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This Article reviews the relationship between U.S. policy after the 1959 Cuban Revolution and the legal mechanisms that have influenced the character of the binational Cuban-American family since then. Over the course of the last fifty years, the United States has used the rule of law to deny families fundamental customs of care-taking and comfort. Of course, the immigration regulations and attendant matters of travel and remittances are customarily linked to national policy and international concerns. However, in the case of U.S. laws governing the relationship of Cuban binational families, there is no normativity of impartiality that can be discerned, a condition that continues notwithstanding some recent changes announced by the Obama administration. These efforts have failed to achieve their goals. Cuban-American families have improvised--often extralegal--mechanisms of familial support. In doing so, they act as transgressors of laws and policies as a means to maintain family support systems.
Geographical proximity has long facilitated travel between Cuba and the United States. Throughout the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth and twenty-first, Cubans have traveled north in search of political sanctuary and economic opportunity. [FN1] Immigration to the United States has developed
fully into a salient constant of the Cuban condition, one that has contributed to the emergence of a
unique binational family system. Cuban migration has itself been a cause and consequence of U.S. pol-
icy. That Cuba was deemed vital to U.S. strategic interests meant that American foreign policy has often
had as much an impact on migration patterns as Cuban domestic policy, with far-reaching consequences:
some intended, others unintended.

The Cuban revolution of 1959 and the punitive U.S. response have provided the context for a vast
continuing Cuban migration. [FN2] By the end of the twentieth century, more than one million Cubans--
one-tenth of the total population--had emigrated, [FN3] mostly to *1883 the United States. [FN4] United
States policy, relying principally on economic sanctions as the method to remove the Cuban govern-
ment, has resulted in unrelieved hardship on the Cuban people, and in the process has profoundly trans-
formed the nature of untold numbers of Cuban families.

Migration developed within two phases of specific global contexts, corresponding to Cuba's chang-
ing international position and U.S. policy: the period after 1960, when Cuba aligned itself with the So-
viet bloc in the final decades of the Cold War; and the years after 1990, when Cuba adapted to the global
economy in the post-Cold War environment ("Special Period"). [FN5] In both instances, the vicissitudes
of U.S. policies that purposefully politicized migration as part of the larger strategy of economic sanc-
tions adversely affected Cuban families. Divided families have found themselves continually separated
not only by the Florida Straits but also by U.S. laws and policies that have manipulated migration proce-
dures, restricted travel authorization, and tightened remittance regulations, the very means by which
families maintain connections. [FN6]

This Article examines the relationship between U.S. policy after 1960 and the legal mechanisms
that have influenced the character of the binational Cuban-American family. The United States has used
the rule of law to deny families the capacity to fulfill the fundamental custom of caretaking and comfort
for the purpose of subverting the Cuban revolution. Of course, the regulation of migration and attendant
matters of travel and remittances are customarily linked to national policy and international concerns.
However, in the case of U.S. laws governing the relationship of Cuban-American binational families, a
normativity of impartiality cannot be discerned.

Part I considers the amendments to travel and remittance restrictions imposed in June 2004 by the
administration of George W. Bush. These regulatory changes were certainly not the first to impose sig-
nificant limitations on the ability of families to maintain connections across the Florida Straits, but they
were the harshest to date. Part II demonstrates the ways in which the 2004 restrictions served as a new
means to an old end. It reviews prior policy and legal *1884 and covert strategies, which imposed sanc-
tions, utilized fear mongering, or otherwise targeted families in the hopes that adversity and hardships
would foster political discontent within Cuba and produce internal rebellion against the Cuban govern-
ment. Part III argues that during the post-Cold War period after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the
socialist bloc when Cuba lost its trading partners, the United States renewed its efforts to politically and
economically isolate Cuba to ensure that Cuba would fail in its efforts to re-integrate itself into the global
political economy. During this period, after the United States recognized that binational family relations
transacted through visits and financial support for families in Cuba had created a flow of foreign ex-
change and goods that had allowed many Cubans to survive the very sanctions designed to topple the Cuban government, U.S. policy began to increase its focus on restricting travel remittances. [FN7] Part III suggests that U.S. efforts to dislodge the Cuban government by way of inflicting hardship on Cuban families have failed. Cuban Americans improvised-- often extralegal--mechanisms of mutual familial assistance. In doing so, they often have been obliged to act as transgressors of laws and policies as a means to maintain family support systems.

United States-Cuba policies are presently under review and revision in Washington. [FN8] There is reason to hope for an end to the use of U.S. laws that create hardships for Cuban binational families in order to encourage the overthrow of the Cuban government. President Obama recently announced the liberalization of family travel and remittance laws. [FN9] However, the administration's rhetoric has not shifted, and the all-too-familiar pronouncements of what is best for Cuba--as determined by the United States-- persist. A bold transformation from Cold War rhetoric and hostilities to full engagement between the United States and Cuba is required to end the United States’ practice of using laws that create hardship for Cuban binational families in attempts to overthrow the Cuban government; such a transformation will allow full restoration of binational relationships and reconciliation on both sides of the Florida Straits.

*1885 I. 2004 Family Restrictions: New Means to Old Ends

In June 2004, the administration of George W. Bush announced new regulations restricting the rights of Cuban Americans to visit and support their families in Cuba. [FN10] Travelers previously allowed to visit relatives on the island once a year for up to ninety days, and perhaps more in the event of a family crisis, were limited to one trip every three years for a maximum of fourteen days [FN11]--no exceptions: not for an emergency visit to be with a dying parent, nor to attend a family funeral. [FN12] When questioned about the hardship imposed on families, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Dan Fisk responded, “So if they have a dying relative, they have to figure out when they want to travel.” [FN13]

The new regulations further redefined what constituted “family” and prohibited visits to anyone other than spouses, children, parents, grandparents, siblings, and grandchildren. [FN14] Aunts, uncles, cousins as well as individuals who, for example, may have previously functioned as parents or caretakers, were henceforth denied family status for purposes of visits. [FN15] Those without living relatives on the island were thus barred from returning to their homeland. The new regulations also limited the right of Cuban Americans to provide financial aid to families in Cuba. [FN16] A cap was set at $300 quarterly. [FN17] The maximum amount travelers were authorized to carry with them during their visits was reduced from $3,000 to $300. [FN18] In addition, families were prohibited from sending clothes and personal items. [FN19] Medicines and other critical necessities could not exceed $200 in value. [FN20] *1886 Notwithstanding the crisis suffered by Cubans after the devastating hurricanes of 2005, the new regulations forbade Cuban Americans from providing humanitarian assistance to their families and communities on the island. [FN21] Assistant Secretary of State, Roger Noriega, conveyed the mean-spirited purport of the new regulations:

