

Bridging the Divide: Strategic Measures to Enhance US-Cuba Relations in 21st Century

Jazab-ur-Rehman¹, Muhammad Naeem Akhtar², Qasim Shahzad Gill³, Ghulam Mustafa*⁴

¹M.Phil. Scholar, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

²Visiting Lecturer, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

³ PhD from Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, University of Saskatchewan, Canada.

^{4*} Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Corresponding author: ghulammustafa@gcuf.edu.pk

Keywords: USA, Cuba, Security, Trade Embargo, Communism, Terrorism, Migration

DOI No:

<https://doi.org/10.56976/rjsi.v5i4.214>

The US-Cuban relations have been historically bitter due to various factors, including the US's reluctance to engage with Cuba and its communist ideology. During the Cold War, the US faced difficulties due to Cuba's inclination towards the USSR, leading to the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. The US has always had concerns about Cuba and its ideology, which have been reflected in policies and statements. The Obama administration attempted to take positive steps towards Cuba, but the Trade Embargo imposed by the USA in the 1960s still heavily affected the relations. By the 21st century, these issues must be resolved to eradicate security and economic concerns from the region for its prosperity. The Reagan administration reversed direction and focused on controlling Cuban immigration to the US, granting up to 20,000 immigrant visas annually. Cuba has always impacted the security of the United States, as the country has been a significant threat since 1959 when the US and USSR faced nuclear war. The US has attempted to influence many countries in the region, but Cuba has been difficult to crack. Despite imposing embargoes, the US has failed to bring democratic norms to Cuba. As Cubans have a major stake in US politics, the US capitalizes on their influence. The worsening law and order situation in Cuba has led to mass migration to the USA, with the US trying to compensate Cuban immigrants to undermine their government policies. The 21st-century fluctuations in American policy for Cuba continue to pose Cuba as a security threat to the US. This article aims at highlighting issues like Migration, Cuban Ideology, US Embargo, and Terrorism which remain to be at core of the US-Cuban relations. These issues must be addressed in order to put US-Cuban relations back on track.

1. Introduction

The relationship between the United States and Cuba has been characterized by complexity, tension, and historical significance (Ilyas, 2023). Since the Cuban Revolution of 1959, diplomatic ties between the two nations have undergone fluctuating periods of thaw and frost, influenced by geopolitical dynamics, ideological differences, and domestic politics (Martinez & Reinoso, 2021). In the 21st century, despite efforts to normalize relations initiated by the Obama administration, persistent challenges and barriers continue to impede the full realization of a constructive and cooperative partnership (Sweeting, 2023). This research article delves into the multifaceted dimensions of US-Cuba relations, exploring the historical context, contemporary challenges, and strategic measures necessary to foster enhanced cooperation, mutual understanding, and sustainable engagement in the modern era. By analyzing the evolving dynamics between these neighboring nations, this study aims to provide insights and recommendations for policymakers, stakeholders, and scholars seeking to navigate the complex terrain of US-Cuba relations in the 21st century.

The relations between the USA and Cuba have always been pivotal in the American continent (Gonçalves, 2021). Historically, these relations have been bitter due a number of factors. Cuba knows its importance in the region. the USA is also rational regarding Cuba. During Cold War, the only hard time that the USA faced, was caused by the Cuba, as it inclined towards USSR. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis is a record of history now (Sweeting, 2023). There are a number of areas of mistrust between these neighbours: from migration to Embargo, from geographic to strategic. The biggest strategic difference between would be ideological difference. The USA has been promotor of democracy around the world (Carothers, 2020). Cuba has been communist ever since its incitement towards USSR (Sigmund, 2022). The United States of America has always had grave concerns regarding Cuba and its ideology (Eschen, 2022). These concerns are often highlighted by the USA via policies and statements. The end of Cold War didn't put an end to these issues (Trachtenberg, 2020). In fact, the USA tightened its grip over the island in terms of policies (Shirk, 2023). The ice between Cuba and the USA is far from melting yet. Obama administration tried to take a few positive steps towards Cuba but the Trade Embargo imposed by the USA in the 1960s is still active which have affected heavily on the relations (Gonçalves, 2021). With the Dawn of 21st century, these issues must be resolved in order to eradicate security and economic concerns from the region for it to prosper (Sweeting, 2023). There in this article, these issues have been highlighted with importance and addressed that why these must be resolved.

