dominican Military Aviation 'Rebellion of the Pilots' expelled the Trujillo Clan from the island.³¹ According to LIED multiparty executive and legislative elections were held until 1933, from 1934 to 1946 executive and legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held, from 1947 to 1951 multiparty executive and legislative elections were held and from 1952 onward executive and legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held. Furthermore, both LIED and V-Dem's PCLI indicate that political liberties were absent for the whole period. From 1932 to 1960, based on Polity5's assessment, the executive operated with unlimited authority, facing no institutional checks on power. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent.

11/19/1961 End Personalist Autocracy/Start Non-Electoral Transitional Regime: Joaquin Balaguer, serving as a nominal president, took on substantial governing authority.³² From 01/01/1962 on he was required, by OAS determination, to share his power with a seven-member Council of state including members of the opposition. On 01/04/1962 the sanctions by OAS were lifted.³³ LIED identifies political liberties as absent, and V-Dem's PCLI is likewise classified by us as showing that political liberties are absent. For the relevant regime period,

V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

01/16/1962 End Non-Electoral Transitional Regime/Start Military Autocracy: A military coup ousted in response to political riots Balaguer, Trujillo's designated successor. A six member military junta was established in the aftermath to oversee competitive elections (Wiarda 1975: 263).

12/20/1962 End Military Autocracy/Start Electoral Hybrid Regime: On this date, elections took place, which were won by the opposition (Hartlyn 1998:103).³⁴ According to LIED legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held. The elections were not competitive according to LIED and not really clean (V-Dem CEI). Whereas the overall conditions achieved somewhat freedom and fairness (V-Dem EF&FI). Besides, political liberties were absent per LIED. However, V-Dem's PCLI categorizes them as somewhat present for this time. The regime in this period is a hybrid case that mixes democratic and autocratic elements. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

09/25/1963 End Electoral Hybrid Regime/Start Military Autocracy: Colonel Elías Wessin overthrew the elected President Bosch out of fears that his economic, cultural and military policies were too extreme and installed a three-member military junta led by De Santos (Atkins/Wilson 1998:130, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 57, Marshall 2018b). Based on our observations, no multiparty executive or legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. Additionally, political liberties were still coded as absent (LIED) and V-Dem's PCLI indicates a not really present level. For 1964, V-Dem's JCE is classified as limited, indicating weak judicial oversight. Concurrently, V-Dem's LCE shows no value, which can be cautiously interpreted as indicating an absence of legislative constraints on the executive. For the following year, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also limited.

04/24/1965 End Military Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: A coalition consisting of a military faction and civilian supporters of Bosch, the deposed civilian president, successfully toppled the government of Wessin. Armed forces were present on both sides of the confrontation. The insurgents managed to overcome the military faction aligned with the triumvirate and established a temporary governing body (Wiarda/Kryzanek 1992: 42-43, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 57).³⁵

04/28/1965 End Military Autocracy/Start Direct Rule Occupation Regime [by USA, Electoral Democracy]: During this period U.S. military and government exerted significant influence and control over the country's internal affairs, effectively establishing provisional governments that were either directed or heavily influenced by the United States. Molina was pushed out of office by forces loyal to Cabral and the junta which overthrew Bosch. This was accomplished in part because of the US-led invasion of the country. Pedro Bartolomé was made the provisional president from 05/01 to 07 of the loyalist occupation government (Campillo/Jolio 1986: 251-255, Yates 2014). He was also a member of the Revolutionary Committee, which ruled the country for about few hours on 04/25/1965.³⁶ On 09/03/1965 Héctor García-Godoy assumed the role of provisional president during this uncertain and tumultuous period, with ongoing shifts in power and political dynamics.³⁷ Based on our observations, no multiparty executive or legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. LIED continues to code political liberties as absent. The state of political liberties is classified as not really present per V-Dem's PCLI. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent.