“[W]hat are we supposed to say to them? We're going to continue to allow this money to be
shoved into the coffers of a regime that's going to keep them in chains in-in-in under a dictatorship because we want to preserve the right of people to visit their aunts?" [FN22] Of course, as Human Rights Watch noted in its report on Cuban families affected by the restrictions, visiting aunts is not a trivial matter, especially for those whose aunts and uncles raised them. [FN23]

That the 2004 travel and remittance regulations played havoc with the circumstances of Cuban and Cuban-American families was not a new phenomenon. For the past fifty years, family migration and corollary issues of travel and remittances have been politicized by the U.S. government as part of a larger U.S. strategy to effect “regime change” in Havana. [FN24] The Cuban alliance with the Soviet Union and the expansion of Cuban influence in Africa and Latin America were vital U.S. Cold War concerns. Certainly, this is the conventional wisdom. But U.S. hostility continued unabated into the post-Cold War period, suggesting that the sources of American attitudes toward Cuba were not based entirely on matters of strategic considerations. [FN25] Since the early 1990s, U.S. policy has been designed to thwart Cuban *1887 efforts to reintegrate into the global economy. [FN26] United States officials were convinced of Cuban vulnerability in the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union and sought to cut off Cuban access to support of any kind in their continued efforts to precipitate the collapse of the Cuban government. [FN27]

Notwithstanding the long and antagonistic history of regulatory maneuvers related to Cuban migration, travel, and remittances, the 2004 regulations were the harshest and most contentious to date. [FN28] The announcements of the new restrictions were timed with the release of a comprehensive cabinet-level report, entitled Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba. [FN29] Charged with the formulation of policies to topple the Cuban government, the Commission provided a comprehensive program to hasten Cuba’s “transition,” including specific recommendations on matters affecting Cuban and Cuban-American families. [FN30] According to the Commission, families who continued to travel and send funds for household support were barriers to the establishment of a “free Cuba.” [FN31] The report offered instructions for supporting dissident groups, rebuilding the Cuban infrastructure, developing new school curriculum, and procedures for achieving a top-to-bottom overhaul of the Cuban Government, including the drafting of a new constitution and converting the Cuban economy to a free-market system. [FN32] As one political scientist noted, the report “read like some antiquated colonial blueprint” and as “a symbol of the Bush administration's arrogant unilateralism and *1888 penchant for intervention.” [FN33] The Secretary General of the Organization of American States, José Miguel Insulza, was equally blunt in responding to the administration's report: ““There is no transition, and it's not your country.”’” [FN34]

With these new restrictions, President Bush, who had made “family values” the centerpiece of his 2000 presidential campaign and a central part of his speeches in Latin America with the oft-repeated quote that “[f]amily values do not stop at the Rio Bravo,” [FN35] made clear that commitments to family did stop at the shores of the Florida Straits. [FN36] The President often remarked on the importance of family integrity and expressed an understanding for families who migrated to provide for their loved ones. [FN37] He approved of remittances to enable migrants to “feed their families just like the citizens of America can find work to feed their families.” [FN38] The new regulations made clear, however, that Cubans and Cuban Americans were an exception, and they were expected to suffer differently than their *1889 counterparts in other Latin American countries and elsewhere throughout the world.
II. Sanctions, Sabotage, and Subversion: Migration and the Cold War

The 2004 restrictions in many ways signified the culmination of nearly fifty years of policy designed to visit hardship on families as a way to topple the Cuban government. [FN39] Since the early 1960s, successive U.S. governments have adopted a policy of political isolation and economic sanctions as a cost-effective way to undermine the government of Cuba. [FN40] The vicissitudes of migration over the course of fifty years were consequences of a policy that itself often lacked both clarity of purpose and consistency of implementation, that sometimes was in contradiction with itself, but always caused untold hardships for families who were denied customary means of contact and mutual support with those who remained on the island.

A. Creating the Economic Context for Migration

The United States' approaches to migration occurred within the larger context of sanctions imposed against Cuba through both legal and irregular means. In 1962, President John F. Kennedy authorized a trade embargo premised on existing statutory powers within the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917. [FN41] The Treasury Department subsequently promulgated the Cuban Assets Control Regulations (“CACR”) to prohibit financial transactions and trade with Cuba. [FN42] The U.S. government also *1890 resorted to covert means that went beyond the boundaries of the embargo statutes and regulations. The CIA's covert program known as Operation Mongoose included objectives that were carried out through clandestine means, including one designed to “[h]arass the economy.” [FN43] The United States set in motion plans to sabotage export agricultural commodities, industries, public utilities, and transportation capabilities in order to “reduce available economic supplies and services,” and “crip[ple] Cuban commerce vital to the regime's domestic economic program.” [FN44]

The American determination to politicize hunger was a key facet of U.S. efforts to bring down the Cuban government. President Dwight Eisenhower encouraged “quarantin[ing] Cuba,” stating that “if [the Cuban people] are hungry, they will throw Castro out.” [FN45] Eisenhower explained that U.S. policy had as a “primary objective . . . to establish conditions which will bring home to the Cuban people the cost of Castro's policies and of his Soviet orientation.” [FN46] Similarly, President Kennedy used economic sanctions as a means to hasten Fidel Castro's departure as a result of the “‘rising discomfort among hungry Cubans.’” [FN47] The State Department advocated that “‘every possible means should be undertaken promptly to weaken the economic life of Cuba [in order to] bring about hunger, desperation and [the] overthrow of the government.’” [FN48]

*1891 The logic of political isolation and economic sanctions was based on an effort to create adversity and hardship within Cuba to foster political disaffection and popular discontent, and thus create optimal conditions to produce internal rebellion. In fact, economic hardship did not result in sustained political opposition at home, but instead produced migration abroad. [FN49] With the exception of the years from 1959 to 1965--when immigration consisted principally of Cubans associated with the Batista regime, upper-middle-class Cubans who were mostly white, and individuals who feared retribution be-
cause of their actions as informers or because of their collaboration with the failed Bay of Pigs invasion.

-Cuban migration has followed discernable patterns that corresponded to U.S. policies.  