The relationship between the United States and Cuba has long been a subject of global interest, given its historical significance, geopolitical implications, and potential for socio-economic impact. Despite efforts to improve diplomatic ties in recent years, persistent challenges and complexities continue to hinder the full normalization of relations between these neighboring nations. This research seeks to address this gap by providing a comprehensive analysis of the factors shaping US-Cuba relations in the 21st century and proposing strategic measures to overcome existing barriers and enhance cooperation. By

examining historical events, current challenges, and future opportunities, this study aims to contribute to the understanding of US-Cuba relations among policymakers, scholars, and the broader international community. Furthermore, in an era marked by shifting geopolitical dynamics and global interconnectedness, fostering constructive engagement between the United States and Cuba holds significant implications not only for bilateral relations but also for regional stability and global cooperation. Thus, this research seeks to provide valuable insights and recommendations to guide efforts towards bridging the divide and promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between these two nations in the modern era.

2. Research Methodology

Research methodology is a healthy tool while conducting research. It always shapes and gives a structure to the research. Here in this article, qualitative method has been applied. Data has been collected from secondary sources like articles, books and internet sources and analyzed in order to draw conclusion.

3. The Directions of the US Cuba Relations

As in the early 20th century, control of Cuba was of basic strategic importance for the United States at the beginning of the twenty-first century, especially when considering the geopolitical significance of Cuba in conjunction with the US national project of global power. Among the most significant inferences that may be made from researching the foundational texts, theories, and history of US foreign policy is this particular one. This laid the groundwork for the US's primary strategic goal in relation to Cuban strategy, which was to regain control of the nation by means of an administration replacement. Change in the regime has served as an essential component of American plan for Cuba entirety of this century, given the intricate connections between Cuban independence and its political and social system. In this regard, it is especially interesting that Barack Obama made it plain in his address on December 17, 2014, revealing a shift in policy of the United States, that he was altering the means rather than the ends of that programme (Obama, 2014).

The subtext of that complex address is that although there was a shift in public policy, the state's approach stayed unchanged irrespective of the audience that statement specifically addressed. Thus, it held true to its historical vision of the United States towards Cuba and the area in the twenty-first century just as it had in 1959. Three broad directions served as the framework for the specific policies. The economic sanctions constitute the first group. Soon after the Cuban Revolution's victory, these became the focal point of policy of the United States towards Cuba (Lamrani, 2013).

As indicated in a 1960 confidential memorandum from the United States of America Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs to the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, their position was established earlier on. He specifically stated in that letter that "disenchantment and disaffection based on economic dissatisfaction and hardship" (Mallory, 1960) was the only predictable way to lessen and possibly abolish the Cuban people's support for the government that had emerged from the Cuban Revolution. The inference is that the people of Cuba will be the primary focus of the sanctions in an effort to topple the regime.

A complex web of legislation, executive orders, presidential declarations, and other rules were used to establish the sanctions framework. The Presidential Proclamation 3447 of 3 February 1962, which established what are known as an embargo in the United States and an economic embargo in Cuba, combined their early incarnations. The Trade with the Enemy Act of 1917's application to Cuba, which permitted the creation of the Cuban Assets Control Regulation of 1963 and other rules, formed the basis of this embargo/blockade. This consisted of controlling commerce, halting technical and aid support, seizing financial assets, and placing foreign firms to conduct business with Cuba on a blacklist (Doxey, 1980).

This had a negative impact on investors with potential, who were essential for an economy with limited resources that depends on FDI to get into marketplaces and technologies. Such sanctions by the United States went well beyond a simple bilateral commerce blockade because they had significant international accessibility, and as a result, they caused much more harm to Cuba's economy as well as its society than a simple trade embargo would (Morley, 1984). This laid the stones of contention that even today are in the basics of US-Cuba relations.