06/28/1966 End Direct Rule Occupation Regime [by USA, Liberal Democracy]/Start Electoral Autocracy: On this day, the United States began the withdrawal of their troops, indicating a voluntary power transfer to

Joaquin Balaguer who was elected under their occupation period (06/01/1966) (Campillo/Jolio 1986: 251-255, Yates 2014), and sworn in in August 1966.³⁸ Although multiparty elections were held regularly between June 1966 and May 1978, this period is considered authoritarian because elections were clearly unfair and civil liberties unprotected (Hartlyn 1998: 108-109, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 57).³⁹ Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. Elections during this time are classified as not competitive by LIED. V-Dem's EF&FI scores them as not really free or fair. Their CEI scores them as not clean. As per FH's classification for 1972 and 1973, the country receives a score of 5 as free, which we categorize as rather free. For the rest of the regime period, the country is partly free with a score ranging from 6 to 7, which we place in the rather free category. Moreover, political liberties are classified as absent (LIED) and not really present (V-Dem PCLI) for the entire period. As per Polity5's classification, the executive's authority was subject to minor institutional constraints during this time. During almost the entire regime period, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent. For 1978, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

05/16/1978 End Electoral Autocracy/Start Electoral Hybrid Regime: On this date, general presidential and parliamentary elections were held, considered free and fair, marking the first peaceful transfer of power to the opposition in the country's history (Campillo/Jolio 1986: 289-295, Hartlyn 1998). We consider the mechanism of the regime change to be a case of elite concessions under mass pressure. The military initially stopped the count of the elections after the partial count indicated Balaguer's loss but resumed the count after vigorous protests at home and strong pressure abroad.⁴⁰ However, this period also saw problematic elections characterized by irregularities and violence, with the Central Electoral Authority accumulating extensive powers while remaining subordinate to the executive (Franco 2005: 241). The military wielded significant influence, constantly threatening political interference, as civilian control was maintained mainly through personal relationships and internal splits within the officer corps. Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. Indices like LIED classify the elections during this time as non-competitive. V-Dem's Electoral Freedom and Fairness Index initially scores the freedom and fairness of elections as not genuinely present, gradually improving over time. The Clean Elections Index rates the elections as not clean. In 05/1982, presidential elections resulted in Jorge Blanco of the PRD emerging victoriously. Despite initial hopes, his administration was no less personalist and failed to institutionalize governance effectively. Protests erupted due to economic conditions, and the period was marked by limitations on political and civil rights, with human rights violations being commonplace. As per FH's classification for the regime period in 1978, the country is considered free with a score ranging from 2 to 4, which we also interpret as free in our framework. Between 1979 and 1981 the country receives a score of 5 as free, which we categorize as rather free. For the years from 1990 to 1992, it is classified as free with a score of 5, which falls into our interpretation of the rather free category. From 1993 onward the country is partly free with a score ranging from 6 to 7, which we place in the rather free category. LIED classifies political liberties as present for this period. According to V-Dem's PCLI political liberties were ambiguous in 1978, present from 1979 to 1987, somewhat present from 1988 to 1990, and again present from 1991 onward, except for 1994, during which political liberties were classified as somewhat present. According to the Polity5 indicator, during this period, the executive faced substantial limitations on decision-making power. From 1979 to 1982, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were robust, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were limited. For the period 1983-1985, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were limited. From 1986 onwards, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, whereas V-Dem's LCE

is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. Thus, it is appropriate to classify the Dominican Republic's political regime from 05/16/1978 until 08/16/1996 as an electoral hybrid regime.