Between 1965 and 1980, migration consisted of Cubans who left principally because of the economic hardship and desires to reunite with family in the United States primarily in South Florida and New Jersey.  

Scholars of this migration period described this cohort as “self-imposed exiles,” and “migrants who resembled the traditional immigrants who came to the United States in search of better economic opportunities” as a result of changing, and for many, *1892 worsening political and economic conditions in Cuba. As the next section will describe, the economic conditions from which Cubans were escaping during these years were often exacerbated, if not created, by U.S. policy.

B. Migration, Fear-Mongering, and the Propaganda of the Cold War

The U.S.-Cuba policy had a larger purpose. In the throes of the Cold War, the United States sought to use Cuban migration to demonstrate to Africa, Asia, and Latin America that socialist systems could not adequately provide for their people.  

The spectacle of tens of thousands of Cubans in flight from their homeland made for good propaganda. The United States also used migration to weaken the Cuban government from within. Additionally, the United States encouraged the exodus of professional and skilled workers from Cuba to create a “brain drain” that would sap Cuba of those individuals with knowledge and needed abilities while positioning the United States as a symbol of the “gateway to freedom.”  

By promoting migration, the United States hoped to gain control of a cohort of exiles and put them to use in carrying out covert operations, sabotage, and sowing fear amongst Cubans in order to turn world opinion against Cuba.

United States documents declassified in 1996 reveal the importance of migration in service of efforts to bring down the Cuban government.  

Plans were made to produce “Cuban refugees and *1893 defectors as dramatic witnesses against the Castro-Communist regime” in Cuba and in the Western Hemisphere.  

Other projects sought to produce an exile force that the United States could control for purposes of disseminating propaganda materials which would be delivered to them by the CIA in order to “disaffect the Cuban people.”  

Once Cubans arrived in the United States, the CIA planned to cultivate certain groups for the purpose of creating dissent inside Cuba.  

The State Department plotted to infiltrate Cuban migrant groups who would in turn encourage and engage in acts of sabotage, “creat[e] and nurtur [e]” political opposition, and “encourage resistance elements inside Cuba.”

One of the most politicized efforts to encourage Cuban migration known as the “Pedro Pan Operación” (“Peter Pan Operation”), targeted families with young children.  

In the fall of 1960, a CIA-sponsored radio station broadcasted reports alleging that the Cuban government planned to remove children from their parents for purposes of indoctrination and military training.  

With *1894 deliberate intent to alarm parents with false information, the radio broadcasts announced that children would be removed according to newly enacted laws and instructed parents to take their children to churches to await further instructions.  

Families were told that their children would receive
scholarships to study in the United States. [FN65] As a result, an estimated 14,000 Cuban children from mostly white and middle class families were relocated to camps, foster homes, orphanages, and other institutions throughout the United States. [FN66] Children were separated from siblings and were often cut off from families, who were denied permission to visit them. [FN67] Many endured abusive conditions. [FN68] One woman, who suffered from her interactions with terrified children who repeatedly called for their mothers who remained in Cuba, described the devastating effects of the operation. [FN69] From the perspective of the Cold War politics, however, the operation was a success. As María de los Angeles Torres, a Pedro Pan herself, writes: “[t]he image of helpless children fleeing the island captured the imagination of anti-Communists throughout the world,” adding that “[i]f the battle over the children’s minds in the 1960s had been a way to contest the country’s political future, interpreting the *1895 exodus became a way to control its history.” [FN70] Decades later, narratives revealing “The Dark Side of Pedro Pan” would reveal the role of the CIA in the operation. [FN71] These narratives illustrate the United States’ active effort to encourage Cuban migration, an effort that continued throughout the decade.

C. Open Door Policy: Migration and the Cuban Adjustment Act

Perhaps no measure set in such sharp relief the politics of migration as the Cuban Refugee Act of 1966. [FN72] The United States received the increasing Cuban migration by adopting an open-door policy best described as exceptional. Most of the 165,000 Cubans who came to the United States up to 1966 entered without immigrant visas, without prior security checks, and without proof of guaranteed employment in the United States. [FN73] To accommodate them, Congress adopted the Cuban Refugee Act (“Cuban Adjustment Act”). [FN74] The Cuban Adjustment Act allowed Cubans to apply for permanent residency one year after arrival without having to leave the country to apply— a privilege, as noted by Ruth Wasem, that has been afforded to no other nationality. [FN75] The Act waived permanent resident application fees for Cuban refugees. [FN76] In addition to the privileged application of the immigration laws, federally funded centers and *1896 services—such as housing, counseling, education, training, and work opportunities—expanded in South Florida to assist specifically new Cuban residents. [FN77]

Legislators defended the exceptional treatment of Cubans, who were first paroled into the United States without visas and subsequently allowed to adjust status in an unusually short period of time, without regard to quotas, and with blanket fee waivers. [FN78] Some argued that there was no consulate post in Cuba to which the Cubans could apply for visas, although the decision to close the embassy was unilaterally made by the U.S. government. [FN79] Others argued that the normal residency adjustment process by which noncitizens without immigrant visas were required to leave and apply at a consulate outside of the United States would be “costly and inconvenient” for Cubans. [FN80]

Several legislators made efforts to extend the Act to similarly situated immigrants from other countries. Some legislators unsuccessfully attempted to include exiles from the Dominican Republic who were fleeing the political instability of the post-Trujillo years. [FN81] Others endeavored to add amendments that would grant similar adjustment benefits to immigrants from the Western Hemisphere in the United States and whose petitions for adjustment were pending on December 1, 1965. [FN82] These amendments were rejected. [FN83] Legislators argued, unsuccessfully, that the financial burden
of leaving the United States to apply for adjustment of status *1897 was equally onerous on many Latin Americans and sought to “[put] the people of Latin America on an equal footing” with people of the rest of the world. [FN84]

The legislative debates illuminated the degree to which the issue of Cuban migration served Cold War politics. Representative Feighan put it succinctly: “granting of permanent resident status would further American policy objectives: by further demonstrating the desire of the United States to play a full and sympathetic role as a country of asylum to refugees from communism.” [FN85] Representative Claude Pepper stated his support for the Act because Cubans showed opposition to the communist regime. [FN86] Similarly, Senator Philip Hart concluded that “we could find no more effective spokesmen to describe the destruction of freedom under Castro's brand of communism.” [FN87] Precisely because Cubans could serve larger ends, they were the “special favorites” in the realm of immigration laws and policies. [FN88] The Cuban Adjustment Act served its purpose and then some. By the end of 1979, over 670,000 Cubans had migrated to the United States. [FN89] Because they were easily able to obtain permanent residency, Cubans naturalized at a faster rate than other immigrant groups and thus obtained political power more rapidly. [FN90] But the Act was not without consequences. Many families were traumatized by the prospect of settling in the United States without contact with family, and close relationships were disrupted. [FN91] Parents were separated from children, brothers from sisters, and many were never to see grandparents, cousins, aunts, and uncles again. Additionally, families were not immune to the political conflicts occasioned by the nature of the Cuban revolution and the manipulation of the politics of exile engendered to facilitate U.S. Cold War interests.