The entire system was significantly strengthened by new legislation as a prelude to the twenty-first century. The Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, commonly referred to be the Torricelli Act (Maier, 1993), and the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (LIBERTAD), sometimes known as the Helms-Burton Act, were the two most important of these laws which put Cuba and its economy on halt (Lucio, 1995). In addition to debilitating limitations on foreign subsidiaries of the United States companies attempting to conduct business with Cuba, this legislation placed harsh fines on ships that enter the United States within six months after leaving a port in Cuba. They forbid the use of dollars of the United States in any dealings with Cuba and enable citizens of the United States to sue foreign firms operating on real estate owned by citizens of the United States previous to the Revolution in courts the United States. They are distinctive because of their extra-territoriality and lasting effects.

Sanctions pertaining to the economy have become United States foreign policy's go-to tool more frequently in the 21st century. In a report published by the US Department of the Treasury, it is stated that beginning in the twenty-first century, sanctions regarding financial and economic matters became a tool of first turn for dealing with an array of hazards to the safety of the nation, foreign policy, and economic well-being of the USA, pointing out that from 2000 to 2023, the utilisation of restrictions climbed by 993% (Department of the Treasury, 2021). A significant portion of them is classified as selective or effective restrictions, which were designed to have an impact on specific people or groups as opposed to whole communities. Nevertheless, there is proof that the effect they have is actually all-encompassing (Gordon, 2019).

The Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act (TSRA) was enacted by the United States Congress in 2000. Any unilaterally medical and agricultural restrictions carried out by the Department of the Treasury or the Department of Commerce had to be lifted by the President of the United States. As a result, although under strict restrictions, it brought up the potential of trading to Cuba for the first time. In accordance with the stipulations of the Helms-Burton and Torricelli Acts, Cuba was specifically left out of the general mechanisms that might

possibly ease the current sanctions. Throughout the first twenty years of the 21st century, the sanctions system was particularly dynamic, according to Barrera Rodriguez and Iturriaga Bartuste (2020). An amount of 122 new rules were issued between January 2001 and June 2020, or during the governments of George Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump (Rodríguez & Bartuste, 2020).

It's important to note that these penalties weren't being applied; rather, some that were set to expire were being renewed, and new restrictions were being introduced. The latter largely involved blacklisting Cuban organisations and people and including the Cuban government on numerous the United States international sanctions lists. It became more and more difficult for prospective enterprises to assess the viability of conducting business in Cuba without running the risk of penalty due to the regularity of modifications in the legislation that these entailed.

According to new strategy drawn by Barak Obama, the embargo/blockade was loosened throughout the years 2015 to 2017. The majority of the 59 instances of policy modifications that improved the flexibility of the sanctions in 2001–20 was enacted in 2015 and 2016 (Rodríguez & Bartuste, 2020). It appears that the following point is accurate. Nevertheless, it's crucial to remember that even when changes were made with the help of the presidency's executive power, the blockade's fundamental components stayed in existence.

The improved adaptability was primarily brought about by the removal of names from the blacklists of people and organisations, the introduction of general licences for legitimate traveller categories that were allowed to visit Cuba, and the approval of some business transactions, including the functioning of some hotels in Cuba by United States-based businesses or the inclusion of Cuban individual tenants in AirBnB. Nevertheless, there was little modification in the embargo on routine banking activities and tourist trips, and all other prohibitions, which include those from the 1960s, continued to prevail (Rodríguez & Bartuste, 2020).

It is also important to note the observed shift in the rationale for the sanctions against Cuba. They were justified for the first three decades of their existence by the imminent danger of Communist ideology in the Western Hemisphere at the time (Mallory, 1960). The emphasis moved to two distinct topics in the 1990s: the island's suspected backing for terrorists and its violations of human rights. The earlier situation was demonstrated by the island's position on an index of nations that support terrorism. Nevertheless, over time, the documents' supporting justifications grew shaky (Sullivan, 2015). The second concept was frequently used in the United States political discourse and the introduction to fresh restrictions. Yet, even Human Rights Watch acknowledged that human rights abuses in Havana were always relatively insignificant in comparison to those reported in nations like Colombia and Saudi Arabia, nations regarded by America as partners. The United States supports and frequently fosters opposition parties to the Cuban regime both inside and outside of the island nation. This is the second major pillar of the United States approach and policy towards Havana.