06/30/1996 End Electoral Hybrid Regime/Start Electoral Democracy: On this date, a significant shift occurred with the general elections. President Balaguer endorsed Leonel Fernández, who won over Peña Gómez and was installed as Balaguer's successor on 08/16/1996. For the first time in thirty years, Balaguer was not one of the candidates (Lansford 2021: 469, Llanos/Marsteintredet 2010: 184). From this date forward, Va-PoReg classifies the Dominican Republic as an electoral democracy. Presidential and legislative elections have been held regularly every four years, and while election-related violence remains a problem, political and civil rights are generally respected, with only minor instances of violations. Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. Per FH, for 1996 and 1997, the country scores between 6 and 7, categorized as partly free, which we interpret as rather free. In 1998 and 1999 the country is classified as free with a score of 5, which falls into our interpretation of the rather free category. For the following years through 2002 the Dominican Republic is classified as free, scoring between 2 and 4, which we also place in the free category. In 2003 the country receives a score of 5 as free, which we categorize as rather free. For the period between 2004 and 2012 it is considered free with a score ranging from 2 to 4, which we also interpret as free in our framework. According to FH, in 2013 and 2014 the country is rated once again as free with a score of 5, which we interpret as rather free in our framework. From 2015 onward the country is partly free with a score ranging from 6 to 7, which we place in the rather free category. LIED and V-Dem's PCLI note that constant political liberties have been present since 1995. Polity5 indicates that since 1996, the executive's power was limited to a degree between substantial constraints and parity with other institutions. Until 2006, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. For 2007-2010, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were limited. From 2011 to 2019, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. For the year 2020, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were robust, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. Since 2021, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were robust, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were limited. Despite improvements, issues like corruption remain systemic at all levels of government, judiciary, and security forces. Court decisions are not entirely free from political influence, and safeguarding the right to physical integrity and other human rights remains problematic.⁴¹ General elections in 2016 and 2020 were found to be credible by independent observers, though procedural deficits and unequal access to media coverage led to an uneven playing field. The Organization of American States (OAS) issued major electoral reform recommendations. Corruption, extrajudicial killings, election-based violence, and voting irregularities persisted, but court rulings in 2019 continually improved public liberties and media freedom. In 2022, former president Danilo Medina was under investigation for administrative corruption, highlighting the ongoing extent of the problem. On 05/19/2024, general elections were held in which incumbent Luis Abinader won a second term with 58% of the vote, with turnout estimated at around 70%. Given the historical context and assessments from various political indices and sources, Va-PoReg classifies the regime in this period as an electoral democracy, acknowledging the presence of democratic structures alongside significant deficits in the implementation and adherence to democratic principles.

Electoral Democracy as of 07/01/2024 continues.

Additional sources (Crassweller 1966, Derby 2009, Haggerty 1989, Moya Pons 1998, Turits 2004, Wiarda 1968)

Notes

- ¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universal_suffrage#Dates_by_country
- ² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic
- ³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic
- ⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ulises_Heureaux; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic
- ⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic#cite_note-42
- ⁶ <https://uca.edu/politicalscience/dadm-project/western-hemisphere-region/dominican-republic-1902-present/>
- ⁷ <https://uca.edu/politicalscience/home/research-projects/dadm-project/western-hemisphere-region/dominican-republic-1902-present/>
- ⁸ <https://uca.edu/politicalscience/home/research-projects/dadm-project/western-hemisphere-region/dominican-republic-1902-present/>
- ⁹ <https://uca.edu/politicalscience/home/research-projects/dadm-project/western-hemisphere-region/dominican-republic-1902-present/>
- ¹⁰ <https://uca.edu/politicalscience/home/research-projects/dadm-project/western-hemisphere-region/dominican-republic-1902-present/>
- ¹¹ <https://uca.edu/politicalscience/home/research-projects/dadm-project/western-hemisphere-region/dominican-republic-1902-present/>
- ¹² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic#Restoration:_Second_Republic_1865%E2%80%931916
- ¹³ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War_\(1911%E2%80%931912\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War_(1911%E2%80%931912))
- ¹⁴ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War_\(1911%E2%80%931912\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War_(1911%E2%80%931912))
- ¹⁵ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War_\(1911%E2%80%931912\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War_(1911%E2%80%931912))
- ¹⁶ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War_\(1911%E2%80%931912\);](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War_(1911%E2%80%931912);)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jos%C3%A9_Bordas_Valdez
- ¹⁷ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jos%C3%A9_Bordas_Valdez#Presidency_\(1913-1914\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jos%C3%A9_Bordas_Valdez#Presidency_(1913-1914))
- ¹⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1914_Dominican_Republic_general_election
- ¹⁹ <https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/wwi/108649.htm>; https://rulers.org/ruld.html#dominican_republic
- ²⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic#Withdrawal
- ²¹ https://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plan_Hughes-Peynado ; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic#Withdrawal
- ²² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1924_Dominican_Republic_general_election
- ²³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Republic
- ²⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Party
- ²⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rafael_Trujillo
- ²⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Women_in_the_Dominican_Republic
- ²⁷ https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rafael_Le%C3%B3nidas_Trujillo_Molina
- ²⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1952_Dominican_Republic_general_election
- ²⁹ <https://countrystudies.us/dominican-republic/11.htm>; <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Rafael-Trujillo>
- ³⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rafael_Trujillo
- ³¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rebellion_of_the_Pilots
- ³² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic
- ³³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Dominican_Republic
- ³⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1962_Dominican_Republic_general_election
- ³⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominican_Civil_War
- ³⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pedro_Bartolom%C3%A9_Benoit
- ³⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/H%C3%A9ctor_Garc%C3%ADa-Godoy
- ³⁸ <https://uca.edu/politicalscience/home/research-projects/dadm-project/western-hemisphere-region/dominican-republic-1902-present/>
- ³⁹ <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199766581/obo-9780199766581-0071.xml>
- ⁴⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joaqu%C3%A9n_Balaguer#Defeat_and_return_to_power
- ⁴¹ <https://www.state.gov/reports/2022-country-reports-on-human-rights-practices/dominican-republic>