D. From Open Door to Open Arms: Migration and the Mariel Boatlift

In addition to the Cuban Adjustment Act, there were other ways in which Cubans migrated to the United States. The Mariel exodus, *1898 which took place between April 1980 and October 1980, provides additional evidence of the politicization of migration by way of the continued efforts by the United States to manipulate conditions on the island and the favored treatment of Cuban immigrants once they reached U.S. soil. [FN92] During this period, over 125,000 Cubans entered the United States. [FN93] This large-scale migration occurred after a period in the late 1970s in which some Cubans on the island were hijacking boats, at times at gunpoint, in order to force boat captains to take them to Florida where they were immediately paroled into the United States. [FN94] A series of dangerous attempts by Cubans to storm Latin American embassies followed the hijackings. The most notable incident occurred on April 1, 1980, when six Cubans seeking asylum crashed their bus through the gates of the Peruvian embassy in Havana, killing a Cuban guard and setting off turmoil and violence on the embassy grounds. [FN95] Weary of the U.S. government's refusal to treat the embassy incidents and hijackings as illegal acts of violence--a policy that appeared to encourage such acts even though Cuba had prosecuted U.S. hijackers who had flown U.S. planes to Cuba-- the Cuban government declared the Port of Mariel open, and invited exiles to come by boat to transport their relatives to the United States. [FN96]

The Mariel exodus must be further understood in its specific historical context. It followed a period of slow emigration and other important but momentary changes in U.S. policy. During the years of *1899 the Carter presidency (1977-1981), and for the first time since the Cuban revolution, the United
States had indicated a willingness to discuss normalization of relations with Cuba without preconditions. Although the United States did not lift the embargo in 1977, the Carter administration ended restrictions on travel to Cuba, permitted limited remittances, and signed a number of bilateral agreements to signal possibilities for reconciliation.

In 1978, the Cuban government welcomed exiled families previously barred from visiting Cuba. At the invitation of the Cuban government, exiles entered into a series of talks, known as “the diálogo,” for the purpose of determining how best to accomplish family reunification. Although many who entered into the dialogue were threatened with violence, and in some instances suffered extreme violence and even death by hard-line Cuban-American exiles opposed to any form of reconciliation, for many, the desire to reunite with families prevailed over fear and intimidation. Cuban Americans quickly took advantage of the new opening, and within a year's period, over 100,000 families paid visits to their loved ones and communities. Reunification efforts also led to the establishment of organizations whose goals were to continue to advocate for the needs of binational families.

With the influx of Cuban-American visitors and the dollars and goods they introduced into the island, conditions for many families improved. Relatives could not, however, sustain the Cuban economy, and indeed, economic sanctions continued to take their toll. These were times of increasing tension in Cuba as a result of exposure to U.S. consumer goods (the “blue jean revolution”). Cubans were introduced to the proposition, if not myth, of “material abundance” on the other side of the Florida Straits. These factors, together with additional encouragement from the United States, set the stage for the Mariel phenomenon.

Notwithstanding the changing forces that affected the Mariel migration, there were important consistencies with regard to the Marielitos in the realm of U.S. policy and its treatment of Cuban migration. First, the U.S. government continued its strategy of manipulation of events in Cuba that encouraged the mass exodus. Following the tragic incident at the Peruvian embassy, the Carter administration not only failed to condemn the violence, on the contrary, it applauded it. In response to the Mariel exodus that ensued, Vice President Walter Mondale, echoing earlier sentiments on the propaganda value of Cuban migration, stated, “[t]here is no better proof of the failure of Castro’s revolution than the dramatic exodus which is currently taking place.” President Carter responded to the crisis by granting refugee status to all those who entered the Peruvian embassy and promising to “continue to provide an open heart and open arms for the tens of thousands of refugees seeking freedom from Communist domination” and from economic deprivation, brought about primarily by Fidel Castro and his government.

Second, the United States granted Marielitos, like their predecessors, exceptional legal status. At the time of the exodus, the United States had passed the Refugee Act of 1980, which placed a quota on “refugees” from Cuba. Cubans were no longer allowed blanket entrance as refugees. They were to be treated in a similar manner as any other arriving immigrants seeking asylum, that is, they were subject to individual case review according to asylum standards and procedures and subject to detention while awaiting determinations in their case.
Though the Refugee Act of 1980 was intended to reduce the arbitrary and political nature of the executive's parole power, the President continued to grant such relief to Cubans, who continued to enter the United States notwithstanding the fact that the U.S. government had spurned the idea that the great majority of Cuban immigrants were eligible for asylum. Moreover, a subsequent amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act extended the special privileges that encouraged migration from Cuba over all other countries. These entrants were not only allowed to adjust their status to lawful permanent residents outside of regular legal processes but were also granted access to other federal statutory relief entitling them to social services and benefits not available to other immigrants. The Mariel exodus episode illuminated the dilemma created by the United States' politicized migration policies and laws that served U.S. Cold War politics.

*1902 E. Maintaining Pressure, United States-Cuba Policy, and the Cuban-American National Foundation

As hostilities between Havana and Washington continued unabated and ongoing efforts to use migration as a political means failed to achieve U.S. purposes, the United States sought additional ways to weaken Cuba. Once again, the government looked for ways to control, if not exploit, the Cuban-American community and the identity of exile for these purposes. In 1981, Cuban Americans in Miami, encouraged and supported by the Reagan administration, created the Cuban-American National Foundation (“CANF”) to function as a Cuban-American political action committee modeled after the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the pro-Israel lobbying group. The group was conceived in the context of larger global concerns, specifically regarding the Western Hemisphere and what U.S. policy makers perceived as growing threats to U.S. political and economic domination of the region. The founding of CANF was linked to President Reagan, Republican Party operatives, and CIA veterans who came to appreciate the efficacy of a fiercely conservative Cuban-American lobby to provide domestic impetus to U.S. foreign policy and “popularize the Reagan administration’s policies.”