Since the beginning of the uprising, the United States has backed or founded organisations that are opposed to the new government and are based in Cuba or abroad—many of them are in the United States. Several of such entities were carrying out activities that now would be categorised as terrorist acts sponsored by states for a number of years (Bolender &

Chomsky, 2010). The imminent danger of Communist ideology in the hemisphere served as rationale for these and other acts, notably Bay of Pigs. Following the conclusion of the Cold War and the subsequent demise of anti-Communism as a justification for the United States policy towards Cuba, the justification of advancing democracy on the communist nation gained its place. The Cold War itself was widely portrayed as a conflict between democracy (or freedom) and communism (or oppression), therefore it wasn't a novel concept.

However, the publicly stated objective of fostering democratic government in Cuba, linked to the island's supposed inferior human rights record, permitted the switch from secret operations to publicly allocating \$20–30 million of the United States federal budget annually to promoting democracy in the Caribbean nation. Major chunk of this budget was used for two main goals and went to media for those purposes:

The first objective was to utilise the funds to portray Cuba as an adversary and an oppressive state in order to defend the United States activities., the second strategy involved directly affecting Cubans, removing both home and global supporters. Additional funds were provided to support the work of the agencies of the United States government focusing on the island nation of Cuba (Sullivan, 2015).

During the 2000s, TV Marti and Radio, which were officially a component of the United States government's Office of Cuba Broadcasting, were the oldest media entities with a focus on Cuba and a commitment to these duties. The broadcasting industry was governed by the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG), an entity established by the federal government in 1999. The United States Agency for Global Media (USAGM) replaced the BBG as the organization's name in 2018 to reflect its embrace and incorporation of a wide range of new channels.

In an effort to boost the efforts of the United States to induce a change in Cuba, the government of George Bush unveiled a new Cuba strategy that aimed to bring together a broad range of organisations and programmes. The Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba, a federal organisation made up of top government officials and cabinet members, oversaw this. The United States encouraged the formation of new organisations that assumed the guise of social campaigns, including the Ladies in White, which was founded in 2003 by the wives of a number of imprisoned dissidents. According to documents made public by WikiLeaks, the United States Interest Department in Cuba consistently collaborated with the Ladies in White's leaders and requested funding for them (de Volo, 2016).

The third Direction is negotiations. There has been a long history of dialogues between the USA and Cuba. Since 1959, many government-led initiatives—the most of them top-secret—have sought to negotiate a resolution to some of the contentious issues. The first significant attempt took place in the late 1970s, under the government of James Carter, and had only modest success. The first president of the United States to order his personnel to "attempt to achieve normalisation of relations with Cuba" (LeoGrande & Kornbluh, 2015) was Jimmy Carter in 1977. He was the one who gave the go-ahead for several actions and clandestine interactions with the people of Cuba. The primary outcome of this initiative was the creation in 1978 of interest agencies for each nation in the other, each of which was housed in the embassy of a different nation. These offices were the first permanent diplomatic representation

since 1960. The 1970s' conversations also resulted in an accord on maritime boundaries, travel by United States residents to Cuba, and the reinstatement of visits from relatives for Cubans residing in the United States (Cañedo & Dominguez 2014).

The administration of Ronald Reagan (1981–1999) reversed direction and went straight to a more typical aggressive approach. Nevertheless, as a result of the 1980 migration crisis known as the Mariel boatlift, both countries came to their first agreement during that time to control Cuban immigration to the United States, which included granting up to 20,000 immigrant visas annually to the United States. In the middle of Cuba's 1990s-era collapse of the economy, new negotiations were prompted in 1994 by the *balseros* (Boat People) problem, a new migration catastrophe. In September 1994, the two governments came to an agreement whereby the United States would yearly award at least 20,000 Cubans immigrant visas in exchange for Cuba's promise to stop additional unauthorised rafter landings. Officials from the United States of America and Cuba gathered every year on two occasions, once in Havana and once in Washington, to supervise the accord's execution. The Cuban Adjustment Act of 1966 was interpreted by the William Clinton administration to create the wet foot-dry foot policy, which effectively gave the category as a political refugee to any Cuban who entered the United States of America, irrespective of how they did so and why (Handford, 2014).