References

- Atkins, G. Pope/Wilson, Larman (1998): *The Dominican Republic and the United States: From Imperialism to Transnationalism*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Campillo, Pérez /Jolio, G. (1986): *Historia Electoral Dominicana: 1848-1986*. Santo Domingo: Junta Central Electoral.
- Casey, Adam E./Lachapelle, Jean/Levitsky, Steven, et al. (2020): *Revolutionary Autocracies, 1900-2015: Codebook*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Crassweller, Robert D. (1966): *Trujillo: The Life and Times of a Caribbean Dictator*. New York: Macmillan.
- Derby, Lauren (2009): *The Dictator's Seduction: Politics and the Popular Imagination in the Era of Trujillo*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Franco, Julio Brea (2005): Dominican Republic, in: Nohlen, Dieter (Hrsg.), *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 239–268.
- Geddes, Barbara/Wright, Joseph/Frantz, Erica (2014a): Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set, in: *Perspectives on Politics* 12, 313-331.
- Geddes, Barbara/Wright, Joseph/Frantz, Erica (2014b): *Autocratic Regimes Code Book*. Version 1.2. Los Angeles, University Park, Bridgewater: UCLA, Pennsylvania State University, Bridgewater State University.
- Haggerty, Richard A. (Hrsg.) (1989): *Dominican Republic: A Country Study*. Washington: Library of Congress.
- Hartlyn, Jonathan (1998): The Trujillo Regime in the Dominican Republic, in: Chahabi, H. E. & Linz, Juan J. (Hrsg.), *Sultanistic Regimes*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 85-112.
- Hartlyn, Jonathan (2001): Dominican Republic: Historical Setting, in: Chapin Metz, Helen (Hrsg.), *Dominican Republic and Haiti: Country Studies*. Washington: Library of Congress, 11-51.
- Marshall, Monty G. (2018b): *Polity5 Regime Narratives: Dominican Republic*. Center for Systemic Peace.
- Moya Pons, Frank (1998): *The Dominican Republic: A National History*. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers.
- Pons, Frank M. (1990): The Dominican Republic since 1930, in: *The Cambridge History of Latin America* 7, 509-543.
- Turits, Richard L. (2004): *Foundations of Despotism: Peasants, the Trujillo Regime, and Modernity in Dominican History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Wiarda, Howard J. (1968): *Dictatorship and Development: The Methods of Control in Trujillo's Dominican Republic*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Wiarda, Howard J. (1975): *Dictatorship, Development, and Disintegration: Politics and Social Change in the Dominican Republic*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- Wiarda, Howard/Kryzanek, Michael (1992): *The Dominican Republic: A Caribbean Crucible*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Yates, Lawrence A. (2014): Operation Power Pack, in: Roorda, Eric P., Derby, Lauren H. & Gonzalez, Raymundo (Hrsg.), *The Dominican Republic Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. New York: Duke University Press, 355-361.