CANF wielded significant influence in Congress through sizeable campaign donations targeted particularly at Senate candidates with influence in matters of foreign policy. CANF members were appointed by the Reagan administration to United Nations committees as part of the government's efforts to globalize the U.S. purpose of and means for isolating Cuba and fostering economic turmoil on the island. In turn, CANF received government contracts, funding for projects related to migration, and support for its propaganda efforts through control of Radio Marti.

CANF's main purpose was to gain political influence over the Cuban-American community in service of U.S. policies. It opposed a continuation of “the diálogo” and attacked Cuban Americans who encouraged negotiations between the United States and Cuba. Although it was not the most extreme of the exile groups, its privileged relationship to the Reagan administration gave it legitimacy and resources with which to impose its views. Indeed, Human Rights Watch condemned the climate of fear, intimidation, and suppression of speech fostered by CANF.
CANF functioned as “a product of the North American pathology . . . an instrument--not an instigator--of policy.” [FN127] By virtue of its ties to policy makers, CANF wielded power in an attempt to shape exile politics. It succeeded in obtaining prohibitions and restrictions on accords and agreements designed to facilitate family contact, claiming that these relationships served to support Castro. [FN128] It was with CANF support that in 1982, President Reagan reimposed travel restrictions that the Carter administration had lifted. [FN129] Families *1904 were now burdened with the requirement of a special license to travel to Cuba. [FN130]

The Cuban-American community, while associated with the politics of exile, has long lost its monolithic character, and its members have demonstrated divergent views on Cuba and U.S.-Cuba relations. [FN131] CANF set the stage for the post-Cold War struggle between the political economy of globalization and the transcendent desires of the binational Cuban-American family to maintain ties and support.

III. Sanctions and the Post-Cold War Global Economy, 1990-Present

A. Torricelli, Helms-Burton, and the Migration Crisis of the 1990s

In the early 1990s, a dramatic global shift occurred. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc signaled Cuba's loss of trading partners. In the aftermath of the Cold War, Cuba plunged into a deep economic crisis that threatened the survival of the Castro government. [FN132] Cuba responded by seeking to engage with other countries and establish and improve international relationships--including its relationship with the United States--in its efforts to seek new economic ties and foreign investors. [FN133] The government also introduced political reforms as well as domestic economic adaptations as a means to weather the crisis and fend off internal collapse. [FN134]

*1905 It was in this changing global setting that the United States seized new opportunities to further increase pressure on Cuba by enacting the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 (“Torricelli Act”) [FN135] for the stated purpose of “wreak[ing] havoc on the island.” [FN136] In response to Cuban efforts to reintegrate itself into the global economy, the Torricelli Act sought to assume extraterritorial authority and prohibited third-country subsidiaries of U.S. companies from doing business with Cuba. [FN137] It authorized the President to impose sanctions, including cutting aid and debt relief on any country that traded with or assisted Cuba. [FN138]

During the next four years, Cuba continued to expand market-style economic reforms, establish trade relationships with countries outside of the former Soviet bloc, and open its markets to foreign investors. [FN139] Although the Clinton administration acknowledged the reforms, the administration nonetheless dismissed them as a sign of weakness--proof that the embargo was working and that more of the same would deliver the coup de grace to the struggling Cuban government. [FN140] Thus, in pursuit of never-ending hopes of accelerating the Cuban government's demise, and in response to further deteriorating relationships between the United States and Cuba, Congress enacted yet another embargo-related statute, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 (“Helms-Burton Act”). [FN141]
The Helms-Burton Act expanded restrictions, added new sanctions, and codified all aspects of the embargo, thereby prohibiting the executive branch from easing the restrictions without an act of Congress. [FN142] The new law expanded the extraterritorial reach of the embargo and prohibited the importation of any products, including goods “made or derived in whole or in part of any article which is the growth, produce, or manufacture of Cuba.” [FN143] Congress instructed the executive branch to exercise its authority to prevent Cuba's membership in international financial institutions and the Organization of the Americas. [FN144] International financial institutions that engaged in financial transactions with Cuba would suffer a forfeit of payment by the United States. [FN145] As a result, the lack of access to international financing severely limited Cuba's integration into the global economy. [FN146]

After the Torricelli and Helms-Burton Acts, the embargo operated at full throttle, despite admissions by the U.S. government that the threat of communism in the region was nonexistent. [FN147] The extraterritorial provisions were effective. Countries dependent on U.S. aid and corporations engaged in U.S. trade, fearful of reprisals, pulled out of Cuba. [FN148] The logic of U.S. policy remained constant: to deepen economic hardship among Cubans who were now especially vulnerable in the post-Soviet environment, and thereby generate popular discontent inside Cuba and--the Americans hoped--uprisings against the Cuban government. The embargo laws and regulations were successful, particularly with regard to the impact on Cuban families. Families suffered nutritional deficits and limited access to medicines. [FN149] The prohibition on trade and travel made the pain of family separation all the more difficult. [FN150]

Many Cuban-American families objected strenuously to these laws. Alicia Torres, testifying before Congress on behalf of the Cuban-American Committee Research and Education Fund, argued that families should not be used as weapons in the U.S. war against Cuba. [FN151] The “pressure cooker” theory, she noted, would have repercussions principally on “our relatives in Cuba” who would suffer “greater hardships.” [FN152] Representatives of the Cuban Democratic Party in Miami, the Coordinated Organizations of Human Rights in Cuba, and Cuban dissident groups testified about the wrong-headedness of the restrictions, including the travel restrictions, noting that in Cuba, “ordinary citizens are consumed by the daily struggle for survival.” [FN153]

The burden, of course, fell primarily on Cubans who lived on the island. For example, a public health expert who visited Cuba following the Torricelli Act noted the detrimental effect of the new law on the health of Cuban citizens due to the U.S. domination of the pharmaceutical industry, the ban on subsidiary trade, and the newly imposed licensing requirement for sending medicines and medical supplies. [FN154] A report by the American Association of World Health concluded that the embargo had resulted in a number of nutritional deficiency related illnesses, including the highly publicized eye disease (neuropathy) that has affected so many Cubans. [FN155] Indeed, a Miami Herald poll in Cuba found that a majority of Cubans identified the U.S. embargo and not the Cuban government as the cause of economic turmoil and misery. [FN156]