As a result, by the year 2000, talks and contacts had taken place, however they had yielded some big accords and only one instance of Washington adopting a significant pro-dialogue posture. Three administrations with varying perspectives on US ties with Cuba were in office during the first two decades of the twenty-first century, as well as the first half of a fourth. The administration of President George W. Bush maintained a combative stance and had few interactions, which were conducted via technical and formal discussions that mostly dealt with the supervision and monitoring of the 1994 migratory agreements. There have been certain instances of technological cooperation involving both Cuban organisations and US federal entities. The collaboration between Cuba's National Institute of Meteorology and NOAA's National Hurricane Centre serves as an example (Reed, 2018).

During second term in government of Barak Obama, there was discussion and negotiation for the most substantial attempt to alter the United States relationship with Cuba. The resumption of both nations' embassies and the development of a bilateral dialogue agenda were the results of negotiations held in secret in 2013–2014. It was expected that this would mark the start of a process to normalise ties between the United States and Cuba (LeoGrande & Kornbluh, 2015). This strategy also implied Washington to acknowledge that the true representative of the people of Cuba is the government of Cuba. In the two years that followed, intense and unprecedented negotiations between the two nations resulted in the signing of a significant number of bilateral agreements in a variety of fields, including agriculture, health cooperation, counternarcotics cooperation, federal air marshals, cancer research, seismology, meteorology, wildfire research, direct mail service, maritime issues related to hydrography and maritime navigation, marine protected areas, and environmental cooperation on a range of issues. In January 2017, a bilateral agreement defining their maritime border in the eastern Gulf of Mexico was also reached by the United States and Cuba.

These all issues along with other issues like US claims, counter-terrorism, regulatory and economic issues, trafficking of humans, migration, renewable energy and efficacy, and human rights were discussed in bilateral talks. The government of the United States gained a long-term influence it had been lacking with the inauguration of a formal diplomatic mission, which gave it access to new sources of intelligence and the possibility to exert a certain impact on Cuba, particularly by fostering closer ties with domestic migrants. Each of the discussion's subjects was relevant to a particular group of American political and elite class. Washington believed that the new connections may set the stage for a slow and steady acceptance of the leadership of the United States in an imbalanced relationship. This view is supported by the fact that state policy did not alter during the process and by official documents that the White House released as rules of procedure.

In 2017, Donald Trump, the US president, announced a change to the approach to Havana (Trump, 2017), adding additional prohibitions and reversing some of the normalisation measures made by the President Barack Obama government. The government of Donald Trump had mostly given up on its participation on Cuba by 2019. The still unsolved health occurrences that impacted American diplomats in Havana served as a justification for downgrading the consulates in both capital cities, effectively ending diplomatic relations, and drastically reducing all oversight and execution of most commitments, even the 1994 immigration accords. This explains priorities of Trump administration regarding Cuba. In its initial year, the government of Joe Biden closed every avenue of communication established by Obama. As a result, we see a lot of activity along the three primary axes of America's approach towards Cuba at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Although there were notable alterations in the manner of modernization of a few of the mechanisms and significant modifications at certain particular occasions, especially under the presidency of Barack Obama, concrete measures were expressed in ways that were essentially consistent with past tendencies.

4. Directional Issues: An Analysis

From a historical or contemporary standpoint, Cuban Island have consistently impacted the security of the US. The bellow discussed elements have provided an unambiguous explanation of how ties between Cuba and the USA affect the United States. The U.S. has maintained its position as the world's hegemon and plans to do so. It's also important to note that, in 1992, when the USSR and the USA were on the verge of engaging in nuclear combat, Cuba posed the most serious danger to the United States of America. After World War II, the United States of America was able to successfully retain its global dominance. It has attempted to sway numerous nations in the area, and many of them dread the fury of the United States. Unlike other countries, Cuba has proven to be a difficult nut for the United States to break open.

Even in cases where the US has been able to put an embargo on Cuba, it has not been successful in introducing democratic norms there. The United States and Cuba are still engaged in a fierce ideological battle. The United States has made every effort to alter Cubans' perspectives in all spheres of life. The people of Cuba actually now have a significant political stake in the politics of the USA as a result of migration from Cuba to the the United States over time and other factors. Any president must win over the Cuban diaspora if he is to secure

his position in Washington's Oval office. This suggests that Cuba is affecting the politics of the United States, the overall safety of the entire region, and other aspects. Undoubtedly, the United States of America has greatly benefited from the fact that Cuba's policies have not brought wealth or success to its citizens. Many reasons, including the steadily deteriorating state of law and order in Cuba and the dearth of excellent living chances, have contributed to the large exodus of Cubans to the United States. Conversely, in an attempt to destabilise Cuban administration actions and incite discontent among the Cuban populace, the United States of America has attempted to pay immigrants from Cuba.

However, the USA's stance towards Cuba has fluctuated in the twenty-first century. Obama attempted to remove the chain that was around the Cuban neck; Trump attempted to put strict policy upon Cuba again, and Biden followed suit. The United States' security has been threatened by the immigrations from Cuba.

4.1 Cuban Immigrants

A number of Cubans departed their homeland in 2022 than at any other time in history, surpassing records set in the decades between the 1980s to 1990s. The number of Cubans detained by the USA Border Patrol between January of this year and September of 2022 was around 203,000, a significant increase from the 33,000 detained in the same period in 2021. From the end of 2021 and the end of September 2022, the USA Coast Guard captured approximately 6,182 Cubans at the ocean's by far the biggest number in the preceding five years. Cubans travelling to the USA may face harassment from both law authorities and criminals throughout the path, particularly at the Darien Passage at the international border between Panama and Colombia and at the southern border along with the nation of Mexico. Since Nicaragua eliminated the need for a visa for citizens of Cuba in late 2021, many Cubans now begin making their way there.

The Kennedy administration of the United States placed limitations on travel on Cuba in 1962 in response to the actions of the government of the island. Cuba's inclination for the Soviet Union and the nuclear missile situation led to the imposition of the sanctions. Since Cuba's activities posed an immediate risk to national security of the USA, these measures had to be taken. Even so because of internal Cuban policies, the Cubans kept on travelling to the States. It has been illegal for the US citizens to travel to Cuba since that time. Cuba and the United States were further separated by a variety of laws and regulations. In 2014, the Obama administration began communicating with Raul Castro, the acting leader of Cuba. One item on the agenda is the relaxation of the travel prohibition. Consequently, in order to grant complete freedom of movement between both countries, the United States required that the government of Cuba implement additional regulations. By the year 2016, Cuba demanded that the 2011 modifications apply to all travel, while the United States demanded that Cuba enact new laws in return.

4.2 Terrorism

In 1982, during the President Reagan's governance, the Island had been initially designated by the United States as a supporter of terrorists and terrorists' activities. Reports

that Castro assisted communist extremist organisations in many Latin American republics, including the nation of Nicaragua, the Republic of El Salvador, Africa and Angola, prompted the United States government to take this drastic measure. Following that time, the island nation of Cuba along with Syria, North Korea and Iran have all been listed by the United States as government sponsors of terrorists. Cuba continued to be on that list of governments as they came and went. The United States took this action to prevent any negative things from flowing from Havana and to initiate action if anything was to happen in their country. This move increased distrust and hostility between the United States and the island nation until the Obama administration attempted to improve relations within the two countries.