Predictably, the combination of the Soviet collapse, the ensuing loss of Soviet subsidies, and the consequences of the Torricelli and Helms-Burton Acts resulted in a marked increase in the number of
Cubans who made desperate attempts to leave the island. In 1994, tens of thousands of Cubans left Cuba in unseaworthy boats and homemade rafts precipitating what has come to be known as the balsero (“rafters”) crisis. [FN157] Like the Marielitos before them, the balseros fit the prototype of economic refugees and garnered less sympathy than earlier émigrés who were more readily classified as political exiles. [FN158]

The response of the United States to the balsero crisis indicated a shift in U.S.-Cuba foreign policy. President Clinton initially prohibited “‘illegal refugees from Cuba’” from entering the United States and ordered their confinement at the Guantanamo Naval Base. [FN159] Though he allowed them entrance soon afterwards, the tide of migration did not subside. In response, the United States closed the “preferential open door” policy and introduced the “wet foot/dry foot” policy, which allowed those Cubans who reached land to avail themselves of the privileges of the Cuban Adjustment Act but required the Cubans intercepted at sea to return to Cuba. [FN160] These arrangements were based on new migration accords in 1994 and 1995 designed to further stem the tide of rafters. [FN161]

The policy of encouraging migration to the United States as a means to weaken Cuba had failed and was no longer considered an effective means to remove the Cuban government. United States sanctions had indeed contributed to weakening Cuba’s economy. But as historian Louis A. Pérez, Jr., observed, “[t]he concept of sanctions . . . was deeply flawed” since pressures created by sanctions “were in large part relieved by Cuban emigration.” [FN162] Because Cuban families in the United States overwhelmingly desired to visit and support their families in Cuba, a flow of foreign exchange and goods allowed many Cubans to survive the very sanctions designed to topple the Cuban government. [FN163] As a result, U.S. policy began to increase its focus on restricting travel and remittances.

B. Shifting Strategies: Deterring Family Support

Cuban émigrés had been afforded privileges in the realm of entry into the United States. They gained admission according to laws that were exclusively created for and applied to Cubans. [FN164] They benefited from social services designed for Cubans only and achieved political enfranchisement with relative ease. [FN165] But these privileges were conceived in service of U.S. foreign policy—not as a matter of family sustenance—and could not be parlayed into the circumstances of the everyday practices of maintaining binational family relationships.

With some brief exceptions, families who wished to travel to Cuba and send funds to relatives on the island have always suffered the punishment of the U.S. economic war on Cuba. [FN166] Since 1959, U.S. laws and regulations affecting families have operated in a dialectical warp that has corresponded to weaknesses that continually burden the Cuban state, as well as global economic conditions, affronts, and perceived wrongs committed by the Cuban government. The pattern of restrictions alternating with relaxation of the rules by which Cuban-Americans must abide in order to support their families continues to the present, with little sign of normalization of relations.

Although the initial embargo and Treasury Department regulations did not specifically ban travel or remittances, the restrictions on financial transactions with Cuba ultimately did. [FN167] In 1977, Cuban
families benefited from a brief exception to the restrictions when the Carter administration permitted travel-related transactions under a general license for anyone wishing to travel to Cuba. [FN168] The Carter administration authorized limited remittances in 1978. [FN169] In 1982, the Reagan administration reinstated travel restrictions but continued to allow general licenses for families visiting close relatives. [FN170] Then, in 1988, the Reagan administration imposed new hardships on families wishing to travel or send remittances by creating a new licensing system for travel services and remittance forwarding businesses engaged in Cuba-related transactions. [FN171] These changes were made to discourage such businesses in order to “reduce the flow of hard currency to Cuba through transactions with persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.” [FN172]

During the 1990s, global circumstances demonstrated the importance of travel and remittances. [FN173] Cuba undertook significant *1911 reforms to increase the flow of funds to families and endeavored to improve relations with émigrés. [FN174] In this period, the characteristics of Cuban migration resembled the migration patterns and consequences elsewhere in Latin America; the economies of which were based on a growing dependency on family remittances as an important source of national income. [FN175] Remittances from abroad, particularly from the United States, dramatically increased. [FN176] It was at this point that U.S. laws became increasingly punitive.

In addition to the provisions of the Torricelli Act that sought to halt all trade with Cuba, the Act authorized the President to impose restrictions on remittances to Cuba and thus limit the amount that could be spent on Cuban families wishing to travel to the United States to visit family. [FN177] In 1992, the Office of Foreign Assets Control (“OFAC”) reduced the sum that families could send from $500 to $300 in any one quarter. [FN178] The Act authorized the Treasury Department to take enforcement action against families who violated the 1992 restrictions. [FN179] In an effort to avoid the more rigorous standards of proof necessary to proceed in criminal matters, OFAC amended its rules to enact civil penalties of up to fifty thousand dollars. [FN180]

From 1994 through 1998, the Clinton administration prohibited family remittances except “when extreme hardship is demonstrated in *1912 cases involving extreme humanitarian need.” [FN181] Cuban Americans were no longer permitted to travel under a general license to family; instead, they were required to submit to a case-by-case review for permission to engage in “travel-related transactions.” [FN182] Both travel and remittance rules were liberalized again in 1995, then tightened in 1996 as a consequence of the Helms-Burton Act, [FN183] and relaxed again in 1998. [FN184] However, in 1998, new regulations obliged Cuban Americans to sign a remittance affidavit that included data on households of both sender and recipient, a requirement that discouraged individuals from sending money through officially sanctioned channels. [FN185]

Between 2000 and 2004, the Bush administration again eased and tightened the regulations. In 2003, a notable regulatory amendment allowed visits of relatives within three degrees of relationship without having to demonstrate humanitarian need. [FN186] These amendments also increased the amount of money that could be carried to Cuba from $300 to $3,000, although the limit of $300 per quarter destined for each household did not change. [FN187] At the same time, OFAC enforcement capabilities were once more strengthened, and President Bush directed the Department of Homeland Secu-
rity to increase enforcement efforts related to travel and any item sent to Cuba. [FN188]