4.3 Communism

Communism has long been viewed by the US as an ideological challenge and fierce opponent. Since the end of World War II, they have been taking action against communism worldwide. Cuba's political leanings towards communism and the USSR were also very influential in US-Cuban ties. In one way or another, the United States of America, as a democratic state, has always worked to advance freedom and democratic principles globally. Havana was also on the radar of the USA. The United States of America has consistently pushed Cuba to embrace democratisation and grant its citizens the opportunity to vote and respect for human rights. Castro had consistently rejected this United States desire and remained committed to socialism at all costs. This stance led to many unfortunate and disastrous outcomes for Cuba in shape of Trade Embargo, multiple invasions, decline in economy, lack of international support and trade etc.

4.4 Trade Embargo

It was a key ideological ally of the erstwhile Soviet Union throughout the period known as the Cold War, which led to a thawing in ties with the USA. This small group of socialist states included the country of Vietnam, North Korea, China, Cuba and Laos. After the Cuban Revolution, in the year 1960, the United States implemented its first trade embargo on Cuba, which caused ties with the island nation to further worsen. The USA was to bolster the trade embargo against Cuba in the years that followed by enacting legislation meant to impede commercial relations. This was also very important to the security of the US. Due to these economic restrictions, Cuba's economy suffered from being unable to trade openly. Hundreds of Cubans were compelled by the embargo to leave their homeland and relocate, primarily to Miami, Florida, and its surrounding areas. As part of their Cuba strategy, the United States welcomed Cuban immigrants wholeheartedly, but it also brought forth a number of issues related to illegal immigration in the country.

5. Conclusion

The geopolitical importance of Cuba and the United States' national project of global power have led to a core strategic objective of restoring authority over the country through a change in regime. This approach has been a sine qua non of US Cuba strategy throughout this century, with Barack Obama revealing in his address on December 17, 2014, that he was altering the means rather than the ends of that program. Three broad directions served as the framework for specific policies: economic sanctions, which became the focal point of policy

after the Cuban Revolution's victory. A complex web of legislation, executive orders, presidential declarations, and other rules were used to establish the sanctions framework. The Presidential Proclamation 3447 of 3 February 1962 established embargoes in the United States and Cuba, which included controlling commerce, halting technical and aid support, seizing financial assets, and placing foreign firms on a blacklist. These sanctions negatively impacted Cuba's economy and society, causing more harm than a simple trade embargo would.

New legislation, such as the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 and the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (LIBERTAD), strengthened the system and made it more frequent in the 21st century. The Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act (TSRA) was enacted in 2000, allowing the potential of trading to Cuba for the first time. The sanctions system was particularly dynamic during the governments of George Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump, with 122 new rules issued between January 2001 and June 2020. However, these penalties were not being applied, and new restrictions were introduced, including blacklisting Cuban organizations and people and including the Cuban government on international sanctions lists.

Cuba has always impacted the security of the United States, as it has been a significant threat to the country since 1959 when the US and USSR were on the brink of nuclear war. The US has attempted to influence many countries in the region, but Cuba has been difficult to crack. The ideological war between the USA and Cuba continues, with the US trying to change the mindset of Cubans and increasing their stake in US politics. Many Cubans fled their homeland in 2022 than at any time before; between January and September of that year, the US Border Patrol detained around 203,000 Cubans. Between October 2021 and September 2022, the United States Coast Guard captured approximately 6,182 Cubans at sea, the most in five years. Although the US has attempted to undercut Cuban government initiatives by providing compensation to emigrants, the migrants have instead posed a security risk to the United States of America.

Since 1982, the United States has designated Cuba as a supporter of terrorism, leading to a state of mistrust and animosity between the two countries. The US has done its best to advance freedom and liberal ideals, and US-Cuban ties have been greatly influenced by Cuba's ideological leanings towards the Soviet Union and communists. The US and Cuban ties have been worse due to trade embargoes, many invasions, economic decline, a lack of international backing, and commerce. As part of its Cuba policy, the US has extended a warm welcome to Cuban immigrants; nevertheless, it has also created issues with unlawful settlements in the USA. The above-mentioned issues are to be resolved if any improvements are to be seen in the US-Cuban Relations.