The ongoing changes and ever-tightening restrictions affecting migration, travel, and remittances raise persistent concerns about the nature of U.S. policy toward Cuba. The policy has relied primarily on statutory and regulatory schemes to deny Cuban families the ability to discharge fundamental commitments to loved ones. [FN189] Although as Adam Feibelman points out, remittances may “act as incentives for workers to migrate internationally, in some cases increasing their exposure to unfair business practices and imposing costs on family members who remain in the workers' home countries;” [FN190] in the case of Cuba, it is more complicated. The migration context of Cuban remittances is entwined with the economic turmoil caused by the embargo. On one side of the Florida Straits, the Cuban government readily encouraged remittances in an attempt to redress the effects of an economic war and a global capitalist economy. [FN191] On the other side, for most of the past fifty years, U.S. laws have restricted Cuban Americans from sending remittances. [FN192] Despite the refusal of the United States to depoliticize the practices of family sustenance, Cuban Americans have continued to find ways to meet their obligations to family notwithstanding obstacles posed by U.S. law. [FN193]

C. A Failed Policy: The Binational Family as Transgressor

While restrictions on remittances and travel have been a nearly constant feature of U.S. foreign policy, so too has the willingness of Cuban-American families to violate the law. Whether funds are sent to assist family members to migrate or to help with everyday necessities in Cuba, remittances have flowed continuously since Cubans first migrated to the United States. [FN194] Families have traveled illegally, typically through third countries. [FN195] They have also sought to bring their loved ones to the island through unauthorized and sometimes dangerous means. [FN196]

*1914 The determinants of transgressive behaviors are varied and complex. They include historic, political, and cultural forces, some unique to Cuba, others related to globalization factors, and still others that are characteristic of families generally. The history of Cuban immigration to the United States dates back to the nineteenth century and includes a sustained pattern of immigrants providing support to relatives on the island. [FN197] Notwithstanding the disruption to households occasioned by the constancy of migration flows, experts who have studied the sociology of the Cuban family have described families as “the most important social unit in the life of Cubans.” [FN198] “Familism” is the basic structure of Cuban society and includes not only nuclear and extended family, but friends, neighbors, and communities who represent fictive kin. [FN199] The strength of these relationships overrides laws that limit the ability of families to sustain relationships.

Professor Guillermo Bernal, who has studied Cuban migration, notes that “the degree of connectedness that Cuban families maintain to their birthplace, culture, and roots is an important element in the assessment of the Cuban families in the United States . . . [l]oyalty and legacy issues are particularly visible with Cuban families.” [FN200] Cubans have successfully established a society in accordance with historic ideals of self-sacrifice, collective duty, and civic participation and have cultivated a consciousness of being Cuban (“conciencia”). [FN201] As one Cuban scholar has noted, “nationalism constitutes a force for unifying people that is superior to any ideological or philosophical creed.” [FN202]
Scholars who have studied patterns of remittance have observed that Cuban Americans are less likely than other remitters to be *1915 motivated for self-interested purposes and more apt to send money to families primarily out of altruistic motives. [FN203] Unlike other remitters who send funds back to the home country where they may have some expectations of return, Cuban émigrés generally consider themselves to be in the United States permanently. [FN204] They have no assumptions of personally benefitting from funds sent to the island. [FN205] Moreover, they cannot expect their funds to be privately invested or yield profits given the nature of the Cuban political economy. [FN206]

It is these characteristics that provide the context for considering the variety of ways that Cubans confront the restrictions. Some are legal but many are illegal. Cuban Americans formed the Cuban-American Commission for Family Rights to counter the travel and remittance restrictions. [FN207] In 2004, as opinions moderated in the exile community, CANF reversed its support of travel restrictions and denounced the Bush administration restrictions. [FN208] More recently, CANF released a “White Paper” for the purposes of addressing U.S.-Cuba relations and encouraging the U.S. government to lift restrictions on all family travel and remittances. [FN209] Other groups have attempted to bring political pressure in an effort to lift the restrictions. [FN210]

*1916 However, many Cubans denied legal means to visit family have opted for extralegal means. [FN211] Families have resorted to obtaining licenses to travel on false pretenses, signing up with religious organizations as religious workers without any intentions of carrying out religious work, or traveling illegally through third countries. [FN212] Informal means of travel and remittance-sending include black market couriers, or mulas, to carry funds and transit through third counties. [FN213] The Cuban-American community in Miami facilitates networks to assist with the processes and practices of sending money with other travelers. [FN214] Anywhere from sixty to seventy-five percent of remittance dollars to Cuba are transmitted through covert means. [FN215]

Between 1994 and 1998, when remittances were fully banned, Cuba simultaneously enacted regulatory changes that liberalized the receipt and use of remittances. [FN216] Ironically, it was during this period that funds from Cuban Americans to their families actually increased. [FN217] Cuban Americans were responding not to U.S. laws, but rather to legal changes in Cuba that facilitated the use of dollars by their families. [FN218]

Sending remittances illegally is not uncommon among Cuban Americans. Early exiles contribute a significant portion of remittances, despite a perception that they have few relatives in Cuba, and are hostile to sending remittances. [FN219] In one recent study of attitudes toward remittances among Cuban Americans, political disincentives were found to have no major effect on the decision *1917 whether or not to send funds. [FN220] Additionally, over time, the flow of dollars to Cuba has steadily increased, even after migrants assimilate in the United States. [FN221] Cuban Americans who visit their homeland are additionally motivated to send money. [FN222] For most Cuban Americans, humanitarian concerns for family override political issues. [FN223]

Although it is difficult to measure remittances to Cuba because of the informal corridors through
which funds are transmitted, the existing data on the volume of funds remitted corroborates the resolve with which Cuban Americans support their families. Notwithstanding the remittance restrictions, from the early 1990s until 2004, dollars were the principal currency in Cuba as a result of funds sent by Cuban Americans. [FN224] Even as remittances have declined elsewhere as a result of the recent global economic crisis, the amount of remittances to Cuba has increased. [FN225] In short, the restrictions do not reduce the transmission of funds; rather, they only increase the informality by which they are sent.

Although families may be successful at times in circumventing the restrictions, they have nonetheless been devastated by their impact. In 2005, Jeanne Parr Lemkau and David L. Strug, concerned about the mental health effects on Cuban-American families as a result of the 2004 restrictions, conducted in-depth surveys with affected individuals. [FN226] The stories they captured led one commentator to conclude that “[s]eparating families by restricting travel is unjust; the suffering inflicted on families, unbearable.” [FN227] In their report, they document an unyielding commitment expressed by Cuban Americans for their loved ones in Cuba, a sentiment given clear expression by one woman who stated “‘[T]he family is more powerful than any law.’” [FN228] Such a sentiment serves as a convincing critique of legal mechanisms that facilitate U.S. hegemonic policies toward Cuba.

*1918 IV. Obama Year One: The Limits of Change*

On April 13, 2009, days prior to attending the Summit of the Americas and after increasing pressure from Latin American countries for the United States to signal a change in relations with Cuba, President Obama announced the lifting of restrictions on family travel and remittances. [FN229] The new regulations continue to impose a limit on funds that can be used for travel (restored to the levels in effect before the 2004 changes) and continue to require families to complete affidavits in order to send remittances. [FN230] Travel restrictions for Americans of non-Cuban descent remain in effect. [FN231] However, families, now redefined to once again include aunts, uncles, cousins, and second cousins, are allowed unlimited visits. [FN232] Furthermore, there are no restrictions on the amount of remittances that can be sent. [FN233] New regulations also make it easier for families to send gift packages to Cuba. [FN234]

The news was, of course, welcomed not only in countless Cuban-American households and throughout Cuba but also among a broad range of policy makers, analysts, and international leaders long opposed to U.S. policies toward Cuba. [FN235] Travel agencies were immediately flooded with reservation requests. [FN236] On the same day of 1919 the President's announcement, remittance-sending providers issued their own media statements to report that they were ready for a new surge in business. [FN237]

But the recent modifications of U.S. regulations do not signal the end of the paradigm within which they function. In the realm of family travel, it merely restores the position of binational families to the circumstances prior to the 2004 restrictions. The lifting of the restrictions was encoded in an unchanging political jargon and captioned as an event to “[promote] democracy and human rights in Cuba,” the euphemism of choice for toppling the Cuban government. [FN238] Although President Obama hailed his announcement at the Summit as a “new beginning,” [FN239] and despite the fact that his administra-
tion acknowledged the failure of the fifty-year-old policy of hostility toward Cuba, he made clear that the United States would not lift the embargo. [FN240] Indeed, in September 2009 the President renewed the Trading with the Enemy Act against Cuba, stating that it was in the interest of the United States to do so--an act overwhelmingly condemned by the international community. [FN241] The Obama administration has continued to impose significant fines for embargo violations and has continued the ban on the exportation of medical *1920* equipment. [FN242] Moreover, the Obama administration decided to continue to keep Cuba on the list of terrorist states. [FN243]

As historian Louis Pérez has observed, “Obama’s ‘new beginning’ possesses a wearisome familiarity.” [FN244] Since the Clinton administration, U.S. officials have noted a readiness to change policy toward Cuba, and a willingness to respond albeit “in a carefully calibrated way” to Cuban economic and political reforms. [FN245] But reforms in Cuba, when they are made, have been used in the United States as evidence of Cuban weakness, followed by U.S. demands for more reforms. Carlos Gutierrez, outgoing Commerce Secretary under the Bush administration, counseled then-President-elect Obama about the need to be cautious with regard to policy toward Cuba, describing it as “‘something between a game of chicken and a game of chess.’” [FN246] Given President Obama’s continuation of failed policies, one would assume that he has followed Gutierrez’s advice and that binational family relations still remain subject to foreign policy manipulation.

Conclusion

There are good reasons to seek meaningful changes toward Cuba. What is required is no less than the normalization of relationships to foster dialogue, debate, and engagement in the pursuit of solutions to the various concerns of mutual interests to both Cuba and the United States. In a recent report issued by the Center for Democracy in the Americas, Cuba analysts from a broad range of disciplines have offered various proposals for shifting from a failed Cuba policy. [FN247] In addition to lifting all restrictions on trade and travel, the report’s authors have endorsed “cooperation in military affairs and law enforcement, health research and hurricane preparedness, energy development and migration policy, commerce and academic exchange, and for reuniting Cuban families--to build *1921* trust back into the U.S.-Cuba relationship.” [FN248] Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, former Chief of Staff to Secretary of State Colin Powell, noted the importance of Cuba to U.S. relationships in the Western Hemisphere. “By [acting positively toward Cuba] . . . we open the door to our backyard, our hemisphere, to Canada, to Mexico, to all of Central and South America. We open the door in a way we have never done before.” [FN249] Certainly Cuba’s close relationship with Venezuela and the Bolivarian Revolution, described as a “movement” that “has galvanised people, first across Venezuela and then across South America as a whole,” demonstrates Cuba’s hemispheric importance. [FN250] Cuba has played a significant role in the formation of Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas Agreement (“ALBA”), which has given rise to a financial institution (“Banco del Sur”) designed to provide alternatives to the World Bank and the development of alternative structures to neoliberalism. [FN251] Recently, old Cold War rhetoric has re-emerged as former high-ranking officials have proclaimed post-coup Honduras “as the principal battleground in a proxy fight with Cuba and Venezuela.” [FN252] These actions challenge the paradigm of U.S. hegemony in the Western Hemisphere. Until the United States ceases to see itself as “‘the centre of political enlightenment and as teachers to a great part of the rest of the world,’” a change of policy is
unlikely. [FN253]

United States laws that have facilitated these policies violate the very normative functions of law by their failure to operate as a *1922* “‘body of general principles, not a collection of special commands.’” [FN254] Using the law in this way is ironic, given U.S. demands of the Cuban government for change that include greater democratic freedoms for Cuban people and to respect basic human rights. [FN255] United States restrictions on family travel violate principles of family reunification that have served as the cornerstone of immigration law, as well as a number of human rights laws that guarantee the right to leave and return to one's country. [FN256] The prohibitions on remittances have served to interfere with the personal bonds, emotional ties, and basic family rights that such transactions represent. [FN257] The irony has not been lost on Cuban Americans who have suffered the restrictions and whose grief and anger are expressed by one woman who stated, “‘Some day it will seem preposterous to anyone that the U.S. government ever devised such restrictions.’” [FN258] It would seem that day is long overdue.

For now, the restrictions that most directly burden the Cuban binational family have been lifted. But the Trading with the Enemy Act, the Torricelli Act, and the Helms-Burton Act, which have functioned as a personal embargo against families who have borne the brunt of U.S. policies, remain in place. Binational families continue to suffer the consequences of these laws. The hope lies in the very words expressed by President Obama on the eve of the lifting of restrictions--that “the Cuban people’s desire to freely determine their future and that of their country is in the national interest of the United States.” [FN259] Only time will tell if those words will be given meaning and whether fifty years of a loathsome policy can be reversed.
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