6. References

- Bolender, K., & Chomsky, N. (2010). *Voices from the other side: An oral history of terrorism against Cuba*. Pluto Press.
- Cañedo, E. R., & Domínguez, E. M. (2015). *From confrontation to attempts at normalization: United States policy towards Cuba*. RUTH.

- Carothers, T. (2020). Rejuvenating democracy promotion. *J. Democracy*, 31, 114-125.
- de Volo, L. B. (2011). Heroines with friends in high places: Cuba's damas de blanco. *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 44(5), 19-22.
- Department of the Treasury. (2021). *The Treasury 2021 Sanctions Review*. Retrieved from: <https://home.treasury.gov/system/files/136/Treasury-2021-sanctions-review.pdf>
- Doxey, M. (1980). Economic sanctions: benefits and costs. *The World Today*, 36(12), 484-489.
- Eschen, P. V. (2022). 15 Roads Not Taken: The Delhi Declaration, Nelson Mandela, Václav Havel, and the Lost Futures of 1989. In *Ideology in US Foreign Relations: New Histories* (pp. 299-321). Columbia University Press.
- Gonçalves, J. P. (2021). The Island, the Peninsula, and the Continent: Cuban American engagements with Africa. *Cuba and Africa 1959–1994: Writing an Alternative Atlantic History*.
- Gordon, J. (2019). The not so targeted instrument of asset freezes. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 33(3), 303-314.
- Hanford, E. (2014). The future of the United States wet foot-dry foot policy for Cuban immigration. *Pub. Int. L. Rep.*, 20, 152.
- Ilyas, M. D. (2023). Responsible Leadership in Crisis Management: Lessons from the Cuban Missile Crisis and Russia-Ukraine War. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 11(3), 983-999.
- Lamrani, S. (2015). *Cuba, the Media, and the Challenge of Impartiality*. NYU Press.
- LeoGrande, W. M., & Kornbluh, P. (2015). *Back channel to Cuba: The hidden history of negotiations between Washington and Havana*. UNC Press Books.
- Lucio, S. E. (1995). The Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (Libertad) Act of 1996: An Initial Analysis. *The University of Miami Inter-American Law Review*, 325-342.
- Maier, C. S. (2007). *Among empires: American ascendancy and its predecessors*. Harvard University Press.
- Mallory, L. (1960). Memorandum to the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Secret). *History*. Retrieved from: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v06/d499>.
- Martinez, J. L., & Reinosa, M. M. (2021). The Foreign Policy of the Cuban Revolution. *Contemporary Issues in Caribbean and Latin American Relations*, 69.112-135.
- Morley, M. H. (1984). The United States and the global economic blockade of Cuba: A study in political pressures on America's allies. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 17(1), 25-48.
- Obama, B. (2014). Statement by the President on ISIL. September 10. *Washington, DC: Office of the Press Secretary, The White House*.
- Reed, G. (2018). Weathering US–Cuba political storms: José Rubiera PhD Cuba's chief weather forecaster. *Medicc Review*, 20(2), 7-10.
- Rodríguez, S. B., & Bartuste, M. J. I. (2020). Las sanciones de Estados Unidos a Cuba (2001-2020). *Revista Política Internacional*, (8), 30-40.
- Shirk, S. L. (2023). *Overreach: How China derailed its peaceful rise*. Oxford University Press.



Sigmund, P. E. (2022). The USSR, Cuba, and the Revolution in Chile. In *The Soviet Union in the Third World* (pp. 26-50). Routledge.

Sullivan, M. P. (2015). *Cuba: Issues for the 114th Congress*. Retrieved from: <https://crsreports.congress.gov/search/#!/?termsToSearch=TV%20Mart%C3%AD&orderBy=Relevance>.

Sweeting, K. D. (2023). Executive orders: Mandating inclusion in the federal workplace: Insights from federal executive departments' strategic plans. *Public Personnel Management*, 52(4), 590-623.

Trachtenberg, M. (2020). The United States and the NATO Non-extension Assurances of 1990: New Light on an Old Problem?. *International Security*, 45(3), 162-203.

Trump, D. (2017). *Strengthening the Policy of the United States Toward Cuba*. National Security Policy.